



National Animal Ethics Advisory Committee

Codes of Ethical Conduct Meeting

Thursday, 18 October 2018
9.00 am – 4.30 pm

Ministry for Primary Industries
TSB Tower, Level 1, Meeting Rooms 2 and 3
147 Lambton Quay, Wellington

MINUTES

Present

Craig Johnson (Chairperson); Malcolm Tingle, Arnja Dale, Bronwen Connor, Rob Hazelwood, Craig Gillies, Leasa Carlyon.

In Attendance

s 9(2)(a) (Secretary); s 9(2)(a) (Senior Adviser, Animal Welfare); s 9(2)(a) (Senior Policy Analyst, Regulatory Reform and Animal Welfare Policy) and s 9(2)(a) (Senior Policy Analyst, Regulatory Reform and Animal Welfare Policy) for agenda item C 8.

Apologies

Grant Shackell and Terry Fenn.

C Johnson welcomed attendees and opened the meeting at 9.00 am. L Carlyon reported that she had to leave the meeting at 11.00 am. C Johnson noted that he was conflicted in relation to agenda items O 1 and C 5. Given that L Carlyon was involved in leading the discussion of these items of business it was agreed to reorder the agenda so L Carlyon could participate in the discussion before having to leave the meeting. C Johnson asked R Hazelwood to chair the meeting for these agenda items once he had left the room.

Any Other Business Part One (Open to the Public)

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

Any Other Business Part Two (Public Excluded Agenda)

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

C Johnson left the meeting at 9.05 am.

PART ONE (OPEN TO THE PUBLIC)

O 1. Three Rs Awards for 2018

L Carlyon provided an update on the teleconference meeting the Three Rs awards judging panel had participated in on 16 November 2018. It was noted that the panel had included NAEAC members L Carlyon, B Connor, M Tingle and C Gillies; Ministry for Primary Industries (MPI) member s 9(2)(a); and Australian and New Zealand Council for the Care of Animals in Research and Teaching (ANZCCART) member s 9(2)(a). Four applications had been received in total – two for the \$5,000 Aotearoa New Zealand John Schofield Three Rs Implementation Award and two for the \$50,000 Aotearoa New Zealand Three Rs Research Grant.

A Dale left the meeting at 9.06 am after receiving a phone call.

L Carlyon reported that the judging panel had only agreed to award the Aotearoa New Zealand John Schofield Three Rs Implementation Award as the research grant applications were not considered to be of an appropriate standard. The judging panel considered that the \$5,000 award should be given to s 9(2)(a) of Massey University for her application: *Massey-SPCA De-sexing Clinic: a stitch in time saves nine lives*. The rationale for the decision being:

- The application clearly demonstrated *reduction* as 4 animals used per 4 students had been reduced to 1 animal per 4 students;
- The application had a community service element as pets used in the teaching programme were being de-sexed;
- The effect of the de-sexing programme saw fewer kittens being surrendered to the local SPCA for rehoming;
- The application had enormous potential to raise awareness of the Three R's in the research, testing and teaching (RTT) community and general public; and
- The application demonstrated the Three Rs principle of *reduction* being applied now rather than in the future.

A Dale returned to the meeting at 9.10 am. R Hazelwood provided a recap of the conversation the committee had just had for the benefit of A Dale. A Dale noted that she was conflicted but supported the decision by the judging panel.

Moved (L Carlyon/C Gillies):

That the Three Rs award judging panel recommend that NAEAC make the 2018 Aotearoa New Zealand John Schofield Three Rs Implementation Award to s 9(2)(a) and the Massey-SPCA De-sexing Clinic.

The motion was put: carried.

L Carlyon provided further information about why the grant applications were not considered of an acceptable standard. One application did not involve animals and had no link to the principles of the Three Rs. The application on zebra fish refinement had merit but required the killing of animals initially and the establishment of a new facility to do this. It was considered that a feasibility study could have

been undertaken at an already existing zebra fish facility. Also, there was no budget included in the application so it was not possible to identify where the money would be spent.

s 9(2)(a) reported that she had received a request for an application to be submitted after the closing date but had advised the individual in question that this was not possible.

Given that it was disappointing that the research grant could not currently be awarded, the judging panel considered that rather than returning the money to the sponsors, the deadline for the award be extended. The judging panel was proposing that NAEAC extend the deadline to 14 April 2019 in the hope that either the current applicants improved their applications and resubmitted them and/or additional applications were received. It was anticipated that the animal ethics committee (AEC) workshop could provide a forum for NAEAC to communicate this information.

Moved (L Carlyon/M Tingle):

That the Three Rs award judging panel recommend that NAEAC extend the deadline for the Aotearoa New Zealand Three Rs Research Grant until 14 April 2019.

The motion was put: carried.

C Johnson was invited back to the meeting at 9.25 am for discussion about next steps and how the application form could be improved for the future. R Hazelwood provided a recap of the discussion that had taken place and resolutions made.

It was agreed that in future, a lay person summary and budget should be provided as part of the application. It was also agreed that feedback should be provided to each unsuccessful applicant. B Connor reported that it was usual practice for funding agencies to provide feedback about how applications could be improved. The NAEAC judging panel members would provide the necessary feedback. The terms of reference and application form for the awards would require amendment for the next award cycle to incorporate those changes.

Moved (R Hazelwood/B Connor):

That the Three Rs Awards judging panel write to each individual that submitted an application to advise why they were unsuccessful.

The motion was put: carried.

It was also agreed that sponsors of the research grant would need to be notified of NAEAC's decision to extend the award. The letter would be drafted by the subcommittee and signed out by L Carlyon. C Johnson advised he would also review the letter on behalf G Shackell.

Regarding future advertising of the extended award, as well as the usual contacts list it was agreed that university research offices also be advised. The committee asked P Lemow to also advise the late applicant about the new deadline.

Actions:

NAEAC Three Rs award sub-committee to write to applicants about judging panel's decision.

NAEAC Three Rs awards sub-committee to write to sponsors about NAEAC's decision to extend research grant deadline.

C Johnson to review letter to sponsors.

s 9(2)(a) to update MPI website about extended dead line for research grant applications.

s 9(2)(a) to contact individual research offices about extended dead line for research grant applications.

NAEAC to amend current terms of reference for Three Rs awards to include details about a lay person summary and budget.

s 9(2)(a) to contact individual who wanted to submit a late application about the new deadline.

**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 (R Hazelwood/B Connor):

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.** *s 9(2)(b)(ii) code of ethical conduct*
- C 6.** *s 9(2)(b)(ii) code of ethical conduct*
- C 7.** *Discussion of arrangements for 2018 AEC workshop*
- C 8.** *Update on MPI Significant Surgical Procedures Regulations*

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 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 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.
C 5.	s 9(2)(b)(ii) code of ethical conduct.	As for C 3 above.	As for C 3 above.
C 6.	s 9(2)(b)(ii) code of ethical conduct	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 section 9(2)(g)(ii) of the Official Information Act 1982.
C 7.	Discussion of arrangements for 2018 AEC workshop	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 8.	Update on MPI Significant Surgical Procedures 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.

B: That s 9(2)(a) (Secretary), s 9(2)(a) (Senior Adviser, Animal Welfare), s 9(2)(a) (Senior Policy Analyst) and s 9(2)(a) (Senior Policy Analyst) 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.

s 9(2)(a) departed the meeting at 10.00 am for the discussion of the s 9(2)(b)(ii) code of ethical conduct.

C 5. s 9(2)(b)(ii) code of ethical conduct

R Hazelwood invited committee members to comment on the amended draft code of ethical conduct for s 9(2)(b)(ii). The following points were noted for clarification/amendment (adopting the references in the code).

Section 2.5: Instead of "a replacement person shall be nominated by the appointing/nominating party" NAEAC considered it would be better if this read "nominations for a replacement person shall be sought from the appointing/nominating party". The rationale being that making other parties nominate or appoint someone was not within the AEC's control.

Section 3.8.1: NAEAC was of the view that, in the first sentence, "at short notice" could be replaced by "urgently" as this provision should not be used for trivial reasons (such as applicants not getting things done in time).

Section 3.8.2: It was considered that this section could be deleted. NAEAC interpreted applications being deferred as covering situations when the AEC just did not get around to discussing all agenda items and did not regard this as a satisfactory reason to consider items without a meeting.

Section 4.3: NAEAC considered that "renewed" should be changed to "resubmitted for consideration" as "renewed" implied an automatic approval.

Section 6.4: This section was considered repetitive so section 6.4.1 could be deleted. If some project reports were required to be more detailed, the AEC could specify this at the time.

Section 7: There should be some reference in this section that people were not prevented by section 3.6 from making complaints. In addition, this section should include a provision relating to possible offences under the Animal Welfare Act being reported to the appropriate compliance agency.

It was agreed to make sure that the code template included a reference to offences under the Animal Welfare Act being reported to the appropriate compliance agency. s 9(2)(a) agreed to advise G Shackell about the required change.

Moved (M Tingle/L Carlyon):

That the 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 advise G Shackell about change required to code template (offences under the Animal Welfare Act being reported to the appropriate compliance agency).
s 9(2)(a) to write and advise s 9(2)(b)(ii) accordingly.

The meeting adjourned for morning tea at 10.40 am.

L Carlyon left the meeting at 10.50 am.

s 9(2)(a) re-joined the meeting at 11.00 am s 9(2)(a)

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

B Connor reported that the code holder had taken NAEAC's advice and re-drafted their code using the code template. Unfortunately, the specific feedback which had been provided to the code holder by B Connor had not been acknowledged or addressed in the code the committee were about to review. C Johnson invited committee members to comment on the amended draft code of ethical conduct for s 9(2)(b)(ii). The following points were noted for clarification/amendment (adopting the references in the code):

Section 2.2.1: NAEAC considered this section would be clearer if the AEC Convenor was listed as a committee member using a bullet point as was the case for the other members.

Section 2.2.4: Given that there are only three statutory external members the way this section was written meant that the AEC could have no more than two staff members so there would be no additional members. It was therefore suggested that the second sentence be deleted.

Section 2.3.1 and 2.3.2: These provisions were repeated in section 2.6 so could be deleted.

Section 3.1: It was suggested that reports on completed projects, adverse events and modifications to approved projects be added to the list in this section.

Section 3.2: Stating that the AEC will meet three times a year and later saying that there will be at least one face-to-face meeting was contradictory. It was suggested that the first bullet point be changed to "The AEC will schedule three meetings per year." Also, setting the dates for the year's meetings at the first meeting of the year seemed illogical as how would that first meeting get scheduled?

Section 3.3: It was suggested that the final bullet point be deleted.

Section 3.5.3: Given that section 3.5.1 stated that decision making was by consensus, section 3.5.3 was not consistent with this so should be deleted. (If consensus were not reached, applications are declined).

Section 3.6: As section 2.2.3 stated that the Chairperson was an external member they would not be submitting protocols so this section should be deleted.

Section 3.9: NAEAC asked MPI to clarify with the code holder how applications graded C would be considered i.e. would this be by videoconferencing only?

Section 3.10: This section should include a provision that such matters will be reported at the next meeting and thus captured in the minutes. Also, subcommittee decisions should be ratified at the next meeting.

Section 3.11: The heading in this section was titled "Public Presence at Meetings" but only mentioned staff, so either the heading needed to be changed or the public needed to be mentioned in the text.

Section 3.14: In the first bullet point it was suggested that the word "supporting" be replaced with "associated" as this was broader and would include approvals which of course should be retained.

Section 3.16: Amending the code was covered in section 10 so this section should be deleted.

Section 4.1.19: NAEAC considered that the AEC should not be generating protocols as this would be a conflict. These should be developed by staff and submitted to the AEC.

Section 4.2: NAEAC suggested that section 7.3.1 would be better placed in this section.

Section 4.4.1: In the first sentence it was suggested "will" be replaced with "can" as the event might be very minor.

Section 4.4: It was suggested that a new section be added at the end stating that all adverse events will be discussed at the next meeting.

Section 4.5: It was considered that there should be a description of what would constitute a minor change.

Section 5.3: This section states "(refer clause 4.1.4b)" but NAEAC could not see the relevance of this reference. Also, it was suggested that there could be a sentence inserted after the first one, worded something along the lines of "Under normal circumstances, this will be in accordance with relevant guidelines."

Section 5.6: This should also specify that amendments to standard operating procedures will also be submitted to the AEC.

Section 5.7: It was suggested that this section be reworded to say "Any adverse event ... RTT project will invoke the responses detailed in section 4.4 of this code." The rest of section 5.7 should be deleted.

Section 5.9: Once feral animals are captured, strictly speaking they are in ^{s 9(2)(b)} care so section 5.9.1 should be deleted. Section 5.9.2 could be reworded (and renumbered) to state "Non-native feral animals captured in ^{s 9(2)(b)(iii)} grounds for the purposes of pest control and then used for research or training will require AEC approval."

Section 6.3.1: NAEAC considered that some wording be added to the effect that all AEC members are encouraged to participate in monitoring.

Section 6.3.3: Section 8.1 stated that external parties will not be permitted to use s 9(2)(b) AEC so this section was not relevant.

Section 7.1.3: The use of the word "require" would be more appropriate than "request".

Section 7.2.2: While s 9(2)(b)(iii) vet might carry out most of the monitoring, NAEAC considered that other AEC members should also be involved at times.

Section 7.3: Given the earlier suggestion that the statement in section 7.3.1 be moved elsewhere, the heading could be changed to just specify C gradings.

Section 9.2.1: This section should cover what people should do if the complaint is about the Chairperson. While complaints about the Chairperson were mentioned in section 9.3.3, it seemed unlikely that such complaints would relate to animal welfare given that the Chairperson was an external member.

Section 9.3: This section should also include some provision for reporting potential offences to the appropriate compliance agency.

Appendices: It was suggested that these definitions be referred to rather than included in full as the definition of manipulation included was not current.

Typographical errors

- In 2.1, "principle" should be "principal".
- In 2.2.2, paragraph 2, "practicing" should be "practising".
- In 2.6 the subsections are numbered 2.5.1, 2.5.2 and 2.5.3 instead of 2.6.1, 2.6.2 and 2.6.3.
- In section 3.2, final bullet point, extraordinary does not have a hyphen (and doesn't have one elsewhere in the document).
- In section 3.5.2, remove the gap before the full stop.
- In section 3.13, remove "be".
- In section 4.4.4, add an apostrophe to "veterinarians".
- In section 9.3.1, change the full stop after "turn" to a comma.
- In section 9.3.3 change "complaints" in the first line to "complaint".
- In section 10 the subsections should be renumbered 10.1-10.4 rather than 10.1.1-10.1.4.

Moved (C Johnson/Rob Hazelwood):

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.

On behalf of the committee C Johnson thanked B Connor for the work she had done on this code. B Connor reported that it was frustrating that the feedback she had provided to the code holder had not been incorporated into the revised version.

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

The meeting adjourned for lunch at 12.45 pm and resumed at 1.15 pm.

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

C Johnson invited committee members to comment on the amended draft code of ethical conduct for s 9(2)(b)(ii). The following points were noted for clarification/amendment (adopting the references in the code):

Section 7.1: In the paragraph after the bullet points, NAEAC considered that the word "Captive" should be deleted from the beginning of the sentence and "that entail new manipulations" be deleted from the end of the sentence. NAEAC was strongly of the view that all C-E approvals should be monitored, though acknowledged that different forms of monitoring are required in different locations. If these changes were made, section e) would no longer be necessary and could be deleted.

Section 7.3: Somewhere in this section reference should be made to reporting offences to the compliance authorities. Also, in the Corrective measures paragraph, "personal file" should be "personnel file".

Section 8.3: Storage of records is specified in the Animal Welfare (Records and Statistics) Regulations 1999 not the Animal Welfare Act.

Section 10.4: As for section 7.3, there should be some reference to reporting offences to the appropriate compliance authorities.

Moved (C Johnson/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 C Johnson.

The motion was put: carried.

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

C 6. s 9(2)(b)(ii) code of ethical conduct

C Johnson invited committee members to comment on the amended draft code of ethical conduct for s 9(2)(b)(ii). s 9(2)(a) reported that s 9(2)(b)(ii) wished to convey their appreciation for the feedback they received from NAEAC after the code was initially reviewed. It was generally agreed that the code was not written to an appropriate standard and was not fit for purpose. It was noted that R Hazelwood's offer of assistance to the code holder had not been taken up.

Rather than going through the code in detail a second time, the committee considered that the code holder should submit a revised code based on the code template then seek guidance about making further changes that may be required. It was agreed that they should be sent the link to the code

template and the latest draft version of the *Good Practice Guide*. M Tingle agreed to send this to [REDACTED]. The last offer of help would be R Hazelwood providing advice directly to the code holder. If a revised code was submitted to MPI it would need to be reviewed by a subcommittee comprising R Hazelwood, C Gillies, C Johnson and A Dale.

The committee asked [REDACTED] s 9(2)(a) when the code was due to expire. As [REDACTED] s 9(2)(a) could not recall she left the meeting at 2.12 pm to return to her desk to find out. [REDACTED] s 9(2)(a) returned at 2.20 pm and reported that the code expired on 26 November 2018.

It was agreed that there would not be enough time for a new code to be submitted and reviewed before that date. As such, the committee considered it appropriate to pass a resolution to extend the expiry date of the existing code for [REDACTED] s 9(2)(b)(ii) until the end of the year.

Moved (C Johnson /M Tingle):

That the current code of ethical conduct for [REDACTED] s 9(2)(b)(ii) code of ethical be extended until 31 December 2018.

The motion was put: carried.

The committee further discussed whether [REDACTED] s 9(2)(b)(ii) should even have a code of ethical conduct. C Johnson asked committee members individually for their opinion. Some members considered [REDACTED] s 9(2)(b)(ii) should not have a code at all and should cease to operate while others were of the opinion that additional support and options such as parenting should be brought to their attention. At the current time however, the committee agreed that it could not recommend that MPI approve the current version of their code. C Johnson agreed to advise [REDACTED] s 9(2)(a) of NAEAC's decision in person after the meeting.

Actions

M Tingle to send [REDACTED] s 9(2)(a) current draft of Good Practice Guide.
[REDACTED] s 9(2)(a) to send code holder the link to the code template and the current revised draft version of the 'Good Practice Guide'.
[REDACTED] s 9(2)(a) to write to advise [REDACTED] s 9(2)(b)(ii) accordingly.
C Johnson to discuss NAEAC's decision with [REDACTED] s 9(2)(a).

C 1. Confirmation of previous minutes

The minutes of the general meeting/operational planning meeting held on 16 August 2018 were reviewed. There were no amendments.

Moved (M Tingle/B Connor):

That the draft minutes of the meeting held on 16 August 2018 be adopted as a true and accurate records of that meeting.

The motion was put: carried.

The minutes of the codes of ethical conduct meeting held on 5 and 6 September 2018 were reviewed. There were no amendments.

Moved (A Dale/C Gillies):

That the draft minutes of the codes of ethical conduct meeting held on 5 and 6 September 2018 be adopted as a true and accurate record of that meeting.

The motion was put: carried.

C 7. Discussion of arrangements for 2018 AEC workshop

The committee reviewed the draft programme which was circulated prior to the meeting. The following updates were provided:

s 9(2)(a) reported that Minister O'Connor was unavailable to open the workshop. Chris Rodwell, Director Animal Health and Welfare was available and willing to open the workshop and present the Three Rs award.

s 9(2)(a) reported that she had circulated the decision making examples T Fenn had extracted from the codes of ethical conduct the committee recently reviewed. C Gillies reported that the two scenarios he had prepared for the consensus session had come from his own AEC. C Gillies confirmed that he had received permission from the other members of the AEC to use them. One scenario involved biopsy sampling of dolphin and the other, toxic cereal bait pellets.

It was agreed that all groups would be given both scenarios and a list of questions to answer. The questions would be:

1. Has your AEC ever experienced this previously?
2. How do you feel about consensus as a decision making process for AECs?
3. How do you think your AEC would deal with this situation?
4. How do you think your AEC should deal with this situation?

s 9(2)(a) reported that she had contacted persons within the MPI strategy group about a speaker on governance using the brief that was provided in the NAEAC 'wish list' as background. s 9(2)(a) had been told that topics relating to consensus and effective input by members related to meeting procedure not governance. It was agreed that because an appropriate speaker on governance had not been identified, the key note address should be changed to a different topic. It was suggested that G Shackell could talk to AECs about NAEAC's updated strategic plan.

s 9(2)(a) reported that she had not heard back from s 9(2)(a) about whether he could talk about compliance in relation to RTT. A Dale suggested that the presentation should last for 10 minutes followed by 5 minutes for questions.

s 9(2)(a) was still confirmed to talk about animal welfare in emergency management in relation to RTT organisations.

C Johnson volunteered to talk about the Arrive Guidelines.

Action – s 9(2)(a) to finalise workshop programme.

C 8 Update on MPI Significant Surgical Procedures Regulations.

C Johnson welcomed s 9(2)(a) to the meeting at 3.50 pm to provide an update on regulations.

s 9(2)(a) provided a summary of the regulatory proposals relating to significant surgical procedures (SSPs). The Animal Welfare Act was amended in 2015 to set new criteria for whether a procedure carried out on an animal is a SSP. When these criteria come into force in 2020, those procedures deemed to be SSPs will only be able to be performed by a veterinarian or veterinary student. However, the Act allows for regulations to be made specifying when it is appropriate for a non-veterinarian to carry out a particular procedure that would meet the new criteria.

s 9(2)(a) reported that where a SSP is carried out within an approved RTT project (in accordance with Part 6 of the Act), and there is no regulation for that procedure, anyone covered by the AEC approval can carry out the procedure. If the same procedure is carried out not in accordance with Part 6, then Parts 1 and 2 of the Act apply and, the same procedures could only be carried out by a veterinarian. Where a SSP is carried out within an approved RTT project (in accordance with Part 6), and there is a specific regulation for that procedure, the procedure must be carried out in accordance with the regulation. There is no automatic exemption for RTT.

s 9(2)(a) reported that a workshop to discuss proposals for SSPs had been held with members of the RTT community in September. The purpose of the workshop being to identify any specific procedures not covered by AEC approval, which were missing from MPI's current list, that meet the criteria of a SSP and are currently undertaken by non-veterinarians. s 9(2)(a) reported she would circulate the notes from the meeting when they became available.

s 9(2)(a) also reported on a meeting she had attended with the Department of Conservation about procedures they performed under standard operating procedures.

s 9(2)(a) asked committee members who she could contact if she had questions relating to SSPs performed in the area of RTT. C Gillies volunteered to be a point of contact. After further discussion it was agreed that communications should be directed to the entire committee.

On behalf of the committee C Johnson thanked s 9(2)(a) for their update after which they departed the meeting at 4.05 pm.

Action – s 9(2)(a) to circulate workshop notes to NAEAC.

C 2. Action list review

The committee did not have time to review the list of actions agreed at previous meetings.

There being no other items of business to discuss, the chair thanked committee members for their attendance and declared the meeting closed at 4.10 pm.