



# National Animal Ethics Advisory Committee

## General Meeting

Wednesday, 15 February 2017  
9.30am – 4.30pm

The Terrace Conference Centre  
Terrace 1 room  
114 The Terrace  
Wellington

## MINUTES

**Present:** Grant Shackell (Chairperson), Terry Fenn, Malcolm Tingle, Craig Johnson, Arnja Dale, Bronwen Connor, Craig Gillies, Leasa Carlyon, Rob Hazelwood.

**In Attendance:** s 9(2)(a) (Secretary); s 9(2)(a) (Senior Adviser, Animal Welfare); s 9(2)(a) (Policy Analyst, Regulatory Reform and Animal Welfare Policy).

**Apologies:** There were no apologies.

G Shackell opened the meeting at 9.30 am and welcomed attendees including new NAEAC members A Dale and R Hazelwood. G Shackell invited committee members to introduce themselves for the benefit of the new members.

### Any Other Business Part One (Open to the Public)

No other items of business were identified for discussion under Part One of the agenda. R Hazelwood asked whether members of the public attended the open part of NAEAC's meetings. s 9(2)(a) reported that although the public were entitled to attend, NAEAC was exempt from having to advertise their general meetings, so in practice, it did not occur.

### Any Other Business Part Two (Public Excluded Agenda)

The NAEAC AEC service award was identified as an additional item of business for discussion under Part Two of the agenda.

## PART ONE (OPEN TO THE PUBLIC)

### O 1. Election of Deputy Chair

The Animal Welfare Act 1999 (section 67 and Schedule 1, clause 3(1)) requires the committee to elect one of its members as its deputy chairperson, at its first meeting each year. The committee nominated C Johnson who agreed to accept the role of deputy chair.

*Moved (M Tingle/L Carlyon):*

*That Craig Johnson be elected deputy chairperson of the committee for 2017, pursuant to the Animal Welfare Act 1999 (section 67 and Schedule 1, clause 3(1)).*

*The motion was put: carried.*

### O 2. Annual review of committee performance

The committee reviewed feedback from the annual review of committee performance which was circulated prior to the meeting. s 9(2)(a) highlighted two comments which were received in regards to legal advice. It was noted that while MPI could not provide legal advice to NAEAC the Ministry may provide its 'point of view' on an issue, when asked. It was not usual practice for the committee to specifically ask MPI for legal advice. If any legal advice was required in respect to the upcoming changes to the definition of manipulation and Records and Statistics Regulations, this would be facilitated by the MPI Animal Welfare Policy team.

### O 3. Discussion and approval of draft Strategic Plan for 2017

G Shackell referred committee members to the updated draft plan which had been circulated prior to the meeting. G Shackell invited committee members to comment on the amendments. R Hazelwood asked why the presentation of the Three Rs award was being moved from once a year to every second year.

G Shackell reported that NAEAC had discussed government funding of the Three Rs award with the Minister, Hon Nathan Guy, when they met with him last year. NAEAC drafted a proposal asking for government funding of \$55,000 every second year (commencing in 2018) with \$5,000 being awarded to the individual and \$50,000 being awarded to the organisation the individual belonged to. The Minister was currently waiting for advice from MPI on the proposal.

It was noted that the 2016 award had been presented to Otago Polytechnic with sponsorship of \$2,000 coming from the Royal New Zealand Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals (RNZSPCA).

There were no other comments on the draft plan.

*Moved (B Connor/C Gillies):*

*That the updated draft Strategic Plan be adopted as the committee's Strategic Plan for 2017.*

*The motion was put: carried.*

*Action – s 9(2)(a) to finalise strategic plan and send to the Minister and ANZCCART.*

#### **O 4. Discussion and approval of draft Operational Plan for 2017**

G Shackell referred committee members to the updated draft Operational Plan for 2017, circulated for committee members' review prior to the meeting. There were no specific comments on the plan.

*Moved (G Shackell/M Tingle):*

*That the updated draft Operational Plan be adopted as the committee's Operational Plan for 2017.*

*The motion was put: carried.*

*Action – s 9(2)(a) to finalise operational plan and send to the Minister and ANZCCART.*

#### **O 5. Code of ethical conduct template**

G Shackell reported that he had contacted former NAEAC member s 9(2)(a) since the last meeting regarding the code template. K Booth had not yet incorporated the feedback received from animal ethics committees (AECs) after consultation with them last year. K Booth had advised G Shackell that she would have a revised draft available for the May general meeting.

It was anticipated that the code template would be used as a tool to assist code holders in drafting clear and concise codes of ethical conduct while at the same time streamlining the review process for NAEAC.

s 9(2)(a) reported that all code holders who had a code expiring in 2017 had been reminded of their obligations regarding independent reviews and code submission dates. Only one organisation had a code expiring in May – the others were expiring in November or December.

#### **O 6. NAEAC content on MPI website**

G Shackell reported that last year he had noticed National Animal Welfare Advisory Committee (NAWAC) guidelines on the NAEAC publications page s 9(2)(a) reported she had asked MPI's web services team to remove them.

Grant Shackell invited committee members to report anything else that they came across on the MPI website that was not working the way that it should be.

#### **O 7. Analgesic best practice**

C Johnson reported that he had located 10 -12 good sources of information (mainly websites) relating to analgesic best practice and just had to put them together on one page for distribution to AECs. It was agreed that the old analgesic best practice guidelines on the MPI website should be replaced with the new references once the summary had been drafted.

#### O 8. Topic/author for next issue of *Welfare Pulse*

A copy of the 2017 timetable for MPI's online magazine, *Welfare Pulse*, had been circulated to committee members prior to the meeting. Three issues of the magazine would be published in 2017. s 9(2)(a) reported she had spoken to the editor, s 9(2)(a), who had advised that sufficient copy was available for the April issue. The following topics and authors were agreed for the August and/or December issue of *Welfare Pulse*:

- s 9(2)(a) – (NIWA) – Tagging sharks;
- s 9(2)(a) – (Otago University) - Ethical decision making;
- s 9(2)(a) – (RNZSPCA) – Compassion fatigue.

#### O 9. NAEAC occasional paper series

s 9(2)(a) reported that she had received the foreword for B Connor's paper. Both the foreword and the draft had been circulated to MPI Communications for layout. MPI was currently waiting for a quote from the printers so it was anticipated that the paper would be distributed within the next two or three weeks.

C Gillies reported on his availability to work on the remote monitoring paper noting that his manager was on a three month secondment and that he would be backfilling the position. C Gillies asked G Shackell if he could draft a framework for what the paper should look like before they began working on it. It was noted that s 9(2)(a) from Massey University who had agreed to start the first draft of the paper would now no longer be involved. The paper would focus on remote monitoring tools for tracking animals and the target audience would be AECs.

The committee discussed contacting AECs to determine their experiences or concerns with regards to remote monitoring tracking devices. There was also some discussion on whether the paper should contain information on internal as well as external devices. Regardless of what was covered in the paper, the welfare implications of those devices should also be explored. M Tingle suggested that the paper could even be broken down into pieces if content was too large.

G Shackell agreed to have a framework for the paper available to members by the next meeting. A Dale agreed to provide advice on welfare impacts.

**Action – G Shackell to draft framework for remote monitoring paper.**

#### O 10. NAEAC Three Rs Award

s 9(2)(a) reported that she had spoken to the s 9(2)(a), about future funding for the award. MPI was in favour of a co-funding arrangement, e.g. with the SPCA and others if this could be organised and was not yet in a position to commit to any dollar amount. s 9(2)(a) had advised she would speak to s 9(2)(a) about appropriate funding partners in the first instance.

G Shackell reported that L Carlyon had some experience in seeking funding/sponsorship and that he and she would work on this to see if they could identify any potential sponsors. In the meantime, G Shackell asked committee members to send L Carlyon details of any contacts they could think of.



*Action – L Carlyon and G Shackell to identify potential sponsors for the Three Rs award.*

**O 11. Update for Minister for Primary Industries**

No matters of business were identified to update the Minister about.

**O 12. Update on alternatives to animal-based regulatory testing**

G Shackell reported that the reason R Hazelwood's name was against this agenda item was that he would have knowledge of international regulatory requirements for testing veterinary medicines and may be able to advise on any alternatives to the use of animals for such purposes.

R Hazelwood agreed that there were certainly some frustrations in the industry about complying with overseas regulatory requirements. A way of reducing animal use was to target batches to one particular area of the world. T Burrell suggested that this issue should be raised with the Minister the next time the committee met with him.

G Shackell reported that for regulatory testing of veterinary medicines, MPI's Agricultural Compounds and Veterinary Medicines (ACVM) group required companies to have AEC approval in place prior to being granted approval to test a particular product.

M Tingle reported that in respect to registration of chemicals, each compound had to be tested. While the European Union (EU) had introduced mandatory in-vitro testing of chemical product registration packages, the British Drug Agency did not accept in-vitro testing. G Shackell asked M Tingle if he could circulate information relating to the EU's decision for mandatory in-vitro testing to committee members.

*Action – M Tingle to circulate information on EU's requirements for the registration of chemicals.*

**O 13. Update on New Zealand Three Rs Initiatives**

s 9(2)(a) reported she had contacted s 9(2)(a) from ANZCCART about the status of the Three Rs resources. Two of the resources had been completed and another five would be discussed by the Board at their meeting on 20 February 2017 before being sent to NAEAC and MPI for feedback. Once these resources were designed, ANZCCART would have a total of seven to launch.

B Connor reported she had been approached by ANZCCART to draft one of these resources based on her AEC workshop presentation. B Connor had drafted a couple of paragraphs which had been amended to very simple language. There was some confusion about who the key audience might be for these resources. T Fenn suggested that ANZCCART's target audience was secondary school children as the resources would build on those already developed for schools.

It was suggested that these examples could be combined and issued as an occasional paper. s 9(2)(a) reported she would make a note of this for NAEAC's meeting with ANZCCART later in the year.

*Action – s 9(2)(a) to add topic of Three Rs resources to agenda for NAEAC's meeting with ANZCCART.*

**O 14. Update on emerging/new technologies**

No update was provided under this agenda item.

**O 15. MPI summary of CEC approvals, notifications and revocations**

s 9(2)(a) referred committee members to the code summary which was circulated prior to the meeting. It was noted that in addition to three new arrangements, s 9(2)(b)(ii)

**O 16. Discussion of information circulated by MPI**

There was no discussion of information circulated by MPI since the last general meeting.

**O 17. Committee members' reports on recent presentations and attendance at conferences**

G Shackell invited committee members to report on recent presentations and attendance at conferences since the last general meeting. M Tingle reported he had attended a National Centre for the Replacement, Refinement & Reduction of Animals in Research session in the United Kingdom.

G Shackell reported that he would be visiting the AgResearch campuses around New Zealand the following week to provide an update about upcoming changes to Part 6 of the Animal Welfare Act. G Shackell had also taken the opportunity of visiting Wellington Zoo as part of his role on NAWAC.

**O 18. Identification of topics for mini-tutorials in 2017**

G Shackell invited committee members to nominate mini-tutorial topics that they might like to hear about. L Carlyon reported that s 9(2)(a) would be available to talk to the committee about shark tagging. G Shackell reported that in investigating venues for the May general meeting, he had approached a contact at the Otago Museum about having a behind the scenes tour of the rainforest exhibition.

B Connor queried whether Otago University's new animal facility would be available to look at. It was noted that the facility was not yet up and running.

**PART TWO  
(PUBLIC EXCLUDED AGENDA)**

**DRAFT RESOLUTION TO EXCLUDE THE PUBLIC**

*Section 48, Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act 1987*

*There being no further introductory items of business to discuss, it was moved (G Shackell/L Carlyon):*

*A: That the public be excluded from the following parts of the proceedings of this meeting, namely:*

- C 1. Confirmation of previous minutes*
- C 2. Action list review*

- C 3. s 9(2)(b)(ii) code of ethical conduct  
 C 4. Update on amendments to the Animal Welfare (Records and Statistics) Regulations 1999  
 C 5. 2016 NAEAC annual report  
 C 6. Discussion of arrangements for 2017 site visit  
 C 7. Discussion of feedback from 2016 AEC workshop  
 C 8. Accredited reviewers teleconference  
 C 9. MPI update  
 C10. AEC service award

The general subject of each matter to be considered while the public is excluded, the reason for passing this resolution in relation to each matter, and the specific grounds under section 48(1) of the Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act 1987 for the passing of this resolution are as follows:

General subject of each matter to be considered		Reason for passing this resolution in relation to each matter	Ground(s) under section 48(1) for the passing of this resolution
C 1.	Confirmation of previous minutes.	To protect the privacy of natural persons.	That the public conduct of the relevant part of the proceedings of the meeting would be likely to result in the disclosure of information for which good reason for withholding would exist under section 9(2)(a) of the Official Information Act 1982 (OIA).
C 2.	Action list review.	As for C1 above.	As for C1 above.
C 3.	s 9(2)(b)(ii) code of ethical conduct.	To protect the privacy of natural persons; and/or:  To maintain the effective conduct of public affairs through the protection of Ministers, members of organisations, officers and employees from improper pressure or harassment.	That the public conduct of the relevant part of the proceedings of the meeting would be likely to result in the disclosure of information for which good reason for withholding would exist under sections 9(2)(a) and/or 9(2)(g)(ii) of the OIA.
C 4.	Update on amendments to the Animal Welfare (Records and Statistics) Regulations 1999.	To protect the privacy of natural persons; and/or:  To maintain the constitutional conventions for the time being which protect the confidentiality of advice tendered by Ministers of the Crown and officials.	That the public conduct of the relevant part of the proceedings of the meeting would be likely to result in the disclosure of information for which good reason for withholding would exist under sections 9(2)(a) and/or 9(2)(f)(iv) of the OIA.
C 5.	2016 NAEAC annual report.	To maintain the constitutional conventions for the time being which protect the confidentiality of advice tendered by Ministers of the Crown and officials; and/or:  To maintain the effective conduct of public affairs through the protection of Ministers, members of organisations, officers and employees from improper pressure or harassment.	That the public conduct of the relevant part of the proceedings of the meeting would be likely to result in the disclosure of information for which good reason for withholding would exist under sections 9(2)(f)(iv) and/or 9(2)(g)(ii) of the OIA.

<i>General subject of each matter to be considered</i>		<i>Reason for passing this resolution in relation to each matter</i>	<i>Ground(s) under section 48(1) for the passing of this resolution</i>
C 6.	<i>Discussion of arrangements for 2017 site visit.</i>	<i>To protect the privacy of natural persons; and/or:  To maintain the effective conduct of public affairs through the protection of Ministers, members of organisations, officers and employees from improper pressure or harassment.</i>	<i>That the public conduct of the relevant part of the proceedings of the meeting would be likely to result in the disclosure of information for which good reason for withholding would exist under sections 9(2)(a) and/or 9(2)(g)(ii) of the OIA.</i>
C 7.	<i>Discussion of feedback from 2016 AEC workshop.</i>	<i>As for C 6 above.</i>	<i>As for C 6 above.</i>
C 8.	<i>Accredited reviewers teleconference.</i>	<i>To protect the privacy of natural persons; and/or:  To maintain the constitutional conventions for the time being which protect the confidentiality of advice tendered by Ministers of the Crown and officials.</i>	<i>That the public conduct of the relevant part of the proceedings of the meeting would be likely to result in the disclosure of information for which good reason for withholding would exist under sections 9(2)(a) and/or 9(2)(f)(iv) of the OIA.</i>
C 9.	<i>MPI update.</i>	<i>As for C 8 above.</i>	<i>As for C 8 above.</i>
C10.	<i>AEC service award</i>	<i>To protect the privacy of natural persons; and/or:  To maintain the effective conduct of public affairs through the protection of Ministers, members of organisations, officers and employees from improper pressure or harassment.</i>	<i>That the public conduct of the relevant part of the proceedings of the meeting would be likely to result in the disclosure of information for which good reason for withholding would exist under sections 9(2)(a) and/or 9(2)(g)(ii) of the OIA.</i>

B: I also move that s 9(2)(a) (Secretary), s 9(2)(a) (Senior Adviser, Animal Welfare) and s 9(2)(a) (Policy Analyst, Regulatory Reform and Animal Welfare Policy) be permitted to remain at this meeting after the public has been excluded, because of their knowledge of meeting procedure and the subject matter under consideration. This knowledge is relevant background information to assist the committee in its deliberations.

*The motion was put: carried.*

#### **C 1. Confirmation of previous minutes**

The draft minutes of the quarterly general meeting held on 17 November 2016 were reviewed. Two minor typographical errors were noted. s 9(2)(a) reported she would amend, and recirculate the minutes.

*Moved (M Tingle/T Burrell):*

*That the draft minutes of the quarterly general meeting held on 17 November 2016 be amended and adopted as a true and accurate record of that meeting.*

*The motion was put: carried.*



**Action – s 9(2)(a) to amend minutes and recirculate to committee members.**

## **C 2. Action list review**

The committee reviewed progress with the actions agreed to at previous meetings. The following updates were provided:

**Update wiki page in light of amendments to Animal Welfare Act (action 4):** G Shackell reported he had drafted various changes to the wiki page in Word including adding links to the NAEAC publications. G Shackell was unsure how to add references to the wiki page. It was noted that other individuals had edited the page over time.

G Shackell provided some statistics on the wiki page since its establishment noting that the number of 'hits' the page had received was up by 70% from the year before.

The committee discussed the pros and cons of constantly updating the wiki page and agreed that the page would be better left as a generalised piece of information relating to the regulatory system governing animal use in research, testing and teaching.

s 9(2)(a) joined the meeting at 11.30 am. It was agreed to defer discussion of the action list until after s 9(2)(a) presentation.

## **O 19. Mini-tutorial: *Never let a crisis go to waste – getting animal welfare to the year 3000***

G Shackell welcomed s 9(2)(a) to the meeting to give his presentation. s 9(2)(a) reported he would provide an overview of animal welfare; give examples of recent 'crises' (e.g. media coverage of bobby calves, live animal exports, and rodeos); and how those crises are dealt with. Points covered included:

- The way people are currently addressing animal welfare may not be the way to address animal welfare in the long term. We should try and understand why people see crises or problems with the animal welfare system in the way that they do.
- Predisposing factors for humans that may result in unnecessary or unreasonable suffering for animals include ignorance, indifference, health difficulties, financial hardship, relationship break downs or pathological behaviour.
- What is necessary or reasonable suffering? We often 'benefit' from it e.g. confinement of rodents in cages for the purposes of research, testing and teaching (RTT). Current ways of dealing with animal welfare issues include: protest, exposure via covert activity, prosecution, education, and prohibition. This is done through legislation, codes of welfare, guidelines and expectations, and assurance programmes. But is this approach sustainable or fair?
- There are three things which make animal welfare sustainable. These include: breeding for production, the relationships between people and animals, and making moral decisions. Intensification reduces fitness. If we understand the drivers (commodity prices) can we address the impacts on animal welfare? We were once foragers and farmers but now 'real' animals no

longer figure in our everyday lives. Making moral decisions can be fast, instinctive and emotional or slow, deliberate and reasoned.

- s 9(2)(a) discussed science and moral judgements and how individuals can see an action or hear a story and have an instant feeling of approval or disapproval towards it. Minority groups are harnessing social media to put their views across. Should we ignore, defend or engage with such groups?
- Demonstrating animal welfare leadership can be achieved via effective communications. Examples include Young Farmer Contest questions and distribution of codes of welfare. NAEAC has a strategic plan and can demonstrate leadership via its functions on giving advice on ethical issues and standards and policies associated with RTT.
- What do we consider to be important? Invasive manipulation, confinement of rodents, blood harvesting? Our reputation is covered by oversight (modified and rejected proposals), monitoring and assurance and transparency.

On behalf of the committee G Shackell thanked s 9(2)(a) for his presentation and invited committee members to ask questions. There was some discussion around what constituted good animal welfare for rodents in respect to housing and cleaning requirements. It was noted that political decisions made by institutions often had a carryover effect on their animals.

The meeting adjourned for lunch at 12.15 pm and recommenced at 1.00 pm. s 9(2)(a) left the meeting at 1.00 pm and s 9(2)(a) joined the meeting at 1.00 pm.

## C 2. Action list review

**Consider how to formalise NAEAC's policies relating to codes of ethical conduct (action 7):** It was agreed to delete this action as the code of ethical conduct template would incorporate the information NAEAC wanted code holders to include in their codes.

**Summarise findings from survey of AEC members (action 9):** G Shackell referred committee members to the summary 2016 NAEAC survey data which was circulated the previous day. Feedback was received in relation to several topics including the AEC workshops. Some AEC members were in favour of workshops being held outside of Wellington. The survey identified that some also wanted the workshops to be longer and held more frequently. The committee considered there was merit in moving the workshop to another major city, such as Auckland for example but there was a danger that attendance would be lower if the workshops were held more frequently. It was suggested that in 2018, one of the workshops could be targeted at AEC secretaries.

**Draft 2016 NAEAC annual report (action 16):** G Shackell reported that he had started drafting the NAEAC annual report and would have a copy available for circulation in due course.

## C 3. s 9(2)(b)(ii) code of ethical conduct

s 9(2)(b)(ii) amended code of ethical conduct had been circulated to committee members for review prior to the meeting. M Tingle reported that s 9(2)(b)(ii) had addressed many of issues raised by

the committee in November, very well. Further comments relating to the references in the code were identified as follows:

**Section 15:** NAEAC raised the question of who would have the power to confer "other functions, duties or powers on the AEC".

**Section 16e:** This section should also specify that the layperson should not be associated with the scientific community as this is a requirement of the Act. The comma after "not" should also be removed.

**Section 30:** NAEAC was of the view that this section should specify that at least one meeting per year will be face-to-face.

**Section 35:** As <sup>s 9(2)(b)</sup><sub>(iii)</sub> is not subject to the Official Information Act, this section should be deleted.

**Section 40:** It was suggested that "(grades A or B)" be added after the phrase "little or no impact".

**Section 53:** NAEAC was concerned to see diagnostic, toxicity and potency testing still included in this section. As well as the issue of lack of consistency with other parts of the code, NAEAC considered that it was unlikely that <sup>s 9(2)(b)(ii)</sup> AEC would have the expertise to deal with such applications. It was suggested that this whole section be deleted.

**Sections 60-61:** In the previous version of the code there was a section between these two. NAEAC suggested that the second and third sentences of the previous section 65 be deleted, not the entire section. The statement that "The AEC will determine if the grading/s assigned to an application are appropriate when the application is being assessed" is valid and should be reinserted.

**Section 63:** NAEAC suggested that "... submitted to the AEC for consideration" would be more appropriate than "for approval" as this could be interpreted to mean that the AEC has no option but to approve.

**Section 69:** NAEAC considered that the phrase "If programmes are later developed and implemented through <sup>s 9(2)(b)(ii)</sup> that develop beyond the scope of research and/or teaching," should be deleted.

**Section 69c:** NAEAC was uncomfortable with the reference to testing in this section.

**Section 79:** NAEAC agreed it would like to see "d. Decline to approve a proposal" reinstated in this section.

**Section 83:** NAEAC suggested that the phrase "final meeting" be amended to read "final scheduled meeting" in this section.

**Section 85:** The first sentence in this section did not make sense.

**Section 88:** NAEAC considered that the AEC should be provided with an explanation of why gradings may have varied. Also, the information should be supplied to the AEC within a specified time, e.g. a month.

A number of typographical errors were also noted.

The committee also discussed the definition of consensus in regards to committee decision making and agreed that this should be brought up at the AEC chairs meeting later in the year.

*Moved (G Shackell/M Tingle):*

That **s 9(2)(b)(ii)** draft code of ethical conduct be received and that NAEAC recommend that the Director-General of the Ministry for Primary Industries approve the code under the Animal Welfare Act 1999, subject to the matters identified by NAEAC being addressed to the satisfaction of MPI.

*The motion was put: carried.*

**Action – s 9(2)(a) to notify s 9(2)(b)(ii) accordingly.**

#### **C 4. Update on amendments to the Animal Welfare (Records and Statistics) Regulations 1999**

**s 9(2)(a)** provided an update on the work being undertaken by MPI Animal Welfare Policy on the various animal welfare regulations. As outlined in the MPI update, the discussion document on the implementation of the upcoming changes to the definition of manipulation and reporting of surplus animals, was released to AECs at the end of last year. A total of 16 submissions had been received. There was general agreement that the counting of surplus animals should be included in the statistics to increase transparency. Some specific concerns were raised about the increase in numbers which counting surplus animals would generate. There were also other comments relating to specific species e.g. counting of fish eggs. NAEAC reminded **s 9(2)(a)** that the definition of an animal under the Act did not include any animal in the pre-natal, pre-hatched, larval or other such developmental stage. The final policy for the reporting requirement for surplus animals was due to be completed by August.

In relation to the Care and Conduct Regulations, 47 of the original 91 which were consulted on last year, would continue to be progressed throughout 2017. The public summary of submissions was due for public release sometime in March.

In regards to communicating the above information to members of the public, T Fenn recommended that MPI engage with the Science Media Centre.

#### **C 5. 2016 NAEAC annual report**

As reported previously during the meeting, G Shackell had already started drafting the 2016 NAEAC report. G Shackell did however require **s 9(2)(a)** to send him committee payment details.

**Action – s 9(2)(a) to send G Shackell 2016 committee member payment details.**

#### **C 6. Discussion of arrangements for 2017 site visit**

G Shackell reported that the May site visit would incorporate visiting five organisations – two AECs **s 9(2)(b)(ii)** as well as three parented organisations.



G Shackell was also investigating the availability of a room at the Otago Museum so that the committee could hold its general meeting there and have a mini-tutorial and/or behind the scenes tour of the tropical rainforest exhibition.

#### **C 7. Discussion of feedback from 2016 AEC workshop**

s 9(2)(a) referred committee members to the summary of feedback she had circulated prior to the meeting. All attendees had found the content relevant to them and nearly all liked the format of the workshop. As in previous years, there were mixed views about workshop frequency. Some AEC members were happy with the workshop being run every two years whereas others wanted the workshops run more frequently. A number of suggested topics were also provided for future workshops.

s 9(2)(a) reported that 19 out of 30 AECs were represented on the day. It was noted that several individuals pulled out of the workshop due to the earthquake which had taken place four days before. G Shackell took the opportunity of thanking s 9(2)(a) for her work in organising the workshop during this difficult time.

s 9(2)(a) reported that s 9(2)(b)(ii) was still making plans to use s 9(2)(b)(ii) code and AEC.

#### **C 8. Accredited reviewers teleconference**

s 9(2)(a) reported that she had been unable to schedule a meeting in February and was instead looking for a date in March that would suit the accredited reviewers, MPI and NAEAC participants.

The NAEAC subcommittee (T Burrell, L Carlyon and G Shackell) suggested the alternate date of Wednesday 29 March at 3.30 pm. s 9(2)(a) agreed to notify accredited reviewers about the new date and set up the meeting if sufficient reviewers were available then.

**Action – s 9(2)(a) to organise March teleconference.**

#### **C 9. MPI update**

The MPI update, circulated prior to the meeting was noted.

#### **C 10. AEC service award**

s 9(2)(a) declared his conflict of interest in relation to this agenda item and left the room at 3.15 pm. The individual nominated for the award was associated with AgResearch Invermay's AEC.

After s 9(2)(a) left the room, the rest of the committee considered the nomination by s 9(2)(a) Coordinator of AgResearch Ltd's AECs to award Sharon Bennie, secretary of the Invermay committee with an AEC service award. The committee agreed that based on the information provided, Sharon Bennie should receive the award and that it should be presented in Dunedin during the May site visit.

*Moved (M Tingle/L Carlyon):*



*That the award nomination by AgResearch Ltd be received and that AgResearch Invermay AEC secretary Sharon Bennie, receive an AEC service award.*

*The motion was put: carried.*

**Action – s 9(2)(a) to prepare AEC service award certificate**

s 9(2)(a) returned to the meeting at 3.17 pm.

L Carlyon reported that she had been employed by Victoria University for one day each week on a six month contract. If any committee business relating to Victoria University came up L Carlyon would not participate in the discussion.

There being no further items of business, the Chair thanked committee members for their attendance and declared the meeting closed at 3.20 pm.