



National Animal Ethics Advisory Committee

The National Animal Ethics Advisory Committee

Te Komiti Tohutohu Matatika Kararehe ā-Motu

General Meeting / Tikanga hui

Date / Rā: 28 November 2023

Time / Tāima: 9.00 am – 3:30 pm

Venue / Whaitua o rēhia: via Microsoft Teams

Minutes / Meneti

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

Attendees / Nuinga: s9(2)(a)

[Redacted list of attendees]

Guests / Manuhiri: Tara Jackson (Executive Director, New Zealand Anti-Vivisection Society)

Public Attendees / Tūmatanui tangata I tae atu:

Apologies / Matangaro: Joanne Holter



National Animal Ethics Advisory Committee

PART ONE (OPEN TO THE PUBLIC)

GENERAL

O 1. Welcomes and Farewells

N Waran opened the meeting at 09:03am and M King gave the opening karakia. R Heeney offered to do the opening karakia at the next meeting. It was noted that J Holter was an apology, and that L Bennet would be late.

O 2. Confirmation of previous minutes

The documents [66.23 and 67.23] were circulated prior to the meeting and taken as read. The committee reviewed each set of draft minutes in turn.

The committee noted that the draft minutes dated 23rd August meeting were an excellent record, although D Wepa's name was missing.

MOTION

Moved: (N Waran / J Duckworth)

That the minutes dated 23rd August are a true and accurate record.

The motion was put: carried.

The committee noted that the draft minutes dated 2nd and 3rd October had a typo on page 19. The Secretary confirmed that all actions relating to the Good Practice Guide had been included in the Publications Sub-Committees (SC) change register.

L Bennet jointed the meeting at 09:09am.

MOTION

Moved: (J Harper / M King)

That the minutes dated 2nd - 3rd October are a true and accurate record.

The motion was put: carried.



National Animal Ethics Advisory Committee

O 3. Status of actions arising from previous meetings

The document [68.23] was circulated prior to the meeting and taken as read. The committee reviewed the actions list.

M King provided an update regarding the ANZCCART conference and options for NAEAC to support it. s9(2)(a) noted that ANZCCART expressed interest in jointly hosting an event on a separate date later in the year to allow more time to secure funding. The committee discussed that they will need to consider this possibility when planning the workplan early next year. N Waran noted that she has been invited to speak at two different sessions, and that it would be good to have NAEAC as a partner in the conference. The committee talked to possible options for supporting the conference. s9(2)(a) suggested that NAEAC allocate the task to an existing or new SC and to include it in their workplan for when N Waran engages with the new Minister. The committee agreed that it would likely best sit with the AEC Training and Workshop SC, and s9(2)(a) agreed to join and support. The SC asked the Secretary to set up a meeting to discuss this.

s9(2)(a) provided an update on the NAEAC Secretary position in that it is being held open for the time being.

The committee discussed the SFFF funding for 3Rs research. s9(2)(a) noted that a previous Minister suggested this fund could be fit for purpose for 3Rs funding, but it was later confirmed that the current terms of the funding doesn't allow for general 3Rs research work. This will be a conversation that may need to be re-opened with the new Minister. The committee asked M King to provide a written record of the NAEAC's 3Rs research grant in relation to the SFFF fund, to provide N Waran with when she engages with the new Minister on the NAEAC workplan. s9(2)(a) noted that she will assist M King to pull information together as she is also aware of the history. It was acknowledged that provisions from a previous Minister can be overridden by a new Minister.

The remaining actions were reviewed. It was confirmed that the 4Rs SC remains on the workplan, but there has been no progress to date and further work needs to be captured in workplan for 2024.



National Animal Ethics Advisory Committee

Actions:

- Secretary to send out doodle link for the AEC Training and Workshop SC and set up a meeting to consider opportunities to support and work with ANZCCART for the 2024 work plan, and put together a proposal to circulate to the committee.
- Secretariat and M King to pull information together regarding SFFF funding for N Waran's discussion with new Minister.

O 4. NAEAC correspondence

The document [69.23] was circulated prior to the meeting and taken as read. N Waran talked to the correspondence received by the NAEAC inbox and the resolutions of each. N Harding queried the correspondence regarding virtual fencing and NAWAC's workstream in this area. N Waran updated NAEAC on NAWAC's intention to draft and publish an opinion piece on animal welfare and emerging Agritech, which is currently being circulated around NAWAC for consideration by the committee. The intended location will be the NAWAC website. N Harding queried whether NAEAC could have the opportunity to review this due to potential scope relating to research approval for developing Agritech, and for NAEAC to be informed across emerging issues. The committee discussed the potential for a workshop idea together with NAWAC. It was noted by J Duckworth that this also has relevance to the pest control industry, and how to make decisions between normal management practice and experimental practices. The committee discussed the issue of when does innovation become research. N Waran noted that NAEAC may wish to identify topics of interest for opinion pieces in the 2024 workplan, for things that may fall outside NAEAC's core functions and that it may be useful to engage with AEC Chairs to pull out common themes. N Waran noted there may be scope to retire some SCs next year to ensure members have capacity for future work streams in this area.

Actions:

- Secretariat to pass on NAEAC's interest to review the NAWAC Agritech opinion piece on to M Stone.



National Animal Ethics Advisory Committee

O 5. MPI update and discussion

The document [70.23] was circulated prior to the meeting and taken as read. s9(2)(a) talked to the MPI Update. She updated the committee that s9(2)(a) formally resigned from MPI, with s9(2)(a) taking the position of Manager Animal Welfare on a permanent basis. She noted that two new senior advisers have joined the Animal Welfare Science team. The Secretariat confirmed the new Ministers for Agriculture and Animal Welfare.

s9(2)(a) noted that the Secretariat had received no direction as of yet, and that they will keep NAEAC updated. The committee shared appreciation for the Secretariat.

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

The document [71.23] was circulated prior to the meeting and taken as read. The committee reviewed the notifications memo. The Secretariat noted that NAEAC had previously requested further information regarding reasons for terminations and shared that the Secretariat have added optional questions for reasons on termination to code holders.

O 7. Update from NAEAC subcommittees

N Waran called for SC updates.

It was noted that the strategy SC would provide an update later on the agenda.

The 3Rs working group SC requested to book a meeting for early 2024, in preparation for the 2024 awards cycle. The committee talked to adding the 3Rs workstreams to this SC, regarding encouraging reporting of 3Rs, funding 3Rs work, and sharing best practice. They agreed to consolidate the 4th R SC work to the 3Rs SC, as there are similar people across both SC's, and review scope of the SC terms of reference at the first meeting in 2024.

The Operation of Part 6 SC noted that their current focus was updating the CEC template.

The Publications SC shared that they have been having regular meetings and are completing a comprehensive review of the GPG and acknowledged the great support from MPI Policy and the Secretariat, who reviewed the GPG with regards to alignment with the Act. M King shared that the publication timeline for the GPG has been pushed out to allow alignment with the CEC template, and a more thorough review by the Secretariat and will be published early next year. This will streamline the process for



National Animal Ethics Advisory Committee

future updates, and they are looking to ensure all guidance documents are aligned moving forward.

The Website and Digital Presence SC shared that there is an ongoing piece of work to discuss the layout of website and how to organise the information and content to streamline the user experience. It was noted that this will not be completed this year, as NAEAC need to get its strategic plan firmed up first.

The AEC Training and Workshop SC noted that they have not met. The committee discussed an idea of regular meetings with AEC chairs and for the SC to discuss this at the next meeting. It was agreed for N Waran to be the Chair for this SC.

The Mātauranga Māori SC shared that they will be connecting with the publications SC to discuss and establish guidance on Mātauranga Māori within the GPG. M King requested a short paragraph for the Publications SC to review.

The Animals in Teaching SC noted they will book a meeting for the SC early next year.

The Rehoming guidelines SC noted that due to the workload relating to the CEC template, no work has been conducted in this space. Resources have been gathered but no progress yet. It was acknowledged that there is information out there on this topic which can be reviewed for this work stream.

N Waran expressed that each SC should put together meeting dates for 2024 during their first meeting for 2024 and set out a workplan for the year.

Actions:

- Mātauranga Māori SC to provide paragraph to Publications SC for the Good Practice Guide.
- 4th R SC and 3Rs Award Working Group SC to be combined to form a 3Rs Subcommittee.
 - a. 3Rs subcommittee to review scope of their Terms of Reference in early 2024.
- All SCs to meet in early 2024 to set meeting dates and establish a workplan for the year.

O 8. Members' reports on recent presentations and attendance at conferences

N Waran shared that she recently finished an 18-month period of work regarding horses in sport for the International Federation for Equestrian Sports (FEI). She presented in



National Animal Ethics Advisory Committee

Mexico on the FEI board report, considering how to improve wellbeing of horses involved in sport and retaining a social license to operate. N Waran shared that she also presented in Paris at an international horse racing regulatory authority conference, with a keynote talk on social license to operate in relation, being proactive in equine welfare issues, and encouraging the need for a unified voice across the equine board. N Waran confirmed that she is happy to circulate the PowerPoint for the presentations, at M King's request.

M King shared that he recently returned from Brisbane, where he presented at the Australasian Association of Bioethics and Health Law on the ethics of developing antimicrobials for exclusive animal use. He received an invitation to present in Hong Kong on obstacles in surveillance of diseases from a One Health perspective.

J Duckworth noted that she was invited to talk at a "Social Licence Workshop" organised by the Animal Welfare Network Aotearoa on 18 October 2023, held in Christchurch, on the topic of Social license for conducting research on vertebrate pest control.

No other member reports.

The committee adjourned for morning tea at 10:22am.

s9(2) left the meeting.

T Jackson joined the meeting at 10:35am.

The meeting reconvened at 10:42am.

PRESENTATION

O 9. NZAVS – Striking at the Source

N Waran welcomed T Jackson and thanked her for accepting the invitation to talk on the NZAVS Striking At The Source campaign. T Jackson acknowledged that it was the second time she has been invited to present.

Key points of the presentation included:

- T Jackson is the Executive Director of the New Zealand Anti-Vivisection Society (NZAVS).
- NZAVS is the only charity in New Zealand focused on ending harmful animal experimentation.
- The new NZAVS website was launched on Monday 27th November 2023.
- The Striking at the Source campaign contained three key requests that NZAVS believe the New Zealand government should act on:
 1. Commit to phasing out the requirement in New Zealand legislation for animal testing.



National Animal Ethics Advisory Committee

- There are legal requirements for animal testing in New Zealand law (e.g., for medicines and medical devices, veterinary medicine, hazardous substances). These requirements leave no room for validated animal free methods to be used where possible.
- NZAVS are not asking for a ban, but for gates to be opened so that validated animal free methods can be used where available and possible. In the U.S there is new legislation (the FDA Modernisation Act) that drops this requirement.
- 2. Allocate funding for the use and development of non-animal based RTT methods.
 - There is currently no government funding towards the development of non-animal based RTT methods. There is a trend internationally in the scientific community of viewing the replacement of animals in RTT seriously.
 - The organoid market is growing substantially in Australia and revenue from non-animal models is forecasted to reach over 1 billion by 2040. There are key benefits to allocating funding for non-animal based RTT.
 - The German government recently finalised their budget for 2024, with \$1.8 million NZD per year towards alternate methods for animal experimentation.
- 3. Commit to phasing out the use of animals for science, as technology permits.
 - There is no end goal for direction in New Zealand at this time, and there is a need to formalise a clear direction for the scientific community.
- NZAVS believe all three requests are simple, practical actions.
- NZAVS believe that a powerful part of their petition is the support provided from members of the animal science and research community in New Zealand. The consensus of feedback was that there is a genuine desire to see shared progress in the three areas.
- The response on the petition from the Primary Production Committee was to recommend that the House take note of its report, and that they consider it important that New Zealand progress scientific development of research methodologies and for the government to investigate possibilities.
- NZAVS have been encouraging institutes using animals for science in New Zealand to make individual commitments to replacing animals for science as technology permits.
- T Jackson spoke at the recent ANZCCART conference on how institutes can adopt individual commitments on animal use in RTT. T Jackson noted that there was a



National Animal Ethics Advisory Committee

common theme arising in the conference relating to a desire to make progress in the space.

- Massey University was the first to publish a statement of intent, publicly available on their website. NZAVS is hoping other institutes follow their lead and noted that such progress shows that a collaborative approach is effective.
- NZAVS have been working on a summary report for members of the new Government to bring them up to speed and encourage them to act on the findings of the Primary Production Committee regarding their petition.
- NZAVS are keen to partner with NAEAC and MPI to help progress this space.

N Waran thanked T Jackson for her presentation and acknowledged the approach of NZAVS, which is starting to show progress, and opened the floor for questions.

M King noted that the approach NZAVS are taking to making progress seems to be working driving culture change and uncovering common areas. He queried whether it was likely someone may agree to share a statement of intent without agreeing with its underlying principles. He also noted that some types of research are non-harmful for animals or may have therapeutic benefit for animals in the long-term and thus may not be morally objectionable. He suggested that this could be a barrier to organisations making such a statement of intent. T Jackson noted that this summarised the complexity of the issue. She shared that historically, NZAVS wanted to encourage an abolitionist approach, but acknowledge that in some cases research is helpful for animals and non-harmful, and that this is challenging to relay to the public. She noted that different phrasing may help get this message across and in some cases, NZAVS does not have an issue with animal involvement in RTT where there are no harms, e.g., companion animals involved that go home after involvement. This was why the statement of intent was written as it is, as this allows for the nuances and complexities of this area. It was acknowledged that it may be a barrier if the approach is not suitable across the board and that some institutes may wish to edit their own intent statement, but the key aspect is putting forward a unified commitment to make this culture for change known.

N Waran asked T Jackson for her thoughts on how to drive recognition of the need for funding for non-animal model methodologies forward. T Jackson acknowledged that funding is complex as there are competing priorities. She noted that there is no dollar figure attached to the NZAVS request for funding, as anything is better than nothing. She suggested that this is an area that NAEAC may be best positioned to provide advice on to the Minister for Science, Innovation, and Technology, to support decision-making. T Jackson confirmed that she was happy to share her resources and information with NAEAC to support this. N Waran confirmed that NAEAC would like to review this as it sits within NAEAC's remit to be knowledgeable about domestic and international trends in order to best inform advice. T Jackson also noted that it may be useful for research to be



National Animal Ethics Advisory Committee

conducted into possible benefits to the New Zealand economy to funding non-animal methodologies, as was recently conducted in Australia.

M King raised the possibility of additional ethical issues arising from non-animal model developments, and that this will need to be explored.

The committee discussed the use of AI and data banks and how these can support the implementation of the 3Rs in RTT. It may be possible that AI models can identify if studies/methodologies have already been conducted with animals. T Jackson noted that projects are underway overseas to look into a pathway forward to replace use of animal where possible, and to create an AI hub to prevent repeated studies. Additionally, an animal-free hub is being developed by an international collaboration to look at how to pull information on completed studies into an open access data hub. NZAVS is hoping to be a part of group working on this. It was noted that the need to rely on the knowledge of the individual AEC members to identify if project principles/methods are being repeated is a concerning gap. It was acknowledged that commercial sensitivity and competition makes releasing this information challenging.

FOR APPROVAL

O 10. 2024 NAEAC Meeting Dates 11:30

The document [72.23] was circulated prior to the meeting and taken as read. s9(2)(a) raised that NAWAC's meeting dates needed to be considered, as well as the overall event schedule. She noted that depending on the complexity of CECs being reviewed in 2024, the CEC review meeting may be one day in person, with a further day online if needed. It was confirmed that only dates need approving for now.

The committee discussed having the meeting on the 29th of February 2024, to set work priorities early in the year. It was noted that the GPG timeline would likely need to be considered at an out-of-session meeting to expedite that process. Due to availability of members, the committee suggested Monday 26th of February for the first meeting.

M King noted that he will need to reschedule teaching responsibilities to be available for the general meeting and site visits in May.

The committee discussed the joint meeting with NAWAC and general meeting in August. It was noted that Wednesdays are difficult for J Harper in 2024. N Harding and J Walker have a clash for Thursday 29th due to an AEC meeting and will confirm with the AEC Chair if they can reschedule their meeting. The Secretariat noted they would explore alternate dates.

The CEC review meeting dates worked for all.



National Animal Ethics Advisory Committee

It was noted that the general meeting proposed for 26th November was fine, however, members noted they were unavailable for an AEC Workshop on 27th November. The committee discussed the intension to have a joint symposium with ANZCCART and explore a date in late 2024 for this, including the idea to join it with the AEC Workshop in Wellington in late 2024 to capture common guests. The Secretariat confirmed they will look for other dates and will publish a calendar to show how the meeting dates are organised across the committees for final approval via email.

The Secretariat shared the tentative idea for Christchurch for site visits. J Duckworth confirmed that she could host NAEAC at Lincoln University for the general meeting. The committee discussed aligning dates for site visits with the ANZCCART conference. It was acknowledged that funding for attending ANZCCART will need to be explored.

Actions:

- Secretariat to explore meeting dates for 2024 and provide NAEAC with final dates for approval.

O 11. Draft updated CEC Template 11:45

The document [73.23] was circulated prior to the meeting and taken as read. N Harding gave an overview of the updated template and highlighted where change had been made. She thanked the Secretariat who facilitated the survey which provided useful responses. The template was redrafted based on feedback and the SC removed areas of duplication, re-ordered sections, and put the application form at the front to create an application pack. N Harding talked the committee through the template. Main discussion points included:

- N Harding noted that the section relating to Mātauranga Māori may be updated after feedback from the Mātauranga Māori SC.
- M King requested the SC review section 2.1 on AEC functions and powers.
- The committee discussed whether to refer to specific sections within the GPG. It was acknowledged that as the GPG is updated annually, with changes in section numbering possible, a statement that the GPG provides guidance is sufficient.
- The committee confirmed that they are happy with the title for section 4 as is.
- The committee discussed that there is a need to provide guidance and definitions minor and major non-compliances. It was confirmed that definitions will be pulled into the updated GPG.



National Animal Ethics Advisory Committee

N Harding noted that any further feedback can be submitted within the next week and that the template will be uploaded to the NAEAC website when completed.

MOTION

Moved: (N Harding / M King)

to approve the updated CEC template with discussed amendments, and to circulate it with stakeholders when completed.

The motion was put: carried.

Actions:

- N Harding to circulate major and minor non-compliance definitions to the Secretariat/Publications SC to include that in GPG review.
- Mātauranga Māori SC to provide feedback on the CEC template section relating to Mātauranga Māori..

The committee adjourned for lunch at 12:15pm

The committee reconvened at. 12:55pm

RELEASED UNDER THE OFFICIAL INFORMATION ACT 1982



National Animal Ethics Advisory Committee

PART 2: PUBLIC EXCLUDED AGENDA

RESOLUTION TO EXCLUDE THE PUBLIC

Section 48, Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act 1987

N Waran moved that the public be excluded from the following parts of the proceedings of this meeting, namely, —

- C 1. Teaching SC Update*
- C 2. CEC Meeting Debrief*
- C 3. NAEAC Strategic Plan 2024-2028 Draft*
- C 4. Draft NAEAC 2023 Annual Report*
- C 5. NAEAC Workplan 2023*
- C 6. Animal welfare policy presentation*

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
C1 – C6	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

She also moved 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 / J Harper)

Motion put: carried



National Animal Ethics Advisory Committee

C 1. Teaching SC Update 13:00

R Heeneey talked to progress on an article with the Education Gazette. R Heeneey engaged with the Schools' AEC on what issues they commonly face. They expressed the lack of approval, or late applications for approval is a common concern. The Gazette editor is after a piece targeted towards primary school teachers to provide information and guidance and is happy to follow up on this with a more technical piece if required. The editor will submit the piece to NAEAC for review, and R Heeneey will connect with the Schools' AEC to loop them in for approvals if needed. R Heeneey reaffirmed that she is not across the content of the piece, which is being drafted by the editor.

R Heeneey shared that the School's AEC expressed they would prefer R Heeneey not contact teachers directly to gather information. s9(2)(a) spoke to the initial proposal for the article, as the editor requested an overview of what does and does not require ethics approval, and that MPI advised against this as MPI and NAEAC are not the regulators in this space. Any advice that goes out within the article needs to be accurate under the Act. It was confirmed that the article is currently planned for the for first Education Gazette issue next year. R Heeneey is involved to provide a NAEAC and teaching lens, and MPI is involved to ensure that information is accurate and reflects the Act and regulatory space appropriately.

s9(2)(a) noted that there is a process for ensuring accuracy, and that the process for getting review by NAEAC/MPI requires time to ensure that information going out is appropriate and accurate. The committee expressed support for the article but encouraged a thorough review process.

C 2. CEC Meeting Debrief 13:15

s9(2)(a) noted that this discussion was intended as a formal point to capture any feedback on the CEC review meeting and process. The Secretariat felt that securing the SC's to do the initial reviews expedited the process, allowed for robust discussion, and ensured that points that needed to be discussed were pulled to the front. It was acknowledged that although it meant increased workload in the lead up for the Secretariat, it allowed for more structure in discussion and information capturing.

J Harper noted that as Acting Chair for the CEC review meeting, she felt the main meeting went very smoothly and that the structure was useful as opposed to annotating the documents directly. She felt that the outcome was a more robust review.

N Waran asked the committee whether they felt the process is fit for purpose, to which the committee agreed.



National Animal Ethics Advisory Committee

M King queried how NAEAC can ensure they remain consistent in their advice. s9(2)(a) noted that NAEAC are required to read all Codes and suggested that common themes should be picked up there but acknowledged this can be a challenge. The committee noted that previous common themes have been addressed within the AEC Chairs meeting and the updated CEC template.

The committee discussed how to structure the review meetings moving forward, noting that the October meeting ran short. s9(2)(a) re-affirmed the Secretariat's plan for setting the CEC review meeting for one day in person if indicated, assuming sufficient funding, and having an overflow day virtually if required. It was acknowledged that an in-person meetings adds an additional level of confidence in the robustness of conversation, but that it depends on the nature of the Codes that are up for review in a given year, as well as how many. It was noted that the two-day meeting was booked with no knowledge of how the new process would work, so this is a new learning.

M King raised the topic of line-by-line reviews, noting that they were discouraged in the SC meetings which he found challenging considering giving adequate feedback may rely on discussing sentence by sentence. He supports doing homework prior to the SC meetings but thinks that may risk compromising the depth of discussion when reviewing CECs. N Waran noted that the SC meetings should be run as the SC feels fit, but it needs to align with the required output whilst being mindful of using time effectively. s9(2)(a) noted that each individual SC member should have reviewed the CEC prior to the meeting, and unless there are issues with each individual line, such an approach may take time away from issues that need to be discussed. It was noted that most SC's completed their reviews within the allocated time with robust discussions, and that the main goal is to not bring a line-by-line approach to the full committee meetings. The committee acknowledged they need to avoid editing.

The committee discussed the idea of a CEC writers workshop. It was agreed that NAEAC can reflect on practicality of this and whether to include it in the work plan moving forward.

C 3. NAEAC Strategic Plan 2024-2028 Draft 13:30

The document [74.23] was circulated prior to the meeting and taken as read. N Waran raised that NAEAC require a new strategic plan for the next 5-year period. The content was drafted by the Strategy SC, and they are calling for feedback and to approve the content. NAEAC need to ensure that the overarching vision is still fit-for-purpose. She shared that the SC wanted to align the strategy with the concept of social licence and shared that the design of diagram will be updated to a circular format.



National Animal Ethics Advisory Committee

It was acknowledged that there are similarities with the previous strategy, as there are certain functions within the Act that NAEAC must do. These elements have been carried over to the updated draft, and the SC have changed the wording to be more proactive. She shared that support for the wording was provided by the Secretariat to align with the Act, e.g., driving change versus promoting change.

The committee discussed the overarching aim, and that they alone cannot improve ethical use and welfare outcomes but work towards the intent of the aim by providing robust advice and recommendations. s9(2)(a) noted that in providing advice to the SC to inform this strategy, she also wanted to encourage NAEAC to think about how the strategy will in term influence the NAEAC workplan. She provided further suggested amendments including removing duplications. It was noted that there may need to be further amendments prior to meeting with the Minister.

It was suggested to define RTT in full as this is a stand-alone document. M King suggested not to focus only on the openness agreement, but rather refer to transparency initiatives in general so as not to be limited.

The committee requested to remove the Minister from the overarching aim, as NAEAC are not only focused on advising the Minister but also the Director-General and AECs. They discussed pulling in content regarding NAEAC robustly performing all functions as under the Act. It was suggested to include providing robust information, advice, and recommendations to which the committee agreed.

N Waran noted that once the wording is approved, this will provide the strategy to put to the new Minister but noting that there may be new direction at this stage.

N Waran confirmed that enhancing relationships with AEC's refers to NAEAC's relationships with AECs. It was suggested to clarify this by stating relationships with and between AECs.

NAEAC approved the content in principle.

C 4. Draft NAEAC 2023 Annual Report 14:00

The document [77.23] was circulated prior to the meeting and taken as read. N Waran noted that there is an intention to complete and publish the annual report earlier in the year, and that members should submit claims for outstanding fees by 31st January 2024. It was also noted that this annual report will go to the new Minister in early 2024 to inform on NAEAC's work programme.

The committee requested that information be included on work to update the CEC template, to be finalised early 2024, the large revision of the GPG, and engagement with



National Animal Ethics Advisory Committee

NZAVS. The committee discussed that moving forward, annual report activities can be structured under the updated strategic plan.

N Waran asked members to indicate which AEC's they have visited and what conferences they have attended in 2023.

Under the section on the 3Rs, the committee noted that they presented the 2022 3Rs Award and engaged with MPI to support the MPI-lead initiative on capturing 3Rs data in the Animal Use Statistics. Additionally, the presentation from ComPass which includes 3Rs related information. M King was asked to draft a paragraph on what NAEAC has achieved in this space.

Actions:

- Secretary to send an email remind members to provide required information for the Annual Report.
- M King to draft a paragraph of NAEAC's achievements to promote the 3Rs in 2023.

C 6. NAEAC Work Plan

The documents [75.23 and 76.23] were circulated prior to the meeting and taken as read. The committee reviewed the NAEAC workplan for 2023, in light of things NAEAC must do and things NAEAC wanted to do. The committee noted the below achievements:

- NAEAC have been active in communicating with AECs and completing AEC site visits. The committee suggested a survey in 2024 to capture AEC perspectives on the relationship they have with NAEAC.
- There was substantial work in 2023 on ensuring NAEAC documents are fit-for-purpose.
- The 3Rs Award was presented to the winner of the 2022 award cycle in early 2023.
- NAEAC provided feedback on Animal Use Statistics processes.
- Substantial work was done to promote a more uniform CEC review process, with the end product of the review process being a lot more robust now as a result.

It was acknowledged that NAEAC had addressed the actions identified as needing to be completed. It was noted that NAEAC decided not to pursue social media, and instead focus on their website.

The committee discussed that they would like to work further to strengthen this relationship with ANZCCART. s9(2)(a) noted that NAEAC can put forward a proposal to attend opportunities which fit within NAEAC's work plan, and that it would be worthwhile



National Animal Ethics Advisory Committee

to explore opportunities for sending a few NAEAC members to the ANZCCART conference to gather information and bring back to share with the full committee. The committee acknowledged that to be an informed advisory committee, it is important to have touch points with these important events to gather information and be informed of current advances. J Duckworth noted that she is based in Christchurch and is happy to attend the ANZCCART conference.

C 5. Animal welfare policy presentation

s9(2)(a) from MPI Animal Welfare Policy joined to give a presentation on animal welfare policy and the process for legislative change.

Key points of the presentation included:

- Confirming what NAEAC is interested in:
 - Legislative change process and the role of MPI Policy.
 - A discussion on zebrafish and the challenges in changing legislation.
 - How MPI Policy can support NAEAC.
- Not all involved in animal welfare at MPI are in the same business group.
- The animal welfare system is complex and includes the Minister, ministerial advisory committees, industry bodies, advocacy groups, PICA, vets, police, the public, and more.
- MPI Policy have responsibility for the Animal Welfare Act 1999, and they advise the Minister and MPI on change to legislation to ensure they are consistent with the Act. The systems need to be robust in order to defend changes.
- The primary influence of NAEAC is through Notices and Orders in Council.
- Considerations when making recommendations on legislative or regulatory change.
 - Identify the problem, cause, and desired outcome, e.g., why is the issue important and what is the appropriate way to make this change?
 - Clearly state why a legislative or regulatory change is needed, e.g., why is the status quo not sufficient? Why are non-regulatory options not suitable?
- MPI Policy are required to ask numerous questions and considerations when analysing an issue for making recommendations on legislative or regulatory change. Why?
 - When consultation is not done well, important questions and considerations may be missed.
 - Successfully completing the standard process of development, asking questions, and the consultation process are important to ensure that desired change stands the test of time.



National Animal Ethics Advisory Committee

- Considerations by Cabinet → legislative change proposals are required to go to Cabinet three times. The Ministers in the cabinet may be unfamiliar with the area and need clear information.
 - Importance of timing: difficult to push through multiple agendas at the same time.
- Process for making secondary legislative change begins with a recommendation, to which the Minister agrees with the principle and commissions work internally. Approval from Cabinet is needed for consultation, after which the recommendation is refined further and approval from Cabinet is secured to draft.
- Impact analysis for regulatory proposals provide background for the case that is being put up to Cabinet, e.g., status quo description, objectives, nature and scale of problem, feasible options, etc.
- MPI is responsible for developing secondary legislation, from initial proposal through to final stage.
- Zebrafish: including larval zebrafish in the Act would require a change to the definition of an animal in the Act, which constitutes an Act-level amendment (primary legislation). This has additional steps and considerations to secondary legislation.
 - Key consideration: there is a section in the Act that states that the Act doesn't consider animals in pre-larval stage.
- MPI Policy would need to consider numerous things when making a primary legislative change for zebrafish.
 - E.g., are there any unintended consequences? How would a change to the definition of animal affect other parties? What about other creatures that require inclusion? How will this affect RTT statistics? Do AEC's have capacity to handle a potentially large influx of applications? If not, how can we ensure they do? What is NAWAC's view on the issue? Government priorities?
- There are a number of steps when making changes to primary legislation, which may take a minimum of 18 months.

N Waran thanked s9(2)(a) for providing an overview of the complexities of animal welfare policy processes and opened the floor for questions and discussion.

s9(2)(g)(i)



National Animal Ethics Advisory Committee

s9(2)(g)(i)

RELEASED UNDER THE OFFICIAL INFORMATION ACT 1982



National Animal Ethics Advisory Committee

s9(2)(g)(i)

RELEASED UNDER THE OFFICIAL INFORMATION ACT 1982

N Waran called the committee to reflect upon the points raised. As no further business was noted, the meeting was closed at 3:15pm.