

**The University of Nottingham
Animal Welfare and Ethical Review Body
Thursday 26 January 2017**

MINUTES

16 Members Present, 8 Apologies, 3 in Attendance

17/01 Minutes

RECEIVED: The minutes of the meeting held on 24 November 2016.

RESOLVED: That the minutes be approved.

17/02 Matters arising from the Minutes

(a) Action log – meeting 24 Nov 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. The HOI had indicated that they were happy to discuss pending applications with applicants and this would be communicated in documentation given to applicants.

(b) Retrospective Review: Emphasis on PPL holders to submit [Minute 16/61(c)]

A number of reviews were still awaiting submission. It had been communicated that the HOI did not require a formal report and that an AWERB Chair's letter would be sent to all licence holders with outstanding reviews to reinforce the requirement of the AWERB to receive reviews.

(c) Applications considered at last meeting [Minute 16/62]

REPORTED: Two of the four applications considered at the last meeting had been submitted to the HO, with one still awaiting submission and another brought to the AWERB for re-submission.

(d) Request for secondary availability from NTU [Minute 16/63]

REPORTED: A request for secondary availability had been discussed at the previous meeting. Interim discussions had raised no issue with the request and would be approved.

17/03 Chair's Business

(a) Task and finish group for mid-licence reviews

REPORTED: A 4-member task group would be instated to discuss and develop a mid-licence review process.

ACTION: 4 members had volunteered to participate and a meeting would be scheduled in the near future.

17/04 Project Licence Applications

(a) Prof AA

REPORTED: The applicant had presented the proposed work, which included the testing of bone scaffolds in sheep.

A series of comments on the application were made by the Primary Reader, NVS and NAWCO. No ethical or welfare issues had been raised, with discussion primarily focused around specifics of surgical interventions and the maximum number of analgesic events per animal. All questions had been answered to the satisfaction of AWERB.

RESOLVED: It was recommended that the application be approved.

(b) Prof BB

The applicant had presented an overview of the intended work to AWERB, which built upon a previous body of work to explore how the brain regulates the body via specific hormonal interactions.

A series of comments on the application was made by the Primary Reader, NVS and NAWCO primarily focused on the need to update the format to comply with more recent directives required of applications and clarification on cumulative effects and endpoints.

RESOLVED: It was recommended that the application be approved subject to AWERB comments being addressed.

(c) Prof CC

The applicant had presented the intended work to AWERB in a previous meeting and had been present in order to discuss recommendations and revisions to the application following AWERB's comments.

A series of updates regarding the application that had occurred since the initial submission to AWERB were provided to members. The majority of concerns had been addressed in the interim, AWERB members gave additional minor comments that would require resolving in the application.

RESOLVED: It was recommended that the application be approved subject to AWERB comments being addressed.

17/05 Report of SVMS Clinical Review Panel

AWERB had previously discussed the need for the SVMS Clinical Review Panel to report to AWERB in the first instance instead of the UREC (University Research Ethics Committee). Members of the SVMS Clinical Review Panel attended and gave a presentation outlining the workload, purpose, and day-to-day functioning of the panel. A series of questions were posed to SVMS members to outline the nature of the reporting relationship with AWERB.

RESOLVED: SVMS would report to AWERB regarding any ASPA work, including any grey areas that could be open to interpretation. SVMS would also provide an annual report to AWERB in September.

17/06 Non-ASPA project UNMC

REPORTED: A non-ASPA project at UNMC had been brought to AWERB to discuss how such projects would be handled in the future. Members discussed different options for how to engage with UNMC projects.

RESOLVED: AWERB would apply the same standard expected of applicants at UNMC as at UNUK, minus the need to present to AWERB due to geographical limitations.

17/07 Retrospective Review of Project Licences

(a) Dr DD (For discussion)

A retrospective review paper had been submitted to AWERB for comment. Members had discussed the review and had highlighted areas where more detail was needed and would be communicated to the applicant.

(b-h) Multiple reviews (for information)

No further comments had been made on the other remaining reviews.

17/08 AWERB as a forum for discussion

REPORTED: AWERB members had attended a presentation involving other AWERB's and the RSPCA. Various points had been raised including the agenda of the RSPCA to reduce animal usage numbers and the capacity of AWERB to function as a forum, with members providing various suggestions as to how this could be achieved. Subcommittees were also noted as a viable option to reduce overall strain on AWERB.

RESOLVED: An observer position would be opened up for AWERB so that members of staff and potential applicants could attend in order to distribute more knowledge about AWERB across the organisation.

17/09 Approvals by Fast-Track Procedure for Report

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

17/10 Project Licences granted by the Home Office

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

17/11 Any other business

REPORTED (a): It had been queried as to whether there could be a mechanism for AWERB members to view applicant progress through the system to increase awareness of upcoming workload, and to highlight any that may be taking a long time to make it to the point of submission.

RESOLVED (a): A spreadsheet currently used to track applications would be shared with AWERB members.

REPORTED (b): The Home Office had issued guidance on retrospectively reviewing severity which could be shared with applicants.

RESOLVED (b): The guidance would be shared with applicants and licence holders, possibly in the format of a seminar.