



## Minutes

**Date** Wednesday, 24/02/2021

**Time** 1pm

**To** Standing Committee

**At** Virtual MS Teams, UBS

**Subject** AWERB Standing Committee

**Our Ref** Doc.UBS.AWERB.24.02.21

**In attendance:** [REDACTED]

Observers: [REDACTED]

Minutes: [REDACTED]

**Scientists in attendance for 1a)** [REDACTED], **1b)** [REDACTED] **& 1c)** [REDACTED]  
**1d)** [REDACTED]

**Apologies:**

**1. Project Licences**

**(a) New licence:** [REDACTED]

The committee discussed the following:

- Further information around the Researcher's preferred method of skin swabbing included in the Project Harms section.
- Further information included in the Reduction section around how data and tissue sharing contribute to reducing animal numbers.
- Further information around the species intended for use and the reasons behind this decision included in the Project Plan: Scientific Background section.
- Further explanation around what will be compared; animal numbers and what conditions and replications will be used in the Protocol: Experimental design sections.
- The committee recommended that the applicant includes one or two examples to illustrate typical experiments in the Protocol: Experimental design sections.
- Further context around the maximum age the fish will be kept to and whether this will have an impact on their health and welfare.
- The committee recommended a comment is added regarding why and the impact on data if older animals are needed in the Protocol: Protocol Justification section.
- Further clarification required in regards to skin swabbing included in the Protocol: Protocol Justification section.
- Further clarification required in regards to specific fins that may be clipped for genotyping purposes if this procedure is used.
- The addition of anaesthetic codes for the genotypic procedures.
- The removal of specific references from the protocols.



- Further information included in the Keeping Animals Alive box around minimum and maximum ages in regards to specific procedures planned.

The committee agreed changes were needed before a draft application is submitted to the Home Office

**(b) New Licence:** [REDACTED]

The committee discussed the following:

- The removal of technical words and references in the Non-Technical Summary.
- The committee recommended the applicant acknowledge the tension that exists between publication limitations and intellectual property and that inclusion of an indication of how this might be addressed should be added in the Benefits section of the Non-Technical Summary.
- Further revision required in the Benefits section of the Non-Technical Summary around the claimed benefits to society.
- Further information around why mice are the most appropriate species for the research in the Project Harms section of the Non-Technical Summary.
- Further information around the likely harms in regards to specific procedures planned in the Project Harms section of the Non-Technical Summary.
- Further clarity required in regards to the typical animal experience in the Project Harms section of the Non-Technical Summary.
- The recommendation that the information included in the applicants presentation be included in the Reduction and Replacement section of the Non-Technical Summary.
- The potential to add tissue sharing to the Reduction and Replacement section of the Non-Technical Summary.
- The recommendation that the applicant re-reads the Project Plan: Scientific background section to ensure that the information provided is clear and unambiguous.
- The committee recommended the researcher completes a validation study in regards to specific procedures planned and the use of anaesthesia and that these experiments are included in the application.
- Specific references in the Refinement section of the Non-Technical Summary should be removed.
- Further clarity needed in regards to humane endpoints for specific procedures planned.
- Revision of the flow diagrams included in the Project Plan: Action Plan in regards to the movement of animals and the use of diet.
- The committee recommended the researcher reviews the animal strains mentioned to ensure they are the most appropriate and the humane endpoints for expected adverse effects where appropriate.
- Further information to include description of longer experiments and the likely duration included in the Protocol: Animal Experience box where appropriate.
- The inclusion of the scientific rationale in regards to specific experiments planned for two of the protocols which should be included in the Protocols: Protocol justification section.
- Further justification around why and how tumour cells are used in the Protocols: Protocol justification sections.

The committee agreed changes needed to be made before a draft application is submitted to the Home Office

**(c) New Licence:** [REDACTED]

The committee discussed the following:

- Further revision of the Non-Technical Summary required to ensure it is understandable to a lay reader.



- Further clarity around the cumulative impact the procedures will have on the animals included in the Non-Technical Summary.
- Further clarity required in regards to specific procedures planned in the Protocol justification sections of the relevant protocols.
- Further information in regards to imaging included in the Protocol justification sections of the relevant protocols.
- Further information and clarity required around humane endpoints and the scoring systems provided in the Protocol step and Animal experience sections of all the protocols.
- Further information around potential refinements included in the Protocol Justification refinement sections.
- Further clarity required in regards to experiments undertaken for translational purposes.
- Further clarity required in regards to specific studies planned.
- The committee recommended the applicant familiarises themselves with the NC3Rs mouse aggression work and considers adopting some of their recommendations.
- The recommendation that the refinements included in the applicant's presentation be included in the Refinement section of the Non-Technical Summary in the application.
- Further information around specific adverse effects and the impact on the validity of the data.
- Further clarification in regards to volumes administered.

The committee agreed changes needed to be made before a draft application is submitted to the Home Office

**(d) New Licence:** [REDACTED]

The committee discussed the following:

- Further detail required in the Protocols: Experimental design and Protocol Justification sections in regards to specific procedures and the approaches planned.
- The recommendation that the applicant reviews the Non-Technical Summary to ensure that it is understandable to a lay reader.
- Further detail around the typical experience of animals included in the Non-Technical Summary.
- The recommendation that information around funding and grant applications that was included in the applicant's presentation be included in the application itself.
- The recommendation that the applicant inserts a diagram to show how their protocols will be used in the Project plan: Action Plan section.
- The removal of specific references to consulting the NVS in the protocols.
- Further clarity required around specific adverse effects in protocols where appropriate.

The committee agreed minor changes needed to be made before a draft application is submitted to the Home Office

## **2. Retrospective Reviews**

(a) None

## **3. Minutes of last meeting 15/01/21**

The minutes were noted

## **4. Matters arising from the minutes and AOB**

(a) Bird use report: [REDACTED]



The committee reviewed the information provided in both the report and graphs and determined that the use of birds as recorded would not affect their welfare. The committee were reassured by the care and attention being taken when using these birds and requested that the researcher continues to collect the same data. The committee requested the researcher submits the full 6 month dataset (mid-October 2020 to mid-April 2021) in time for the AWERB meeting on the 26<sup>th</sup> May 2021. The committee requested the researcher reflects on whether they think or can assess whether using only certain birds repeatedly has any impact on the scientific validity on the data they are collecting.

(b) Overseas research request: [REDACTED]

The AWERB committee reviewed the Overseas Research request and had several questions for the researcher that needed answering before they felt the University name could be associated with this work. The committee also requested that several members of the committee undertake a virtual tour of the facility and asked the researcher to organise this. Once answers to the committee questions have been provided, the committee agreed this request could be considered again, at the AWERB meeting at the end of March or April. This would give the researcher time to organise a virtual tour of the facility.

(b) Non-Regulated Procedure request: [REDACTED]

The AWERB committee discussed the Non-Regulated Procedure request and were impressed with the obvious care and attention taken when preparing this request. The committee had no concerns but suggested that careful records of the number of animals bred and used are kept. They also requested that the researcher keep records of when they are able to supply other non-regulated requests. The committee requested that they review this information in twelve months' time. The AWERB chair signed this request.

## 5. List items of note

None

**Date of next meeting:** 24/03/21