
**Minutes: from the AWERB meeting held on 23rd February 2016 at 11am in
Camden Council Room VIDEOLINKED TO Hawkshead Council Room**

Status: **Chair approved**

1 MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING

The minutes of the meeting held on 27 January 2016 were confirmed as an accurate record.

2 PRESENTATION FROM PPL HOLDER

An amendment to a project licence had been submitted to AWERB for review. The project licence holder had therefore been invited to attend AWERB to explain why the amendment was required and also as part of the mid-term review for this project licence.

The work focused on the discovery and development of medicines to treat respiratory diseases. Their key expertise was in the treatment of diseases where accumulated mucus secretions were an important contributor to disease pathology. Such diseases included:

- Cystic fibrosis.
- Bronchiectasis.
- Chronic obstructive pulmonary disease (COPD).
- Sinusitis.

The aim of the project licence was to identify substances which could treat these respiratory diseases characterised by abnormal airway secretions. Identification of substances that down-regulate the electrical potential difference across the airway lining could lead to their subsequent development as drugs to reduce the cough, mucus accumulation, and lung degeneration suffered by patients with chronic respiratory diseases.

It was proposed to add a new protocol to the licence which would enable drug delivery to airways by nebulised aerosol for investigation of ciliary transport of secretions.

AWERB discussed the proposed amendment to this project licence. This research could result in new treatments that would be long lasting and provide significant advances in the field. There was some concern that the proposed studies were not really making a big step forward in the drug development process. The consensus was that the current harm benefit analysis to carry out research involving terminal anaesthesia was favourable. The terminal anaesthesia would also be safer for the pig welfare, as it avoided any risk of the pig having a conscious awareness of what was happening when the drug was administered. It was logical to take this step, prior to moving on to much more complex in vivo functional studies.

3 GUIDING PRINCIPLES ON GOOD PRACTICE FOR ANIMAL WELFARE AND ETHICAL REVIEW BODIES

3.1 Section: Project Review

The following recommendations were made:

- PPL applicant discuss their proposed draft licence application with the NVS or NACWO before it was circulated to AWERB (now done as standard practice).
- When the PPL applicant came to AWERB to discuss their project licence, instead of giving a powerpoint presentation, they would be sent a list of generic questions of the issues they might be asked at the meeting and so should be prepared to answer. Different members of AWERB should be assigned to lead the questioning on the areas that were of interest to them, so for example the scientists would ask questions about the science; the lay people general questions about the licence and the NACWOs questions about the adverse effects and end points and the training and competencies required by their personal licence holders.
- Once the PPL applicant had left the meeting the AWERB should then discuss whether they were happy for the work to be carried out at the College.

AWERB agreed this approach should be trialled and then reviewed to see if there was any improvement over the current less structured approach.

3.2 Section: General principles of Good Practice and top ten tips for a successful AWERB

AWERB noted that this paper had been updated. It was agreed that the proposed survey of owners of dogs that had been rehomed from the RVC should be added to the document as the results of the survey would be helpful to assess how the processes have worked to date and whether there was a need to improve on them.

4 PROJECT LICENCES – NEW LICENCES GRANTED

AWERB noted that one new project licence had been granted with primary availability at the RVC.

5 PROJECT LICENCE AMENDMENTS UNDERGOING REVIEW

AWERB noted that there were three project licences that required amendments. One was at the Home Office, and two were still going through AWERB review.

6 PROJECT LICENCE MID TERM AND END OF TERM REVIEWS

6.1 Way forward

It was agreed that for future midterm and end of term project licence reviews, they should be assigned to members of the committee to review the paperwork who would then report back at the next meeting to say how they felt about it and whether any queries should be raised with the project licence holder. It was felt that this would be a more proactive process.

7 PROJECT LICENCE MID TERM REVIEW

AWERB noted and approved the mid term review that had been submitted.

8 PROJECT LICENCE END OF LICENCE REVIEW

AWERB noted and approved the end of licence project review.

9 WORKING GROUP UPDATES

9.1 Sharing of resources group

The second meeting had been arranged for 7th April.

9.2 Rodent Handling Group

Instead of setting up a Rodent Handling Group, it was proposed that there should be a brainstorming session to develop a College policy on handling, which would provide a description of the different techniques available and the pros and cons of each one. This approach was agreed.

10 NVS REPORTS

10.1 NVS report – Hawkshead

AWERB noted the report.

10.2 NVS report - Camden

AWERB noted the NVS report for January.

11 TEMPERATURE REPORTS

AWERB noted the temperature reports.

The chiller unit in Hawkshead BSU would be replaced to ensure that there was optimal control of the environment for the animals kept in H60. The new chillers (there would be two installed) were on order (lead time 10 weeks) so by the time the warmer weather comes a cooling system with built in back up would be in place.

12 GENETICALLY ALTERED MICE SELF ASSESSEMENT FRAMEWORK

AWERB noted that this framework had been updated by the Home Office.

13 TRAINING RECORDS

Letters would be sent to PIL and PPL Holders by the end of the week updating them on issues relating to the buildings at Camden and Hawkshead and reminding them of their responsibilities under the legislation. The letters were with the NVS for their input.

14 LARGE ANIMALS – HANDLING SESSIONS

Concern had been raised that the ponies were being kept separately during the anatomy handling sessions. A number of options were discussed to mitigate the effects of this

The following actions were agreed:

- Those running the classes involving the ponies were to be told that the Committee were not happy that the ponies were being separated
- Option of bringing in a 3rd pony to be looked into, who would be a companion to the pony who was left on its own, whilst the other one was in the class should be explored.
- Queries would be made to see if it was possible to run a student project where the student examined the welfare and behaviour of those animals involved in the teaching classes.