

**The University of Nottingham**  
**Animal Welfare and Ethical Review Body**  
**Thursday 6 October 2016**

**MINUTES**

17 Members Present, 6 Apologies, 3 in Attendance

**16/48 Minutes**

RECEIVED: The minutes of the meeting held on 7 July 2016.

RESOLVED: That the minutes be approved.

**16/49 Matters arising from the Minutes**

**(a) Action log – meeting 7 July 2016**

An action log from the previous meeting had been presented to AWERB. A number of items within the log had been discussed and progress updates provided to members.

**(b) Applications considered at the last meeting [Minute 16/37]**

The application for consideration at the previous meeting would be presented at a future meeting as the applicant was previously unable to attend.

**(c) Proposed dates of meetings in session 2016-17 [Minute 16/44]**

Proposed dates had been circulated to members. A gap in the timetable had meant that an application required discussion via email and submission prior to the meeting, though it would still be presented and critiqued.

**(d) Any other business – options for pig housing and feeding [Minute 16/47]**

Options for pig housing were still under investigation and a solution would need to ensure appropriate balance between scientific justification and welfare. AWERB would continue to investigate.

**16/50 Chair's Business**

**(a) Membership**

Following the retirement of a previous AWERB member, a new member was currently being sought. The AWERB also welcomed a new member to the board.

**(b) AWERB strategy meeting – 26/9/16**

A strategy meeting had been held and a document outlining key points from the day and action plans would be circulated to members.

**16/51 Project Licence Applications**

**(a) Dr AA**

The applicant had presented an overview of the intended work to AWERB, which proposed the study of brain and vascular interactions, and their effect upon pain and perception.

A series of comments on the application were made by the Primary Reader, NVS, NACWO and committee members in discussion with the applicant. The application had also been previously discussed with, and to the satisfaction of the HOI. Discussion had primarily focused upon the possible effects of analgesia upon the scientific aims of the project.

RESOLVED: It was recommended that the Establishment Licence Holder approve the application for submission to the Home Office.

**(b) Ms BB**

The applicant had presented an overview of the intended work to AWERB, which aimed to develop pre-clinical models of cancer that could be used to increase understanding of tumour development and assist in future drug development.

A series of comments on the application were made by the Primary Reader, NVS, NACWO and committee members in discussion with the applicant. Discussion was primarily focused upon the difficulty of surgical procedures that had been proposed. A linked application which had been approved prior to the meeting was also discussed.

RESOLVED: It was recommended that the Establishment Licence Holder approve the application for submission to the Home Office subject to the applicant satisfactorily addressing the comments of the AWERB members.

**16/52 PPL Application Process**

REPORTED: Discussions with other institutions and the functionality of the new ASPeL system to send first drafts to the HOI had raised the possibility of amending the application process to permit earlier discussion between the applicant and the HOI. The need to streamline the application process had been discussed at a number of previous AWERB meetings and this had seemed an ideal opportunity.

ACTION: HOI would be asked whether it would be possible for applicants to discuss projects with them in the first instance.

**16/53 SVMS Ethics Clinical Review Panel reporting structure**

REPORTED: The SVMS had currently only reported directly to the Research Ethics Committee. The overlap with AWERB had been discussed previously and the concept note proforma had been amended to include sections on ASPA and inclusion of project licence codes. The SVMS panel had agreed to report to AWERB, though the format of this report had not yet been agreed.

ACTION: Report format to be sent to the Chair of the SVMS along with request that an updated concept note is required to be used by applicants.

**16/54 FOI Request**

REPORTED: An FOI request had been received requiring additional breakdowns of categories of usage beyond what was currently published.

ACTION: New breakdowns would be published to assist in any further FOI's.

**16/55 Retrospective Review of Project Licences**

**(a) Dr CC**

A retrospective review paper had been submitted to AWERB for comment. Members had discussed the outcomes with the licence holder, paying focus to benefits of in-vitro findings to the development of the area of work. The outcomes had so far been published in abstract form only.

**16/56 Approvals by Fast-Track Procedure for Report**

REPORTED: Six licences had been approved by Fast Track procedure.

**16/57 Project Licences granted by the Home Office**

REPORTED: One licence discussed at a previous AWERB meeting had been granted by the Home Office.

**16/58 Any other business**