



National Animal Ethics Advisory Committee

General Meeting

Tuesday, 16 May 2017
8.45am – 2.45pm

Otago Museum
Kakapo Room
419 Great King Street
Dunedin

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) (Senior Adviser, Animal Welfare Sector Liaison); s 9(2)(a) (Adviser, Animal Welfare).

Apologies: There were no apologies.

G Shackell opened the meeting at 9.05 am and welcomed attendees including s 9(2)(a) and s 9(2)(a) who had recently joined the Ministry for Primary Industries (MPI) Animal Welfare team. It was noted that the meeting would be adjourned at 11.30 am in order to take a tour of the tropical rainforest (butterfly) exhibit at the Museum.

Any Other Business Part One (Public Excluded Agenda)

No other items of business were identified for discussion under Part One of the agenda.

Any Other Business Part Two (Open to the Public)

No other items of business were identified for discussion under Part Two of the agenda.

PART ONE (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/M Tingle):

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. Code of ethical conduct expiry dates s 9(2)(b)(ii)*
- C 5. Allocation of codes for review in October*
- C 6. Update on amendments to the Animal Welfare (Records and Statistics) Regulations 1999*
- C 7. Approval of NAEAC annual report for 2016*
- C 8. Feedback from AEC site visits*
- C 9. Feedback from accredited reviewers teleconference*
- C 10. NAEAC correspondence*
- C 11. MPI update*

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:

<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>
<i>C 1.</i>	<i>Confirmation of previous minutes.</i>	<i>To protect the privacy of natural persons.</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 section 9(2)(a) of the OIA.</i>
<i>C 2.</i>	<i>Action list review.</i>	<i>As for C 1 above.</i>	<i>As for C 1 above.</i>
<i>C 3.</i>	<i>s 9(2)(b)(ii) code of ethical conduct.</i>	<i>To protect information where making the information available would be likely unreasonably to prejudice the commercial position of the person who supplied or is the subject of the information; 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)(b)(ii) and/or 9(2)(g)(ii) of the Official Information Act 1982.</i>

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 4.	Code of ethical conduct expiry date s 9(2)(b)(ii)	<p>To protect the privacy of natural persons; and/or:</p> <p>To maintain the constitutional conventions for the time being which protect the confidentiality of advice tendered by Ministers of the Crown and officials.</p>	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.	Allocation of codes for review in October	<p>To protect the privacy of natural persons; and/or:</p> <p>To maintain the effective conduct of public affairs through the protection of Ministers, members of organisations, officers and employees from improper pressure or harassment.</p>	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 6.	Update on amendments to the Animal Welfare (Records and Statistics) Regulations 1999.	<p>To protect the privacy of natural persons; and/or:</p> <p>To maintain the constitutional conventions for the time being which protect the confidentiality of advice tendered by Ministers of the Crown and officials.</p>	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 7.	Approval of NAEAC annual report for 2016.	<p>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:</p> <p>To maintain the effective conduct of public affairs through the protection of Ministers, members of organisations, officers and employees from improper pressure or harassment.</p>	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.
C 8.	Feedback from AEC site visits.	<p>To protect the privacy of natural persons; and/or:</p> <p>To maintain the effective conduct of public affairs through the protection of Ministers, members of organisations, officers and employees from improper pressure or harassment.</p>	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 9.	Feedback from accredited reviewers teleconference.	<p>To protect the privacy of natural persons; and/or:</p> <p>To maintain the constitutional conventions for the time being which protect the confidentiality of advice tendered by Ministers of the Crown and officials.</p>	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.

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 10.	NAEAC correspondence	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 sections 9(2)(a).
C 11.	MPI update.	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.

B: That s 9(2)(a) (Secretary), s 9(2)(a) (Senior Adviser, Animal Welfare), s 9(2)(a) (Senior Adviser, Animal Welfare Sector Liaison), and s 9(2)(a) (Adviser, Animal Welfare) 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 15 February 2017 were reviewed. There were no amendments.

Moved (M Tingle/B Connor):

That the draft minutes of the quarterly general meeting held on 15 February 2017 be adopted as a true and accurate record of that meeting.

The motion was put: carried.

C 2. Action list review

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

Discuss review of Good Practice Guide with s 9(2)(a) (action 3): G Shackell reported that he had discussed the review of the Good Practice Guide with s 9(2)(a) had suggested that NAEAC might like to survey AEC members to ascertain whether the publication was being used or not before the committee began revising it.

Investigate alternatives to the 2002 publication on analgesic best practice (action 5): C Johnson reported that he would be in a position to complete this action soon.

Arrange for AEC survey results to go on the MPI website (action 9): While NAEAC had previously agreed that the results of the AEC survey should go on the MPI website, s 9(2)(a) reminded committee members that the letter, which accompanied the survey, said the results were only for internal use. The committee agreed to rescind their previous decision to make the results public.

Circulate information on the European Union's requirements for the registration of chemicals (action 22): M Tingle reported that he had emailed a paper on this topic to G Shackell. G Shackell agreed to forward it to the rest of the committee.

Action – G Shackell to circulate paper received from M Tingle to rest of committee.

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

G Shackell invited committee members to comment on the draft code. The following points were noted for clarification/amendment (adopting the references in the code):

Part II – Description of general nature and extent of the work: More information on membership being in accordance with the Animal Welfare Act 1999 (the Act) was required in this section of the code. For example, the Act requires that one of the internal members of the AEC must be a senior member of the organisation who is capable of evaluating proposals, their scientific value and the qualifications and skills of the applicant. NAEAC was unable to identify which of the persons specified in (a) or (b) fulfilled this role.

In addition, in (c) and (e) the phrase "not associated with s 9(2)(b)(ii)" or similar wording should be added.

In respect to additional members, NAEAC was concerned that any number of additional members could be added to the committee, overwhelming the statutory external members. If this provision was retained NAEAC suggested that the circumstances where this may occur be detailed. Also, the maximum number of additional members should be specified.

Part III - Purpose of the AEC: This section referred to a policy which the AEC would adhere to in relation to project suspension or revocation. However, without seeing the policy the committee was unable to ascertain if it contained sufficient information. s 9(2)(a) reminded committee members that past NAEAC members had thought it appropriate for code holders to simply make reference to policies in their code rather than include them as appendices. This ensured that codes were kept to a reasonable length and meant that any amendments made to policies did not have to be reported to or approved by MPI as they did not form part of the code.

As reference to other policies were also included in the code it was agreed to ask the code holder to include the intent of those policies within the text of the code to enable it to be understood in a stand-alone context.

While reading through Part III of the code, G Shackell noted in passing that some practising veterinarians may not be seeking AEC approval because they believed they were manipulating animals for clinical purposes rather than for the purposes of research, testing and teaching.

Part IV - AEC procedures (a): NAEAC raised the question of what happens when the vote is not unanimous.

Part IV (b): NAEAC was unclear what was meant by “stakeholders” in this context.

Part IV (c): Rather than “All decisions must involve ...” NAEAC considered that this should be “All meetings require...”. In addition, while the quorum is satisfactory if the AEC membership is as specified, if there are extra appointees or co-opted members thereby increasing the total number of AEC members then NAEAC’s view is that the quorum should be half the membership plus one and include at least two external members. In addition, the phrase “external members” should be changed to “statutory external members” to distinguish them from other external members appointed under the co-opting provision. NAEAC was also unclear about the co-opted experts and suggested that this section be clarified. Were co-opted experts AEC members (with full voting rights) or simply expert advisers?

NAEAC was of the opinion that decision-making should be made by consensus.

Part IV (d): The previous comments regarding defining a quorum, and external members, also applied to this section.

Part IV (e): It should be at least 5 working days before each meeting that relevant material is circulated to AEC members, not “within” 5 days of the meeting.

Part IV (g): Section IV (d) specified there would be at least one meeting a year. NAEAC considered that the teleconference provisions in this section should apply only to additional meetings i.e. at least one meeting must be held face-to-face. In addition, applications with impact gradings of C, D or E should be discussed at a physical meeting.

Part IV (h): It was not clear that modifications to protocols had to be approved by the AEC.

Part IV (i): NAEAC considered that this section required elaboration to specify physical monitoring requirements for monitoring high and very high impact graded projects and minimum numbers.

Part IV (j): Some adverse events would require much more urgent action than consulting the AEC. There should be provisions to cover various types of adverse events in this section. The committee asked s 9(2)(a) to mention that the code template may assist in this regard.

Part V – Approval of protocols by the AEC: NAEAC considered that this section should specify that the operating procedures should be approved by the AEC and that the fixed period referred to should have a specified maximum. In addition, this section referred to electronic approvals suggesting that some applications are approved without any meeting. If so, it should be specified in what circumstances this will occur. Also, the reference to teleconferences specifies all members of the AEC whereas a quorum is specified elsewhere.

Part VI - Reporting: NAEAC was unsure what was meant by “any variations” as any changes to an approved project should have been approved by the AEC and not come to the AEC’s attention for the first time in a report that is prepared after the project is finished. In addition, this section did not indicate

what the AEC would do with the project reports. It was also noted that "Ministry of Primary Industries" should read "Ministry for Primary Industries" in this section.

Part XI – Animal facilities and practices: Mention should be made of monitoring of facilities and a reference to NAEAC's *Good Practice Guide for the Use of Animals in Research, Testing and Teaching* was suggested.

Part XIII – Treatment of commercially sensitive information: Matters relating to conflicts of interest should be in a separate section from that dealing with commercially sensitive information.

Part XIV – Additional provisions (a): The committee considered that specifying a specific dollar amount in this section was not necessary.

Part XIV (c): There should be some reference to mechanisms to ensure effective input by external members. In addition, the final sentence about external members being required to attend meetings is not enforceable.

It was noted that s 9(2)(b)(ii) current code as well as the code submitted for approval stated that the AEC Chairperson is elected at each meeting but the review report stated that "The AEC Chairpersons are s 9(2)(a) and s 9(2)(a)." Clarification was required around this point. A Dale considered that this discrepancy should be raised with the accredited reviewer involved.

M Tingle offered to help s 9(2)(b)(ii) redraft their code if they required assistance. It was agreed to pass on M Tingle's contact details to the code holder and ask them to consider using the draft code template.

Given that s 9(2)(b)(ii) current code was due to expire on 20 June it was agreed to give them a deadline of one week (Friday 26 May) to have their revised code back to MPI.

Moved (G Shackell/L Carlyon):

That s 9(2)(b)(ii) 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 a subcommittee comprising G Shackell, A Dale, B Connor, and M Tingle. It was agreed that the subcommittee consider the amended code at a face-to-face meeting in Auckland.

The motion was put: carried.

Actions:

s 9(2)(a) to write to advise s 9(2)(b)(ii) accordingly.

O 10. Mini-tutorial: 'Behind the scenes' look at rainforest exhibit at Otago Museum

The meeting adjourned at 11.35 am in order to take a tour of the rainforest (butterfly) exhibit, which was followed by lunch.

The meeting resumed at 12.40 pm.

C 4. Code of ethical conduct expiry date for the s 9(2)(b)(ii) and the s 9(2)(b)(ii)

s 9(2)(a) reported that in 2013 a legal technicality had been identified with the publication of Gazette notices for approval of codes of ethical conduct. If a code was approved for a five-year period starting 1 January and the Gazette notice was published before 1 January, the five-year period would start from the date of publication.

Some code holders affected by this had asked to have their existing code approved for an extra few weeks to the end of the calendar year so that their new code came into force on 1 January.

Of the code holders who had a code expiring before the end of the year, s 9(2)(b)(ii) had requested that the approval of their current code be extended. s 9(2)(b)(ii)

The committee agreed to pass a resolution that would cover the periods requested for s 9(2)(b)(ii) respectively.

Moved (T Fenn/A Dale):

NAEAC recommends that MPI approve the current code of ethical conduct for the s 9(2)(b)(ii) and the current code of ethical conduct for s 9(2)(b)(ii), for the relevant periods requested.

The motion was put: carried.

C 5. Allocation of codes for review in October

A list of codes due to expire before the end of the year was circulated to committee members prior to the meeting. To facilitate the review process in October, it was agreed that two or three committee members take the lead on a particular code. The following allocations were agreed upon:

- s 9(2)(b)(ii) (C Gillies/C Johnson)
- s 9(2)(b)(ii) (A Dale/B Connor/R Hazelwood)
- s 9(2)(b)(ii) (A Dale/C Johnson)
- s 9(2)(b)(ii) (C Gillies/T Fenn)
- s 9(2)(b)(ii) (M Tingle/L Carlyon)
- s 9(2)(b)(ii) (M Tingle/R Hazelwood)
- s 9(2)(b)(ii) (B Connor/T Fenn/L Carlyon)

C 6. Update on amendments to the Animal Welfare (Records and Statistics) Regulations 1999

A paper outlining stakeholder feedback on the upcoming changes to Part 6 of the Animal Welfare Act 1999 and proposed amendment to the Animal Welfare (Records and Statistics) Regulations 1999 was circulated prior to the meeting.

Overall MPI received 15 responses. Most submitters agreed that the proposal to require the reporting of surplus animals would improve transparency and oversight of the animals used in RTT.

The final policy proposal for amendment to the Animal Welfare (Records and Statistics) Regulations 1999 would proceed to Cabinet in July 2017 for approval. Following this feedback, MPI would consider the issues raised alongside the NAEAC RTT subcommittee.

Leading into the 1 January commencement date, a joint communications plan would need to be implemented.

C 7. Approval of NAEAC annual report for 2016

The draft 2016 NAEAC annual report was circulated to committee members prior to the meeting. The committee reviewed the draft report. The following amendments/comments were noted:

- In paragraph 3 'animal ethics committee' should read 'animal ethics committees';
- As A Dale and R Hazelwood were appointed on 15 December 2016, their names should appear in the report;
- Under the heading 'CEC Template' it was noted that there were 26 code holders not 30.

It was agreed that once the above changes had been made the annual report could be sent to the Minister and put on the MPI website.

Moved (G Shackell/C Gillies):

That the draft annual report be received and adopted as the committee's annual report for 2016.

The motion was put: carried.

Action – s 9(2)(a) [redacted] to amend the report and arrange for it to go to the Minister and be put on the MPI website.

C 8. Feedback from AEC site visits

G Shackell invited committee members to comment on the previous day's site visits. It was agreed that the day had been a valuable experience and had illustrated the variety of work being carried out by institutions in New Zealand. Seeing the two commercial operations at the end of the day had been particularly useful.

It was noted that the level of environmental enrichment for the animals housed in [redacted] s 9(2)(b)(ii) [redacted] differed depending on the species.

It was agreed to write and thank those organisations who had hosted NAEAC.

Action – s 9(2)(a) [redacted] to draft thank you letters to host organisations.

C 9. Feedback from accredited reviewers teleconference

A record of the accredited reviewers teleconference held in March was circulated to committee members prior to the meeting. It was noted that NAEAC members T Fenn, L Carlyon and G Shackell had participated.

An action arising out of the last teleconference was for reviewers s 9(2)(a) to meet with G Shackell to discuss monitoring. Feedback reported from that meeting indicated that in universities, monitoring was difficult to do because of the high turnover of students when compared to other research organisations. A comment about adverse event reporting not being done well was also noted. NAEAC's fifth occasional paper s 9(2)(a) was highlighted as a resource which summarised monitoring approaches which AECs could use.

The committee discussed the use and storage of morbidity sheets, which G Shackell mentioned had been referred to during the teleconference discussion. It was noted that data sheets recording animal health information were different to reports generated by AEC members who were actually monitoring projects.

The accredited reviewers had been interested in setting up a drop box to share information, but later decided that an email communication group would suffice.

In respect to audits, one accredited reviewer had concerns MPI might be changing its audit expectations in respect of reviewers. Reviewers were reminded that the performance standards had not been amended and that terms of reference for such audits were received prior to the audits going ahead.

There was some comment from committee members about setting up a workshop for reviewers and/or inviting them to the AEC chairs meeting.

C 10. NAEAC correspondence

G Shackell referred committee members to two pieces of correspondence received since the last general meeting.

The first correspondence referred to the numbers of animals used for testing the efficacy of veterinary products. G Shackell reported that he had already spoken to s 9(2)(a) MPI's Agricultural Compounds and Veterinary Medicines (ACVM) group about testing the efficacy of veterinary products. It was noted that commenting on whether ACVM requirements were excessive in relation to animal numbers, was outside NAEAC's remit. However, it was important that the 'correct' number of animals were used in research projects in order to obtain statistically valid results.

G Shackell reported he would try and progress this matter further by bringing a few more parties together. G Shackell agreed to send a formal response back to the code holder who had raised the issue.

The committee also discussed correspondence relating to multiple AECs being involved in approving the same project. It was agreed that the AEC linked to the organisation that is the primary host for the

research should be used to gain approval as that AEC will be in a position to monitor compliance with the conditions of the approval as well as the animal facilities used.

M Tingle reported it was not appropriate for an AEC to be forced to look at applications that have already been approved by another AEC.

G Shackell agreed to write to the code holder in question, reiterating NAEAC's policy on this topic. The draft response would be circulated to the RTT Regulations subcommittee for feedback, before being sent.

Actions:

G Shackell to write to s 9(2)(b)(ii) .
G Shackell to write to s 9(2)(b)(ii) .

C 11. MPI update

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

PART TWO (OPEN TO THE PUBLIC)

O 1. Progress against milestones in NAEAC Operational Plan

In light of time constraints, it was agreed not to review the milestones arising out of the NAEAC operational plan that were recorded in the actions list.

O 2. NAEAC content on MPI website

No update was provided under this agenda item.

O 3. Discussion and approval of draft code of ethical conduct template

The draft template had been circulated to committee members by former NAEAC member Karen Booth on 19 March 2017. Comments from M Tingle and G Shackell had been incorporated into the draft before it was sent to those AECs who had a code expiring before the end of the year. s 9(2)(a) reported she had also asked s 9(2)(a) to comment on the draft which was the version now before the committee.

The committee reviewed the draft template page by page. The following comments were noted:

- Section 1.1: This section was not required as providing a description on 'scope of activity' formed part of the application form.
- Section 1.4: It was agreed to leave this section in the template.
- Section 2.2, bullet 1: The chief executive was not the code holder; the organisation was the code holder. It was also optional to specify a time period.
- Section 3.15: Statistics on animal use were due to MPI by 28 February each year. The date was not going to change.

- Section 4.3: It was agreed to use the alternative suggested wording in this section.
- Section 4.6: It was agreed to leave this section in the template.
- Section 5.4: It was agreed to remove reference to the Animal Welfare Amendment Act (No 2) from this section.
- Section 9.2, paragraph 2: It was agreed to delete the word 'submits'.
- Section 10: It was agreed not to amend the heading for this section.

It was agreed to send K Booth a formal letter from NAEAC thanking her for her efforts in drafting the template and revising the code writing guidelines. G Shackell volunteered to draft the letter.

Moved (G Shackell/M Tingle):

That the agreed changes be made to the template and that the finalised version be published as a word document and go on the MPI website.

The motion was put: carried.

Actions:

s 9(2)(a) to finalise template and arrange for it to go on the MPI website.
G Shackell to draft thank you letter to K Booth on behalf of NAEAC.

O 5. Discussion on November sentence workshop

Notes from a teleconference on the sentence workshop, held in March, had been circulated to committee members prior to the meeting. Since then further meetings had been held via teleconference with the sentence workshop subcommittee, which included G Shackell. At the meeting, G Shackell circulated hard copy notes from the teleconference which had been held the previous week.

To summarise, G Shackell reported that the workshop would be held on 15 November 2017. The venue would be Westpac Stadium in Wellington. Up to 200 stakeholders including industry, non-government organisations and AEC representatives would be invited to attend. The purpose of the workshop was not to relitigate the meaning of sentence, but rather understand the implications of including animal sentence within the Act for the work of NAWAC and NAEAC and to understand stakeholder perspectives on how the change in the Act will impact them and their work.

G Shackell invited committee members to reply to him directly if they had any comments on the draft programme.

O 6. Analgesic best practice

An update on this topic had already been provided under agenda item C2.

O 7. Review of NAEAC publications list and AEC induction pack

A list of NAEAC/MPI publications and contents of the AEC induction pack had been circulated to committee members prior to the meeting. The committee reviewed the publications list first. The following comments were noted:

- Due to the Act being amended, the publication *The Use of Animals in Research, Testing and Teaching – Users Guide to Part 6 of the Animal Welfare Act 1999* was now no longer current. It was agreed that if the publication could not be updated then it should be removed from the MPI website. G Shackell reported he would write to Animal Welfare Policy to ascertain if the document would be revised.
- It was agreed to remove the NAEAC Wikipedia page from the publications list.

The committee did not consider any amendments were required to the AEC induction pack at the current time.

Actions:

G Shackell to ask Animal Welfare Policy about revising the 'Guide to Part 6 of the Act'.
s 9(2)(a) to update publications list.

O 8. Shared Workspace using SharePoint 2010

In the interests of time, this agenda item was not discussed.

O 9. Identification of mini-tutorial topic for August general

The committee considered that a mini-tutorial on shark tagging s 9(2)(a) from the National Institute of Water and Atmospheric Research might be an interesting topic for the August meeting. Another suggestion was hearing from an accredited reviewer about the code holder review process. G Shackell agreed to contact one or more reviewer about speaking to NAEAC.

Action – G Shackell to contact accredited reviewer(s) about mini-tutorial.

O 11. NAEAC occasional paper series

The framework for NAEAC's next occasional paper on remote monitoring, was circulated prior to the meeting. The paper is intended to provide AECs with guidance on matters to be considered when applications involving the attachment of monitoring devices on animals are presented to them. The paper will be high level, not detailed and will focus on wildlife and large animals. It was noted that there were a couple of papers on the subject, published by the Department of Conservation (DOC), which might be of interest. Both C Gillies and G Shackell have hard copies of these publications but no links were able to be found on the DOC website.

O 12. NAEAC Three Rs Award

G Shackell invited L Carlyon to provide an update on funding arrangements for the Three Rs award. L Carlyon reported that the following organisations had been approached:

- The Morgan Foundation;
- Ministry of Business, Innovation and Employment (MBIE);
- Health Research Council of New Zealand (HRC);
- The Royal Society of New Zealand (RSNZ);

- Royal New Zealand Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals (RNZSPCA).

The Morgan Foundation was not in a position to provide funding. HRC sounded interested but were currently fully committed to funding other projects.

An email had been sent to the Director of Research Funding at RSNZ, but to date no response had been received.

MBIE thought the award would fit with their criteria for sponsorship and had sent through an application form for NAEAC to complete. This was currently with G Shackell. Due to significant interest in sponsorship, MBIE would only be able to partially fund the \$55,000 sought if NAEAC's application was successful.

A letter had been sent to the chief executive of the RNZSPCA in early May asking if the charity would be interested in continuing to support the Three Rs award by providing the individual prize of \$5,000. No official response had been received yet. A Dale reported that the letter would have been forwarded to her and she was surprised she had not seen it yet. s 9(2)(a) reported she would send A Dale a copy of the letter by email.

Action – s 9(2)(a) to send A Dale a copy of the sponsorship letter sent to SPCA.

Due to NAEAC having to meet with ANZCCART New Zealand at 3.00 pm G Shackell declared the meeting closed at 2.45 pm. The committee did not have time to discuss the following agenda items:

- O 04. Discussion and approval of draft code of ethical conduct guidelines;
- O 13. Topic/author for next issue of *Welfare Pulse*;
- O 14. Update for Minister for Primary Industries;
- O 15. Update on alternatives to animal-based regulatory testing;
- O 16. Update on New Zealand Three Rs Initiatives;
- O 17. Update on emerging/new technologies;
- O 18. MPI summary of CEC approvals, notifications and revocations;
- O 19. Discussion of information circulated by MPI;
- O 20. Committee members' reports on recent presentations and attendance at conferences.