



# National Animal Ethics Advisory Committee

## General Meeting

Friday, 11 May 2018  
8.30 am – 4.00pm

Board Room, Level 3  
Rendezvous Hotel  
166 Gloucester Street, Christchurch

## MINUTES

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

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

**Apologies:** None.

G Shackell opened the meeting at 8.45 am and welcomed attendees. G Shackell invited committee members to stand in silence for a minute, as a mark of respect for Dr John Schofield, Associate Member of the Australian and New Zealand Council for the Care of Animals in Research and Teaching (ANZCCART) New Zealand, and a past NAEAC member, who had passed away unexpectedly on Tuesday evening.

G Shackell also took the opportunity of congratulating C Johnson on his recent promotion as Director of Research Ethics at Massey University.

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

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

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

No other items of business were identified 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.     s 9(2)(b)(ii) code of ethical conduct
- C 5.     Update on Animal Welfare Regulations
- C 6.     Accredited reviewers teleconference
- C 7.     2017 NAEAC annual report
- C 8.     Discussion/feedback from Christchurch site visits.
- C 9.     Discussion of arrangements for 2018 AEC workshop
- C 10.    MPI update
- C 11.    NAEAC correspondence.

*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:*

<b>General subject of each matter to be considered</b>		<b>Reason for passing this resolution in relation to each matter</b>	<b>Ground(s) under section 48(1) for the passing of this resolution</b>
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 C 1 above.	As for C 1 above.
C 3.	s 9(2)(b)(ii) code of ethical conduct	To protect information where making the information available would be likely unreasonably to prejudice the commercial position of the person who supplied or who 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.	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 OIA.
C 4.	s 9(2)(b)(ii) code of ethical conduct	As for C 3 above.	As for C 3 above.



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 5.	Update on Animal Welfare Regulations.	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 6.	Accredited reviewers teleconference.	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 7.	2017 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.
C 8.	Discussion/feedback from Christchurch site visits.	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 9.	Discussion of arrangements for 2018 AEC workshop.	As above for C 8 above.	As above for C 8 above.
C 10.	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.
C 11.	NAEAC Correspondence.	As for C 1 above.	As for C 1 above.

B: That 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) and s 9(2)(a) (Graduate, Regulatory Reform and Animal Welfare Policy) 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 general meeting held on 15 February 2018 were reviewed. There were no amendments.

*Moved (C Johnson/C Gillies):*

*That the draft minutes of the meeting held on 15 February 2018 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:

**Investigate alternatives to the 2002 publication on analgesic best practice (action 1):** It was noted that this action had now been completed and would be discussed in the Open section of the meeting.

**Draft occasional paper on monitoring devices (action 2):** G Shackell reported he would speak to s 9(2)(a), Manager Animal Welfare about getting s 9(2)(a) from the Animal Welfare Science team to assist NAEAC in preparing this paper.

**NAEAC correspondence (action 4):** In relation to writing to the New Zealand Qualifications Authority (NZQA) to remind them that animal-based courses required animal ethics committee (AEC) approval, G Shackell reported he had provided the necessary background information to the chair of the Schools' AEC. It would be up to the Schools' AEC to remind NZQA about their obligations.

In relation to the euthanasia of rat pups, G Shackell reported he and C Johnson would finalise the letter after the meeting.

**Understanding MPI's legal framework (action 13):** G Shackell thought it appropriate for someone from MPI Legal to talk to NAEAC about this.

**Identifying risks and opportunities (action 14):** It was noted that 'high risk' and 'developing' issues would be incorporated into NAEAC's draft strategic discussions.

**Investigate topic of sharing MPI information with NAEAC (action 19):** s 9(2)(a) reported that s 9(2)(a) from MPI Legal had been scheduled to provide the National Animal Welfare Advisory Committee (NAWAC) with a mini-tutorial on this topic. It was noted that a similar tutorial could be organised for NAEAC.

**Write to accredited reviewers inviting them to a face-to-face meeting (action 22):** It was agreed to talk to the accredited reviewers about this meeting during the accredited reviewers teleconference.

**Advise MPI of changes required to section 5 of the code template (action 22):** G Shackell reported he had talked to R Hazelwood about what changes were required to section 5 of the template.

**Accredited reviewers teleconference (action 23):** s 9(2)(a) reported that due to scheduling difficulties the teleconference was unable to take place in April but had been organised for 23 May 2018.

**Actions:**

*G Shackell to speak to s 9(2)(a) about support for the occasional paper on remote monitoring.*

*G Shackell to speak to accredited reviewers about face-to-face meeting during teleconference.*

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

G Shackell invited committee members to comment on the s 9(2)(b)(ii) draft code of ethical conduct that was circulated prior to the meeting. The following points were noted for clarification/amendment (adopting the references in the code):

**Section 1.3:** Although external parties using the AEC were referred to in section 8, it was suggested that external parties also be mentioned in this section.

**Section 1.5, penultimate bullet point:** While NAEAC understood the rationale behind the statement "the Applicant is responsible for ensuring that the application meets all the requirements of the CEC before submission", if the application did not meet all the requirements, this would constitute a breach of the code. Therefore, it was suggested that this bullet point be deleted.

**Section 2.1, first and second bullet points:** The phrase "the approval of" should be removed because this could imply that all projects will be approved.

**Section 2.2.1:** One of the internal members should be specified as a senior member of staff capable of evaluating project proposals (in accordance with section 101 of the Act).

**Section 2.2.4:** NAEAC suggested that the AEC consider appointing a Deputy Chairperson as a matter of course.

**Section 2:** There were no provisions relating to dealing with vacancies or prolonged absences in this section.

**Section 3.1:** It was suggested that the first sentence of this section be deleted.

**Section 3.3, second bullet point:** It was suggested that "electronic mail" be amended to "electronically" as, during the life of the code, there may be mechanisms used or introduced other than email (e.g. shared workspace).

**Section 3.4:** As the number of committee members that may be appointed can vary, NAEAC considered that the quorum should be 50% of members plus one. Also, the two external members should be statutory external members.

**Section 4.1:** In the phrase before the bullet points it was suggested “where relevant” be deleted. It was also suggested that reference was made to the consideration of sentience in the bullet point which related to choice of species.

**Section 4.1, additional conditions:** In the first bullet point “defendable” would be more appropriate than “desirable”.

In the second bullet point it was suggested that “which is best met by the use of live animals” is replaced by “and the benefits outweigh the costs”.

In the eighth bullet point NAEAC was of the view that “except in exceptional circumstances” should be deleted.

NAEAC considered the ninth bullet point to be unnecessary as this was covered in section 4.3.

**Section 4.2:** NAEAC considered that several matters covered in this section were procedures not outcomes and as such should be elsewhere (and in some cases already covered elsewhere so did not need to be repeated).

**Section 4.4:** There may be circumstances where waiting 24 hours for termination is too long so NAEAC considered that “immediately” should be inserted before “terminate” in the first bullet point. The second bullet point could cover written confirmation within 24 hours.

**Section 4.6:** As people can be consulted but their views ignored it was suggested that this section be reworded to specify a decision by consensus or decision by a quorum or approval by a subcommittee to reach decisions between meetings. In addition, in this section MPI was referred to as the Ministry of Primary Industries instead of the Ministry for Primary Industries.

**Section 4.7:** NAEAC suggested the macron be added to Maori.

**Section 5.1:** One responsibility in this section should be to comply with all relevant Acts of Parliament, regulations and bylaws pertaining to activities undertaken under the code. Also, in relation to the penultimate bullet point, NAEAC presumed that the University would have policies and procedures which dealt with unacceptable behaviour. As such there should be an addition at the end to say that steps will be taken as specified in these documents. NAEAC also considered that another bullet point should be added to state that any breach in the Animal Welfare Act must be referred to the appropriate compliance authority.

**Section 5.3:** There should be reference to animals being transported in accordance with relevant codes of welfare, regulations and any SOPs unless the AEC has approved otherwise.

**Section 5.4:** It was suggested that “unless otherwise approved” be added to the end of this section.



**Section 5.5:** NAEAC did not consider that "regularly" was sufficient and should be at least daily. Also, if there were SOPs on this topic, they should be referred to.

**Section 5.6:** Section 5.6 in the code template referred to standard operating procedures. If the code holder did not want to include a section on this topic then renumbering of the code was required.

**Section 5.7:** NAEAC considered that adverse events should be dealt with immediately and then be reported to the AEC chairperson or co-ordinator.

**Section 5.8:** NAEAC considered that the wording of this section could be interpreted as indicating that the AEC evaluation was less rigorous for projects graded A-C and suggested rewording to indicate that manipulations graded D or E will only be considered at a scheduled meeting of the AEC, and will be monitored closely.

**Section 5.9:** As euthanasia for tissue collection or dissection was now covered by the definition of manipulation in the Act this seemed superfluous and should be deleted.

**Section 6.1:** This could be taken to mean that SOPs cannot be changed during the five year approval period so NAEAC suggested adding "and may be updated during that period" to the end of the second sentence. Also, it was suggested that the word "the" be added before "AEC" in that same sentence.

**Section 7, second bullet point:** The meaning of "non-exempted" was not obvious to all committee members so it was suggested it be clarified.

**Section 7.1:** NAEAC considered that this should specify 10% of approved projects graded A or B and that "should" should be amended to "shall".

**Section 7.2:** Similarly, "are likely to be" should be "shall".

**Section 7.3:** NAEAC suggested this be reworded to state the following: "Where appropriate the AEC may nominate a veterinarian to undertake the monitoring of facilities, research animals and approved procedures on the AEC's behalf."

**Section 7.4:** In the second sentence "later date" should be changed to "date specified by the AEC".

**Section 7.5:** In the second sentence "Any major" should be "All" and it should cover gradings as well as numbers.

**Section 9.1:** In the first instance, procedural complaints should be reported to the s 9(2)(a). If necessary after that they could be reported to the Director-General of MPI.

**Section 9.2:** In the first sentence after "will be" add "investigated immediately and". Also, somewhere in section 9.2 reference needed to be made to reporting offences to the appropriate authority.

**Section 10:** The sentence can end after "CEC" as job titles may change.

*Moved (G Shackell/M Tingle):*

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 MPI.

The motion was put: carried.

G Shackell invited committee members to comment on the review report which accompanied the draft code. Committee members generally agreed that the report was comprehensive and that the reviewer, s 9(2)(a) should be commended for his work.

s 9(2)(a) reported that the format of the report was listed as a separate agenda item for discussion later in the meeting as s 9(2)(a) had requested feedback on accredited reviewers reporting style. C Gillies reported that he had found the checklist helpful. It was generally agreed that the format of a checklist was a good idea. However, it was the content of the checklist which was an issue for some committee members.

**Actions:**

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

**C 4. s 9(2)(b)(ii) code of ethical conduct**

s 9(2)(a) provided some background information about why s 9(2)(b)(ii) wanted to apply for a new separate code. If the draft s 9(2)(b)(ii) code was approved, s 9(2)(a) would be operating under two codes at the same time. Alternatively, there was a possibility that the s 9(2)(b)(ii) code might never be activated or that s 9(2)(b)(ii) might cease to be involved with s 9(2)(b)(ii). If that was the case, there would need to be an amendment to the s 9(2)(b)(ii) code to reflect that.

It was noted that M Tingle was uncomfortable with one person operating under two codes. NAEAC asked s 9(2)(a) to check with MPI Legal about whether this practice was allowed under the Animal Welfare Act.

In the meantime, G Shackell invited committee members to comment on the s 9(2)(b)(ii) draft code of ethical conduct which was circulated for review prior to the meeting. The following points were noted for clarification/amendment (adopting the references in the code):

**Section 2.3:** It was noted that external members were not representatives of the organisations that nominated them.

**Section 3.8:** If all decisions are made by consensus, as stated in section 3.7, there would not be a vote.

**Section 3.9:** It was agreed that "statutory" be inserted after the word "external".

**Section 3.11:** In the first sentence, the phrase "are to be approved" should be changed to "require approval" otherwise this could imply that the AEC has no choice but to approve all modifications. NAEAC was also of the view that the rest of the section could be deleted.



**Section 7.2:** It was agreed that “and will be presented for consideration by the committee.” should be added to the end of the final sentence.

**Section 8:** The first sentence was not correct as the AEC had not yet been established. If AEC agreement was still wanted the first sentence could be reworded to “The VHSAEC must agree that ...”.

**Section 9.3:** This section should also include a statement that offences under the Animal Welfare Act will be reported to the appropriate authority.

**Section 10:** While gaining AEC agreement to proposed amendments to the code is fine, it is not appropriate for suspension or revocation of the code.

#### **Other points**

In the first line of section 2.2 “who” would be more appropriate than “which”.

*Moved (G Shackell/C Johnson):*

*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 MPI.*

*The motion was put: carried.*

#### **Actions:**

s 9(2)(a) to ask MPI Legal about whether a person can operate under two codes.  
s 9(2)(a) to write to advise s 9(2)(b)(ii) accordingly.

### **C 5. Update on Animal Welfare Regulations**

G Shackell invited s 9(2) to update the committee on animal welfare regulations. s 9(2) reported that the Animal Welfare (Care & Procedures) Regulations would come into force on 1 October 2018. Prior to the October commencement date, MPI was continuing to engage with impacted stakeholders. The implementation stage of regulations was being led by the animal welfare section liaison team.

Scoping work relating to the Significant Painful Procedures Regulations was currently underway.

s 9(2) reported that while the Government did not intend to ban rodeo, they had asked NAWAC for advice on certain activities in rodeos. It was noted that G Shackell (as a member of NAWAC) and s 9(2) were invited participants in a workshop held on 6 April 2018 where, a 5 domains model was used to assess the impact of individual rodeo events on animal welfare. The workshop was convened by the NAWAC Animals in Exhibition and Encounter subcommittee. Outcomes of the workshop were used to inform written advice from NAWAC that was requested by the Minister and due at the end of May. MPI attendees also used the outcomes of the workshop to prepare written advice to the Minister at the same time.

s 9(2) would be reviewing current poultry standards with the aim of identifying if there were any compliance issues associated with them.

Two petitions (seeking the banning of the use of farrowing crates, and rehoming research animals) were noted.

s 9(2) reported that the Minister had recently visited Massey University, a slaughter premises and pig farm. A Dale reported that the Minister would also be visiting Wellington SPCA soon.

An advocacy Hui, which was announced at the launch of the New Zealand Animal Law Association rodeo report, will take place in Auckland on 8 June 2018. It was noted that s 9(2)(a) Manager Animal Welfare Policy and Regulatory Reform, would organise the day's proceedings but that it would be facilitated by an external person. C Johnson reported he might be interested in attending the Hui and s 9(2) agreed to send him the relevant details.

Finally, s 9(2) reported that s 9(2)(b)(ii) had a bid before the Ministry of Business, Innovation and Employment for funding to support a programme of work looking at animal welfare issues and Māori values towards animals. It was noted that NAEAC's strategic planning document referenced Māori Mātauranga and there could be an option, at some stage, to link into this work.

**Action – s 9(2) to send C Johnson advocacy Hui event details.**

#### C 6. Accredited reviewers teleconference

It was noted that the accredited reviewers teleconference had already been discussed under agenda item C2.

#### C 7. 2017 NAEAC annual report

The committee reviewed the draft 2017 annual report that had been circulated prior to the meeting. The following comments/changes were requested:

**Chairperson's comment:** In the second paragraph, the second to last word should be changed from 'pleasurable' to 'positive' experiences.

**Membership:** It was agreed that appointment dates for committee members be added to the table of current members.

**Fees:** M Tingle reported that the reason he did not claim fees in 2017 was because it was a condition of his reappointment (as a result of his being a university staff member). M Tingle asked that this clarification be included in the report.

L Carsons reported that it was Cabinet Office who had decided that university staff, because they were paid by the State in the normal course of events, should not ordinarily be allowed to claim fees. The circumstances why other NAEAC members who were also university or teaching staff, were in fact paid fees, was noted.

**NAEAC publications:** In the final bullet point, 'as' should be replaced by 'is'.

s 9(2)(a) noted she would also make a few minor editorial changes.

*Moved (M Tingle/R Hazelwood):*

*That the above amendments are made to the draft NAEAC annual report for 2017 and that it is submitted to the Minister responsible for animal welfare.*

*The motion was put: carried.*

**Action – MPI to finalise NAEAC annual report and submit to the Minister.**

#### **C 8. Discussion/feedback from Christchurch site visits**

G Shackell invited committee members to comment on the previous day's site visits. It was generally agreed that the visits were interesting and informative.

The following topics which came to light during the site visits and AEC evening function were noted for future consideration:

- euthanasia techniques - use of CO<sub>2</sub> and cardiac injection;
- pigeon housing;
- single rodent housing;
- parenting arrangements and use of AECs; and
- testing traps.

It was noted that NAEAC had received a nomination from the Landcare Research NZ Ltd AEC for their chair, Dr Dave Morgan to receive the NAEAC AEC service award. NAEAC had agreed out of session that Dr Morgan was deserving of the award and had passed a resolution to that effect. The award was presented to D Morgan at the AEC function following the site visits.

**Action – s 9(2)(a) to write to organisations to thank them for hosting NAEAC.**

#### **C 9. Discussion of arrangements for 2018 AEC workshop**

The committee discussed arrangements for the November AEC workshop. The following changes were agreed to the draft programme:

It was agreed that the update to AECs on the NAEAC publications which were being amended, including the *Good Practice Guide*, would not require the half an hour originally allocated to it. It was agreed that more time (half an hour instead of 15 minutes) should be allocated to s 9(2)(a) talk on animal welfare regulations.

It was noted that a speaker for the keynote address on governance still had to be identified.

C Gillies agreed to provide the consensus scenario for workshop 1.

For workshop 2, it was agreed that each group receive the same 3 non-compliance scenarios. C Johnson agreed to draft a high level non-compliance scenario; M Tingle a middle level non-compliance scenario; and G Shackell a low-level non-compliance scenario. It was agreed that these scenarios be available for discussion at the August general meeting.



NAEAC members would mediate the workshop feedback sessions.

It was noted that s 9(2)(a) would need to be contacted to ascertain her availability to talk about the *Animal Research: Reporting of In Vivo Experiments* (ARRIVE) guidelines.

**Actions:**

**NAEAC/MPI to identify speaker for key note address on governance.**

**C Gillies to draft scenario for consensus workshop.**

**C Johnson, M Tingle and G Shackell to draft non-compliance scenarios.**

s 9(2)(a) to contact s 9(2)(a)

s 9(2)(a) to amend draft programme to reflect agreed changes.

**C 10. MPI update**

The MPI update, circulated prior to the meeting was noted. s 9(2) reported that in addition to the policy staff changes that had been recorded, s 9(2)(a) would be leaving the Animal Welfare Policy team to the lead the Dairy Industry Restructuring Act review in the Agriculture, Marine and Plant Directorate. s 9(2)(a) would be Acting Manager Animal Welfare Policy for three months.

s 9(2)(a) was leaving MPI for two years on a secondment as Senior Advisor to the Legislation Design Advisory Committee. Her last day in the office would be Friday 11 May 2018.

**C 11. NAEAC correspondence**

The list of NAEAC advice requests, received since the last meeting was noted. The topic of veterinarians doing research was noted as a topic that could be added to NAEAC's issues register.

**Action – NAEAC to consider adding topic of veterinarians doing research to issues register.**

## **PART TWO (OPEN TO THE PUBLIC)**

**O 1. NAEAC content on MPI website**

G Shackell reported that he had asked MPI to provide statistics on the number of hits various NAEAC pages and documents had received on the MPI website. The information provided by MPI's Web Services Team had been circulated prior to the meeting.

G Shackell advised that he had copied the information into a spreadsheet so that he could reorder the documents in relation to the number of hits they had received – highest through to lowest. Interestingly, the code template and publication *A Culture of Care*, proved to be the most popular. The publication *A review of analgesic best practice for animals* had been accessed the fewest number of times.

While the code template was on the 'animals in research, testing and teaching' page on the MPI website, G Shackell reported he had had difficulty finding it so asked s 9(2)(a) if she could add it to the NAEAC page as well.

**Action – s 9(2)(a) to add code template to NAEAC page on MPI website.**

## **O 2. Analgesic best practice**

C Johnson reported that it would not have been sensible to rewrite the paper on analgesic best practice. Instead, C Johnson had chosen to highlight a number of different resources that targeted different levels of anaesthesia and analgesia knowledge. These had been circulated as a two page word document prior to the meeting.

The committee reviewed the text and references. It was agreed to add a comment about contacting the NAEAC secretariat if the links to the websites did not work. Also, C Johnson pointed out the word 'probably' appeared twice under the *Laboratory Animal Anaesthesia and Analgesia (University of California, Santa Barbara)* reference instead of once. s 9(2)(a) suggested that "Laboratory" be spelt out in the title and noted that "Berkeley" was misspelt in the subheading for its guidelines.

### **Actions:**

s 9(2)(a) to amend analgesic best practice resources document.

s 9(2)(a) to put analgesic best practice resources document on MPI website.

## **O 3. New RTT issues for forecasting**

It was recalled that committee members had been asked previously to send G Shackell topics or issues relating to research, testing and teaching which required NAEAC consideration. G Shackell reported he had started compiling a list of the suggested topics.

## **O 4. Format of independent review report**

Based on the earlier discussion of codes of ethical conduct, s 9(2)(a) reported she would provide s 9(2)(a) with NAEAC's feedback on the format of his review report.

The accredited reviewers' reports were based on questions provided in the MPI document *Template for Checklists for the Review of Code Holders and Animal Ethics Committees*. It was noted that this document and the *Performance Standards for Independent Reviews of Code Holders and Animal Ethics Committees* had been circulated to NAEAC members earlier in the year. NAEAC considered that the template should be reviewed. G Shackell invited committee members to comment on the template by 1 July 2018. In the meantime, it was agreed to discuss this further with MPI and the accredited reviewers.

### **Actions:**

s 9(2)(a) to provide feedback to s 9(2)(a).

NAEAC to provide comment on MPI template.

G Shackell to discuss review of template with s 9(2)(a) and accredited reviewers.

## **O 5. Reappointment of external AEC members**

s 9(2)(a) reported that s 9(2)(a) also sought the views of NAEAC in relation to reappointments of external AEC members. NAEAC was of the view that code holders should go back to the nominating body to seek the reappointment of statutory external members. The formal renomination process



reminded the nominating organisation about their obligations for putting members forward and provided an opportunity to replace members if they wished.

**Action – s 9(2)(a) to provide feedback to s 9(2)(a) on the reappointment of external AEC members.**

#### O 6. Sentience workshop

The animal sentience workshop report was circulated to committee members for their information prior to the meeting. It was noted that the NAWAC subcommittee, responsible for putting the workshop together, would be meeting in May to discuss next steps. Their findings would be reported to the whole of NAWAC at their August general meeting.

#### O 7. Zebra fish

A summary of the feedback received so far from both national and international experts on zebra fish was noted. It was agreed to wait until all the responses were received before deciding on next steps. In the meantime, C Johnson asked s 9(2)(a) if he could document in writing the process for the Governor-General to change the definition of an animal in the Animal Welfare Act.

**Action – s 9(2)(a) to document process for Governor-General to change the definition of animal.**

#### O 8. Review of NAEAC *Good Practice Guide* and policies

M Tingle reported that the *Good Practice Guide* had now been reviewed by R Hazelwood, B Connor and A Dale. It was noted that collating the different versions had been a very time consuming exercise. It was agreed that in future NAEAC would control content of the document but that the secretariat provide more support in terms of formatting and document management.

#### O 11. NAEAC Three Rs Award for 2018

In light of the sudden death of J Schofield, G Shackell asked committee members if they agreed to the new individual Three Rs award prize being renamed in his honour. The committee agreed this would be fitting tribute given J Schofield's knowledge of animal use in research, testing and teaching.

It was recalled that the Three Rs subcommittee had agreed to draft new terms of reference for the award. The draft documents were circulated to committee members prior to the meeting. Regarding the research grant, it was noted that the winner would not require a signed contract with MPI. G Shackell asked committee members for their comments on the draft documents by the end of the following week.

G Shackell reported he would include an item on the rebranded award in the next AEC newsletter.

#### **Actions:**

**G Shackell to include item on Three Rs award in the next AEC newsletter.**

**NAEAC to provide comments on draft terms of reference to G Shackell.**



**O 9. Topic/author for next issue of *Welfare Pulse***

The following topics and authors were agreed for the next issue of *Welfare Pulse*:

- Sentience workshop (G Shackell);
- Obituary for J Schofield. It was agreed that s 9(2)(a) would ask s 9(2)(a) if she was willing to do this; and
- AEC Service Award for D Morgan. s 9(2)(a) will send documentation to s 9(2)(a) to draft an article.

**Actions:**

s 9(2)(a) to ask s 9(2)(a) if she will draft obituary for J Schofield.  
s 9(2)(a) to send documentation on Dr Morgan to s 9(2)(a).

**O 10. NAEAC occasional paper series**

No update was provided on the NAEAC occasional paper series.

**O 12. Identification of mini-tutorial topic and speaker for August meeting**

Both information sharing and legal advice were topics that had been identified as future mini-tutorial topics during earlier meeting discussion.

**O 13. Update for Associate Minister of Agriculture**

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

**O 14. Update on alternatives to animal-based regulatory testing**

R Hazelwood advised there was nothing to report under this agenda item.

**O 15. Update on New Zealand Three Rs Initiatives**

s 9(2)(a) had no new information to provide under this agenda item.

**O 16. Update on emerging/new technologies**

No update on emerging or new technologies was provided.

**O 17. MPI summary of CEC approvals, notifications and revocations**

The MPI summary of CEC approvals, notification and revocations, circulated prior to the meeting, was noted. s 9(2)(a) reported that s 9(2)(b)(ii) had terminated their arrangement as they no longer had room in their classrooms to house rodents.

**O 18. Discussion of information circulated by MPI**

There were no particular matters for discussion arising out of the information circulated to NAEAC since the last general meeting.

**O 19. Committee members' reports on recent presentations and attendance at conferences**

G Shackell invited committee members to comment on any meetings or conferences they had attended since the last general meeting. The following past, and upcoming meetings were noted:

- Rodeo assessment workshop (G Shackell/A Dale);
- July ANZCCART conference in Australia (G Shackell/A Dale);
- Fish and pain/halal slaughter/transport (C Johnson);
- July gene editing workshop at SCICON2018 (T Fenn);
- June stem cell conference in Melbourne (B Connor);
- Local government conference (L Carlyon); and
- July conference on the humaneness of pest control (C Gillies).

There being no further items of business, the Chair thanked committee members for their attendance and declared the meeting closed at 3.55 pm.