



National Animal Ethics Advisory Committee

Te Komiti Tohutohu Matatika Kararehe ā-Motu

The National Animal Ethics Advisory Committee

Tikanga hui: General Meeting

Rā: 23rd August 2023

Tāima: 9.00 am – 4.00 pm

Whaitua o rēhia: via Microsoft Teams

Meneti | Minutes

Komiti / Committee: Natalie Waran (Kairuruku/Chairperson), Jessica Walker, Laura Bennet, Janine Duckworth, Joanne Holter, Jacquie Harper, Mike King, Nita Harding, Rachel Heeney, Dianne Wepa

Nuinga / Attendees: s9(2)(a)

[Redacted names of attendees]

Manuhiri / Guests: Professor Gail Anderson (Team Lead ComPass, ANZCCART), Professor Pat Cragg (Chair, ANZCCART NZ).

Matangaro / Apologies: No apologies

Any Other Business (Open to the Public): No other business

Any Other Business (Public Excluded): No other business



National Animal Ethics Advisory Committee

PART 1: OPEN TO THE PUBLIC

GENERAL

O 1. Welcomes and Farewells

N Waran called to open the meeting at 09.05am, and D Wepa gave a karakia. It was noted that L Bennet would join the meeting between 9.30am – 10am and that R Heeney had not yet joined. N Waran advised that P Cragg and G Anderson from ANZCCART would be attending the meeting and that a member of the public may also attend the open session.

O 2. Confirmation of previous minutes

The document [31.23] was circulated prior to the meeting and taken as read. N Waran went through the minutes page by page. No issues were noted.

R Heeney joined the meeting at 09.11am.

N Waran noted the discussion in May on zebrafish and updated the committee that she had spoken with s9(2)(a) on this matter, noting that the work stream isn't progressing. s9(2)(a) will consider how this matter can be approached, noting the upcoming election. s9(2)(a) advised that s9(2)(a) will be presenting to NAEAC on the topic of amending the Animal Welfare Act 1999 during the November NAEAC meeting. The committee also spoke to an interest in hearing on NAWAC's progress regarding a Code of Welfare for fish.

N Waran noted the previous discussion on the CEC template, and how some prefer to download and amend the document. N Harding advised that the Part 6 sub-committee would provide an update on this later in the meeting.

Moved: (M King / J Harper)

That the minutes dated 24th May 2023 are a true and accurate record.

The motion was put: carried.

Actions:

- **Secretary to seek and provide an update from NAWAC regarding the potential Code of welfare for Fish.**



National Animal Ethics Advisory Committee

O 3. Status of actions arising from previous meetings

The document [32.23] was circulated prior to the meeting and taken as read. The committee read through the document together. No comments were made.

O 4. NAEAC correspondence

The document [33.23] was circulated prior to the meeting and taken as read. The Chair asked for any comments.

M King suggested an updated timeline for the 3Rs award should be available on the website. s9(2)(a) advised that this is currently being reviewed internally. The committee discussed the potential of a webpage on the NAEAC website dedicated to the 3Rs award, and when NAEAC should contact ANZCCART (NZ) to discuss funding for the next award cycle. The committee discussed whether there is currently any 3Rs conferences in New Zealand and proposed this could be an opportunity to showcase 3Rs examples, jointly with ANZCCART. s9(2)(a) and M King will be touch points to liaise with ANZCCART on this.

Actions:

- **M King and s9(2)(a) to discuss with ANZCCART NZ the idea of a satellite 3Rs meeting with ANZCCART NZ conferences.**
- **Secretariat to share Promapp on the 3R's award process with NAEAC once complete.**

O 5. MPI update and discussion

The document [34.32] was circulated prior to the meeting and taken as read.

L Bennet joined the meeting at 09.43am.

s9(2)(a) noted recruitment that is underway currently within the Animal Welfare Science Team, including for a permanent NAEAC secretary role and advised that briefings for the incoming Minister will include priorities for the first 90 days of office.

M King raised the topic of the Thermal Stress project and asked if NAEAC could have the report once it is circulated s9(2)(a) noted NAEAC could be included on a stakeholder list.

s9(2) advised the pig Code remains with the Minister for a final decision.



National Animal Ethics Advisory Committee

s9(2)(a) spoke to the diagram of the organisational overview, noting that the Animal Welfare Science team has been divided in two for people management purposes (Waiti and Waitā). All staff members work across all work programmes. The position of Animal Welfare Manager was advertised and interviews will take place shortly.

Actions:

- **Secretariat to include NAEAC on the stakeholder list for updates on the MPI Thermal Stress project.**

O 6. MPI summary of CEC approvals, notification, and revocations

The document [35.23] was circulated prior to the meeting and taken as read. s9(2)(a) talked through the memo and summarised that two CEC's and a number of parenting arrangements were approved; one CEC expired and was not renewed; several parenting arrangements lapsed and were not renewed, and several arrangements were terminated.

J Harper asked if the reason for termination is possible to be documented in case it is for a reason that NAEAC should be aware of. NAEAC agreed that they would like AECs to seek and provide this information. J Duckworth confirmed that her AEC application form includes whether applicants have applied elsewhere and whether they have any transgressions with other AECs. N Waran praised this good practice method.

O 7. Update from NAEAC subcommittees

The Publications subcommittee (SC) recently approved the Good Practice Guide (GPG) for publishing. They have also initiated a discussion on the advice currently within the guide to lay-members on AECs. The main point discussed was whether this document is needed in its current form, given that it has not been reviewed since 2009 and similar content is covered within the GPG. There are also several other older publications, and they will be reviewed.

The committee noted that the NAEAC website is still missing a link to the CEC template, and that the GPG is a document that gets continuously reviewed and improved and this process needs to be completed at the start of the year. s9(2)(a) noted that when the GPG came through for final approval, it was flagged that it hadn't gone for a robust internal review, and a few minor things were picked up which may not align with the intentions of the Act. The AWS Team are trying to strengthen how documents are published and it has been proposed to allow s9(2) () from the Policy team additional time



National Animal Ethics Advisory Committee

to review the document and aim for publication in October 2023. This process for publications will be process mapped and followed going forward. This approval process will be put forward to the Publications SC prior to being finalised. The committee discussed that the GPG document has become lengthy, and some content could be revised, removed, or condensed.

The Three Rs Award SC noted that they have not met and have no updates, as there is currently no work to progress until early 2024.

The Operation of Part 6 SC noted that they would provide a more in-depth update at 1pm as per the agenda.

The website SC noted that they scheduled a meeting, but it had to be cancelled due to conflicting schedules. s9(2)(a) was instead invited to one of the routine fortnightly Chair/MPI catch-ups and provided N Waran with an update on the website.

The AEC Training and Workshop SC discussed that the AEC Chairs meeting is scheduled for October and letters have been sent to AEC chairs by s9(2)(a), with roughly 50% responding with positive responses. s9(2)(a) advised that potential topics for the meeting are: parenting arrangements, non-compliance, unexpected adverse events, 3Rs data from animal use statistics, how Chairs can drive implementation of 3Rs advancements. M King suggested Committee Composition could be a valuable topic. N Harding was approached to lead the discussion on non-compliance, to which she agreed. J Duckworth suggested managing online meetings as a topic. It was noted that the SC will review the agenda timing, topics, and speakers.

The Mātauranga Māori SC shared that they have met twice, supported by s9(2)(a). They have agreed to an educative approach to support Code holders and J Harper will create a Code that imbues Mātauranga Māori as an exemplar, utilising a principles-based approach, rather than prescriptive, with bilingual headings. s9(2)(a) will be pulling together a preamble to be included and this will be circulated before the next meeting.

The Animals in Teaching SC provided an update that R Heeney joined the schools' AEC meeting on Monday night to better understand the applications they receive, the school farms and what guidance and rules they operate under. It was noted there are currently 14 school farms. R Heeney noted that school children often apply for approval only after already completing substantial preparatory work. She also queried the topics of parental consent if they are a child, and at what age they no longer require guardian consent. M King suggesting connecting with a human ethics committee.

s9(2)(a) joined the meeting at 10.26.



National Animal Ethics Advisory Committee

The Rehoming Guidelines SC updated that they have not met and don't have any updates.

The 4th R SC shared that they have no updates, and that s9(2)(a) circulated the 4th R paper to the SC (provided by N Harding).

Actions:

- s9(2) to provide the Publications subcommittee with a timeline for review and a list of amendments for ease of understanding the changes.
- Secretariat to liaise with R Heeney to support her attending NZASE meetings person.

The committee adjourned for morning tea at 10.38am.

s9(2)(a) left the meeting at 10:47am.

The committee reconvened at 10:49am.

PRESENTATION

O 8. Introduction to ComPass

P Cragg and G Anderson joined the meeting at 10.49am.

N Waran welcomed P Cragg and G Anderson to the meeting and handed the meeting over to G Anderson for a presentation on the ANZCCART Competency Passport (ComPass) online course.

G Anderson noted that she will circulate links for NAEAC to access the core ComPass modules without registration as it will be useful for them to access the material. G Anderson introduced that she is a veterinary surgeon and an academic veterinarian and worked at the University of Adelaide. She noted it was important for students to understand their roles and responsibilities in animal research and ensuring training and competency, however a lot of material was EU based and Australasia needed its own material. She discussed that s9(2)(a) was involved in editing the most recent material, to ensure it was correct for NZ and updated with information to make it more NZ friendly.

She gave a presentation to the committee, with key points covered below:

- Launched on December 1st, 2020
- There are four phases in ComPass.
- There are 8 core modules.



National Animal Ethics Advisory Committee

- The core modules have a 60-question quiz, and the pass mark is 80%, for which people are allowed 3 attempts.
- The wildlife module was released in early 2023.
- Over 10,000 people have registered, over 7,000 core users and 80% completion rate.
- Institutions are using this as compulsory material / course.
- G Anderson provided an overview of the material that is covered in several of the modules.
- ComPass provides material to both trainers and trainees to understand what basic competency is.

N Waran thanked G Anderson for the in-depth presentation, and the committee moved on to the next agenda item.

O 9. ComPass in New Zealand

The document [36.23] was circulated prior to the meeting and taken as read.

G Anderson noted that a review of the core materials could be circulated to NAEAC, or a subcommittee for review. It was noted there should not be a great deal of amendments, as it was written with NZ in mind too and has been based on high-level legislation and guidelines.

R Heeney queried a point within G Anderson's presentation, that 30% do not have English as a first language and asked what the other languages are. G Anderson confirmed that other common languages include Chinese or Indian. R Heeney volunteered to review the material from a schools perspective, and to ensure the technical language is accessible, if NAEAC were to take this into the work programme.

G Anderson noted that a lot of the feedback received from NZ representatives has been minor, and that differentiation between organisations should not render the information within ComPass irrelevant.

G Anderson offered to present at the upcoming AEC Chair workshop.

M King queried the timeline for amending material which G Anderson confirmed will depend on the volume of feedback. M King proposed that a review is undertaken of how the modules align with the Good Practice Guide, noting that ComPass has not yet been reviewed by NAEAC. G Anderson suggested that as she works through each module, it could be reviewed by NAEAC or the relevant subcommittee.

N Waran noted that ComPass has been reviewed and amended for a New Zealand context, including by New Zealand ANZCCART representatives, and as a result, is comfortable for it to be recommended as-is, but with a disclaimer regarding the lack of



National Animal Ethics Advisory Committee

NAEAC and MPI review. J Walker supported M Kings proposal that a more comprehensive review is undertaken from a NAEAC perspective.

M King suggested a soft approach of recommending it and that a more thorough review of the material from a NAEAC lens is included in the NAEAC work programme next year.

The committee discussed considerations which should be given if the ComPass training is deemed compulsory by NAEAC, including the recognition of previous learning if individuals have completed prior compulsory courses (e.g., SPCA AEC Members).

M King suggested that NAEAC write to ANZCCART (AUS) to confirm NAEAC's support for the ComPass material to be adapted and used within New Zealand.

J Walker volunteered to assist with the review of ComPass in 2024.

P Cragg affirmed that a soft approach be taken with promoting ComPass at the AEC workshop, with a discussion started on the benefit of individuals contributing to the review of modules, including agricultural animals' modules.

The committee discussed that funding options within MPI may need to be explored to resource this. s9(2)(a) advised that, should NAEAC decide to progress this in the 2024 workplan and stand up a subcommittee for review, MPI would seek resource to review this to ensure that it aligns with NAEACs GPG.

The committee thanked G Anderson and P Cragg for attending and for the rich discussion.

G Anderson and P Cragg left the meeting at 12:01pm.

Actions:

- **AEC Training and Workshop committee to review ComPass modules as part of the workplan for 2024. NAEAC members encouraged to review modules shared via link from G Anderson.**
- **Secretariat to draft up letter to ANZCCART AUS capturing direction and decision for ComPass review, confirming commitment to supporting and promoting the resource.**

O 10. Committee members' reports on recent presentations and attendance at conferences

M King shared no activity to report.

J Harper shared no activity to report.



National Animal Ethics Advisory Committee

J Duckworth shared that she completed an AEC Visit to Northern Branch of Otago Medical School

N Harding shared that she met with ACVM to discuss the issues with use of food production animals in research settings. It is in the process of being resolved.

J Walker shared that she attended the ANZCCART conference in Adelaide with the Waikato Animal Ethics Committee. She noted that there were valuable sessions, including on the Openness Agreement and the launch of the Australian openness agreement. She noted she was surprised by the lack of NAEAC representation. The committee discussed planning for meeting attendance at the start of the year and ensuring good representation. s9(2)(a) noted that the Secretariat is currently planning and establishing what relevant meetings and touchpoints would be, and whether NAEAC attend or present. s9(2)(a) noted she also attended the ANZCCART conference virtually.

The committee adjourned for lunch at 12:20pm

The committee reconvened at 12:52pm

OTHER BUSINESS

O 11. Operation of Part 6 Subcommittee work programme update

The documents [37.23a, 37.23b] were circulated prior to the meeting and taken as read.

N Harding shared that the SC has met two – three times since the last NAEAC meeting, and there was not a lot of change on the work programme document. She introduced the questionnaire on the CEC template, and that the SC have tried to keep the questionnaire concise, with not too many questions, but broad enough to still get feedback on important aspects. Seeking feedback from NAEAC before targeted distribution.

M King noted that he was happy that it is a short survey, but that this may reduce the level of information that they can capture. N Harding introduced the option of verbally going through the survey questions with the respondent, rather than as a written survey. The committee confirmed that they would like to distribute the survey to people who have recently used the template, and to circulate it to both AEC Chairs and Code to ensure they can target the person responsible for developing the Code, as each organisation is different and may have different processes.

N Waran noted that as having recently used the CEC template, she found it useful but repetitive, and that even she may find it difficult to recall what may need to be updated if asked in a survey. She suggested that it would likely be easier to recall feedback when being talked through the template in verbal discussion. The committee acknowledge that



National Animal Ethics Advisory Committee

such an approach, whilst promoting rich feedback, would likely extend the timeline of completion, due to resourcing required for guided conversation versus written survey.

The committee discussed that NAEAC should suggest that those completing the survey do so with reference to feedback they received on their Code, as well as their experience in writing the Code, to capture feedback on this process.

The committee discussed the need to differentiate between review processes as part of accredited reviews, versus the NAEAC review process. It was touched on that this survey is focused on the CEC template; however, these are important questions and maybe we need to clarify that both template and review process will be touched on, structured into separate sections.

N Harding confirmed that the next steps after completing the survey will be for data to be collated and analysed for common themes. The SC will then look at how feedback might be addressed. She noted that the SC could feedback to stakeholders who completed the survey via a report detailing common themes and planned updates, to be distributed to contributors and put on the website. N Harding also noted that they will get MPI to review the revised template to ensure all requirements of Part 6 of the Act are still covered, and that the publications SC will be looped in to ensure it aligns with the GPG.

The committee discussed that the timeline still needs to be confirmed, and if possible, it would be ideal to have the updated template for the next round of Codes for next year. Letters usually get sent out in January/February to allow time for preparations. SC to see how that timeline might look realistically, depending on how the feedback might be captured (written vs verbal). Resourcing requirements will depend on how people want to respond to the survey.

s9(2)(a) re-joined meeting at 1:18pm.

FOR DISCUSSION

O 12. NAEAC euthanasia guidelines update

The documents [38.23a, 38.23b] circulated prior to the meeting and taken as read. N Harding provided an introduction that the guideline was developed before she joined NAEAC, and that she finished them off. The guideline was distributed to ANZCCART board members for feedback and a lot of feedback received, which was summarised into the update provided for the meeting. N Harding advised she has a meeting next week with s9(2) to talk through feedback.



National Animal Ethics Advisory Committee

The committee sought clarity on the reasoning behind why this NAEAC document was produced, to which N Harding reaffirmed that it was initiated prior to her joining NAEAC and she is unsure of the background. The committee discussed that there needs to be a clear scope for having a bespoke NAEAC document when other guidelines exist.

It was noted by J Duckworth that the guideline is NZ specific, which will not be captured by other existing guidelines. N Harding added to this that there are constraints to euthanasia depending on use, and guidelines needs to be context-driven - not just focused on a laboratory setting.

s9(2)(a) left the meeting at 1.24pm.

It was noted for N Harding to cross-reference the euthanasia module in ComPass at such a time where it is reviewed by NAEAC.

The committee discussed the need for a bespoke NZ euthanasia document. The guideline needs to be clear in the scope that the guide covers circumstances specific to NZ and refer people to other guides for more general points that are already covered elsewhere. It was discussed how NAEAC can ensure that it has expertise to keep this document maintained and reviewed going forward, and that it may need to draw on expertise within MPI. J Duckworth noted she is happy to assist N Harding.

Actions:

- Secretariat to research background of why the euthanasia guidelines were commissioned into the NAEAC work programme, and feed this back for further decision making by NAEAC.



National Animal Ethics Advisory Committee

RESOLUTION TO EXCLUDE THE PUBLIC

Section 48, Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act 1987

I (N Waran) move that the public be excluded from the following parts of the proceedings of this meeting, namely, —

- C 1. Draft response to campaign emails
- C 2. NAEAC meeting protocols
- C 3. Code reviews - lessons learned and strategy going forward
- C 4. Animal Use Statistics – 3Rs
- C 5. NAEAC Strategic plan 2024-2027 draft plan

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. Draft response to campaign emails. C 2. NAEAC Meeting protocols. C 3. Code reviews - lessons learned and strategy going forward. C 4. Animal Use Statistics - 3Rs; and C 5. NAEAC Strategic plan 2024-2027 draft plan.	To maintain the effective conduct of public affairs through —	the free and frank expression of opinions by or between or to Ministers of the Crown or members of an organisation or officers and employees of any public service agency or organisation in the course of their duty

I also move that: s9(2)(a)

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 discussion. This knowledge is relevant background information to assist the committee in its deliberations.

Moved: (N Waran / M King)

Motion put: carried



National Animal Ethics Advisory Committee

PART 2: PUBLIC EXCLUDED AGENDA

FOR DISCUSSION

C 1. Draft response to campaign emails

The document [39.23] was circulated prior to the meeting and taken as read. N Waran talked through the document and reminded the committee of the emails the NAEAC inbox has received from members of the public as part of a SAFE campaign on the use of animals in science. The committee were asked to consider whether these emails should receive a NAEAC response, and if so, what should be included within the response. It was noted that the Secretariat has included a draft response in the circulated document.

s9(2)(g)(i)

RELEASED UNDER THE OFFICIAL INFORMATION ACT 1982



National Animal Ethics Advisory Committee

s9(2)(g)(i)

C 2. NAEAC meeting protocols

s9(2)(g)(i)

The committee discussed the split for virtual and in-person meetings and agreed on 50/50 for general meetings, and in-person for all Code meetings. Going forward, all meeting dates will be cross-referenced with school holidays and other important dates.

C 3. Code reviews - lessons learned and strategy going forward

The document [40.23] was circulated prior to the meeting and taken as read. s9(2)(a) spoke to the document, noting that in April a new strategy was trialled for Code of Ethical Conduct reviews, to step through the process more efficiently. This strategy was successful, and the Secretariat would like to implement this approach for the October meeting, in which five Codes are due to be reviewed by NAEAC. The document outlines the proposed approach.

The Secretariat proposed that a SC approach is utilised, with each SC assigned to one Code to review in depth and record feedback on a feedback sheet. These feedback sheets will be presented at the Codes review meeting for full committee discussion. NAEAC



National Animal Ethics Advisory Committee

members are expected to have read through all of the Codes in advance of the meeting to allow for robust discussion, with the relevant SC responsible for leading the discussion.

The Secretariat anticipate one to two SC meetings per Code in September, and following the October CEC meeting, the Secretariat will collate the feedback and relay the feedback to the Code holder for them to update the Code. After this, the Secretariat will check the Code against feedback and seek NAEACs recommendation as to whether the CEC can be accepted as it is, or if further amendments are required.

s9(2)(a) referred to the proposed SCs within the memo and noted that three NAEAC members on each SC ensures a robust review process, with support provided by the Secretariat to collate feedback and schedule meetings.

Committee members conflicts of interests were noted and considered in the proposed SC compositions. M King advised that he has a conflict of interest with AgResearch and requested to be moved to the Auckland Zoo SC instead or another non-conflicting SC.

s9(2)(a) re-joined the meeting at 2.04pm.

J Walker noted that she is happy to be on additional SCs if necessary.

s9(2)(a) confirmed that the Secretariat will circulate doodle polls next week to set up SC meetings. It was confirmed that all NAEAC members will receive all CECs to read but are only required to review their SC CEC in depth. NAEAC members can expect to receive the CECs in separate emails, circulated at the same time, to reduce file size within the same email.

Actions:

- **Secretariat to circulate doodle polls and schedule SC meetings for CEC reviews.**

C 4. Animal use statistics - 3Rs

The document [41.23] was circulated prior to the meeting and taken as read. s9(2)(a) spoke to the document and advised that last year MPI moved to a new animal use statistics system. This involved additional questions regarding the implementation of the 3Rs, alongside the mandatory animal use statistics questions. This resulted in a significant volume of data being received and the Secretariat would like to discuss the best ways for this data to be highlighted. s9(2) has reviewed and categorised the data and developed several examples of how this information can be presented and reported. These



National Animal Ethics Advisory Committee

examples were incorporated into the circulated document for NAEAC to review and provide feedback on.

M King noted this ideal timing, as ANZCCART have recently issued a press release on the reporting of the 3Rs in animal use statistics.

The difficulty in accurately capturing information was raised, as those no longer using animals in RTT due to replacing them would not file returns. It was agreed that what the Secretariat are proposing is a positive step towards addressing the gap in the reporting of the 3Rs.

s9(2)(a) advised that the questions relating to the 3Rs were included in the 2021 report, however only a small amount of data was received as this information is only collected on a voluntary basis, unlike the other statistics. This year, this section of questions were moved up in the reporting and a lot of examples were received from Massey, who were open to having this information shared. As this is the first attempt at increasing the information received on the 3Rs, the data presented is preliminary and will need further work. The case studies included are placeholders at this stage and the Secretariat are continuing to work with organisations to gather more examples. This information will be presented first in the animal use statistics report to highlight the work and shift the focus to this.

J Harper praised the infographics and the work of the Secretariat on this. N Waran also thanked the Secretariat for their work on this and put forward several questions for consideration:

- Suggestion to include percentage of organisations providing this additional information, as it may encourage others to provide it in the future.
- Further clarity may be required for organisations returning data on the different species. A species focused approach rather than organisation focus was suggested. s9(2)(a) advised that numbers of the animals were not provided for these examples, just species descriptions.
- Clarity on the species being replaced s9(2)(a) noted this is not straightforward to tease out of the information provided but is open to suggestions on how the graphs and reports can be framed.

N Waran praised the different subcategories and case studies and queried whether there may be unintended consequences, due to the data being interpreted differently by stakeholders. s9(2)(g)(i)

M King noted the report contains technical jargon and could be reworded to lay terms.



National Animal Ethics Advisory Committee

s9(2)(a) advised that internal reflections on how to best capture the information have been occurring and as this is the first run, there are restrictions due to the way the data has been received. It is also noted that there are continual improvements in how data is captured year on year, and these comments can be noted for future data collection

J Harper praised the document and noted that it provides a lot of opportunities on how best the data can be organised, but that it can be considered in future reports.

s9(2)(a) confirmed that this information will be captured at the start of the animal use statistics report which is published for public information and distributed to stakeholders.

The committee adjourned for afternoon tea at 2.35pm.

s9(2)(a) left the meeting at 2.42pm.

The committee reconvened at 2.44pm

C 5. NAEAC strategic plan 2024 - 2028 draft plan

The document [42.23] was circulated prior to the meeting and taken as read. N Waran spoke to the document and introduced the discussion on the NAEAC strategy update. The strategy for 2024-2028 is for NAEAC to be more proactive and forward thinking, whilst promoting increased visibility regarding the 3Rs.

The relationship between the NAEAC strategy and social licence was discussed, noting that it may guide elements of the strategy such as the pillars reflecting accountability, transparency. It was noted that the pillars will be updated to a circular diagram.

The committee were shown the current vision and strategy, alongside an example of the proposed updated vision and strategy on page 3.

The committee discussed their feedback on these proposed updates and agreed that there are work streams that align with "engagement, transparency and trust" and the language should be amended to be reflective of this. However, it was proposed that the "underpinned by" section is removed to reflect these elements being embedded within specific workstreams.

NAEAC discussed the potential new diagram layout, which received positive feedback.

It was noted that there is further work to be undertaken to establish the 4th R, and whether NAEAC is the appropriate committee to be accountable for the RTT system being trusted. However, it was acknowledged that NAEAC can make efforts to ensure the system is trustworthy.



National Animal Ethics Advisory Committee

M King proposed that rather than “trusted”, the system should be “robust”, and N Waran suggested that trust will be an inherent result of the other elements within the strategy pillars.

J Duckworth praised the proposed diagram display but noted it may be a challenge to fit all the required information in.

NAEAC agreed that this should be finalised by a graphic designer to modernise the diagram and ensure the best format for the information it needs to contain. An operational plan underpinning the strategy diagram can be included and provide more detail.

The committee agreed that they are satisfied with the strategic plan to date and are comfortable for the working group to continue progressing this work.

J Harper noted the higher-level messaging should be regarding what the SCs are working on, and that the Mātauranga Māori element will evolve once the rest of the diagram is being developed.

s9(2)(a) reminded NAEAC that they are able to update their strategy prior to 2028, should they wish.

The committee agreed that they would like to have the strategic plan finalised by the end of 2023.

Actions:

- **Secretariat to explore options for formatting the strategic plan.**

The meeting was closed at 3.01pm with a karakia by D Wepa.