

**The University of Nottingham
Animal Welfare and Ethical Review Body
Thursday 24 November 2016**

MINUTES

18 Members Present, 6 Apologies, 4 in Attendance

16/59 Minutes

RECEIVED: The minutes of the meeting held on 6 October 2016.

RESOLVED: That the minutes be approved.

16/60 Matters arising from the Minutes

(a) Action log – meeting 6 October 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 16/51]

One application presented to the AWERB at the previous meeting had been submitted to the HO and another was awaiting approval on a second draft before submission to the HO.

(c) SVMS Ethics Clinical Review Panel reporting structure [Minute 16/53]

REPORTED: The report format used by the SVMS for the Research Ethics Committee had been reviewed, it was agreed that this was not an appropriate format for AWERB purposes.

ACTION: SVMS would produce a free text report that could be used for reporting key information to AWERB. This would be presented by a member of the panel at the January meeting.

16/61 Chair's Business

(a) Welcome new members

A new member and a lay observer had been welcomed to AWERB.

(b) Timetable for AWERB submission

The date for submission had been moved forward two weeks to provide additional lead-time for processing applications prior to AWERB.

(c) Retrospective Review: Emphasis on PPL holders to submit

REPORTED: Some retrospective reviews had not been received on time and had required reminders to be sent out.

ACTION: Any future reviews received late would be officially noted as late by AWERB and this would be communicated to the licence holder.

16/62 Project Licence Applications

(a) Prof AA

The applicant had intended to present to AWERB remotely, however, technical difficulties had prevented this. Members had discussed notes on the application and had generally agreed that the scientific justification and proposed interventions were sound.

RESOLVED: The application would be reviewed electronically outside of the meeting and approved if appropriate.

(b) Dr BB

The applicant had presented an overview of the intended work to AWERB, which was a continuation of a previous licence to permit breeding and maintenance of mice genotype lines for use in animal research.

A series of comments on the application was made by the Primary Reader, NVS and NAWCO primarily focused on structure and ordering of the application. There had been no concerns raised with the proposed work.

RESOLVED: It was recommended that the application be approved.

(c) Prof CC

The applicant had presented an overview of the intended work to AWERB, which aimed to investigate immune responses to salmonella infection in different animals.

A series of comments on the application was made by the Primary Reader, NVS, NACWO and Committee members in discussion with the applicant. Whilst the overall scientific justification for the research was clear, a number of areas within the application had caused concern for members.

RESOLVED: That the application not be approved at this time and be resubmitted to a future meeting following its revision in the light of AWERB comments.

(d) Dr DD

The applicant had presented an overview of the intended work to AWERB, which aimed to investigate human parasite molecules for therapeutic exploitation and vaccine development.

A series of comments on the application was made by the NVS, NACWO and Committee members in discussion with the applicant. The scientific justification for the work was clear and some clarifications had been provided satisfactorily regarding statistical methods and group sizes.

RESOLVED: It was recommended that the application be approved subject to the Primary Reader's questions being addressed satisfactorily.

16/63 Request for Secondary Availability

REPORTED: A request for secondary availability under an external licence application had been received primarily for the purpose of transporting animals within the licence.

RESOLVED: Secondary availability would be granted if the licence was approved by the HO and if, after electronic circulation no concerns were raised by AWERB members, otherwise it would be brought before the next AWERB meeting for discussion.

16/64 Retrospective Review of Project Licences

(a) Dr EE

A retrospective review paper had been submitted to AWERB for comment. Members had discussed the review and had raised concerns regarding the relative brevity of the review and lack of clarity in the actual outcomes.

RESOLVED: The licence holder would be asked to resubmit their review for comment at the next AWERB.

16/65 FOI Request

REPORTED: An FOI request had been received from a Students' Union Society requesting general information on animal research work conducted at the University.

ACTION: A meeting would be arranged with representatives from the Society to discuss the request and provide information on animal work taking place at the University.

16/66 BSU Application guide and checklist

REPORTED: A guide, utilising a checklist format, had been produced in an attempt to minimise common errors made during the project licence application process. This was shared with members for comment. Members had agreed that the guide would be a useful resource and would be given to applicants in future.

16/67 BSU October 16 Home Office Training Course and Results

REPORTED: An overview of the outcome of a recent Home Office training course had been provided to members for discussion. It had been noted that the addition of a dedicated training room had proved beneficial in the running of the course and failure numbers were indicative of the high level of standard required to complete the course.

16/68 Approvals by Fast-Track Procedure for Report

REPORTED: Two licences had been approved by Fast-Track procedure.

16/69 Project Licences granted by the Home Office

REPORTED: Three licences discussed at previous AWERB meetings had been granted by the Home Office.

16/70 Any other business

REPORTED: It had been queried as to whether the AWERB received reports akin to those requested of the SVMS from departments across the University. Members had discussed the mechanism by which this could be achieved and the merits of reviewing these reports.

RESOLVED: The possibility of reviewing reports would be considered in a future AWERB meeting.