

THE UNIVERSITY OF LEEDS

**ANIMAL WELFARE AND ETHICAL REVIEW COMMITTEE**

Minutes  
21 March 2017

**Present:** 8 members were present at the meeting with 1 person in attendance.

**Apologies:** Apologies were received from 8 members.

In the unavoidable absence of the Chair the meeting was chaired by the PEL holder (for general business) and then by the NVS (for consideration of licence applications and reviews).

**Minutes**

16/86 The minutes of the meeting on 27 January 2017 were received and approved.

**Matters arising**

*Received AWERC16/16*

16/87 The update on actions was received for information.

**Establishment Licence (PEL) holder's update**

16/88 The PEL holder reported that one condition 18 report had been submitted to the Home Office (HO) since the last meeting to report that one mouse on a preliminary dose finding study had died while being given a drug by intravenous injection. Only one mouse had been used for the study. A similar drug when used previously by intra-peritoneal route did not result in death. Arrangements had been made to refine the procedure and check for adverse effects. This had been reported to the HO and the inspector was satisfied with the report and the action taken.

16/89 The Facility had been authorised for use and added to the Schedule of Premises.

**NVS's update**

16/90 The NVS advised that there had been no HO inspections since the last meeting but that he had been in regular contact with the HO inspector. One pig (out of six on a study) had developed unexpected complications, three weeks after surgery, which could not be treated under the project licence authorities. Because of this the animal had to be humanely killed. Some work involving rats under a severe protocol was being closely monitored but this presented no undue concerns.

**NACWOs' Report**

16/91 Since the last inspection in January when feedback from the inspector had been positive there had been no animal welfare issues to report.

16/92 The Manger reported that estates and refurbishment work, planned on both sites, would require careful management to minimise potential impact to animals. He would continue to liaise with the Estates and building staff concerned to ensure that animal welfare could be taken into account at all stages.

16/93 With regard to the authorisation of the the Committee was told that two rooms would be authorised for overnight holding for small numbers of animals for defined periods in relation to need. The use of these rooms would be controlled by standard operating procedures (SoPs). The unit manager reported that SoPs were being written in consultation with the NACWO responsible, the NVS and the academic lead for the facility.

16/94 The integrated management software system was due to be penetration tested with a

report due in early April. Master data for input was already being prepared outside the system and the project plan was still on target to begin the roll-out during the summer.

### **Annual Statistical Report**

*(Received paper AWERC/16/17)*

- 16/95 The Committee was asked to note the slight drop in animal use at the University during 2016. The NVS explained that this reflected better use of animals, cryogenic preservation of GA lines and improved breeding strategies adopted by the animal care and research staff. However, the trend was likely to rise again in 2017 due to recent appointments which were already being reflected in the increase in both personal and project licences held at the University. It was suggested that funding could also be a contributor.
- 16/96 It was noted that the proportion of species used at the University reflected the national position.

### **Schedule of Business**

*(Received AWERC/16/18)*

- 16/97 The updated Schedule of Business was received for information. Members were reminded to think about potential additional members for the meeting in July. Any suggestions should be sent to the administrator. **ACTION: All.**

### **ASC, AWERB hubs and AWERB-UK**

*(Received AWERC/16/19)*

- 16/98 The Committee received a paper, for information, produced to provide an explanation of the relationship between the Animals in Science Committee (ASC), Animal Welfare and Ethical Review Body (AWERB) hubs and the organisation AWERB-UK. This had arisen from concerns that proliferation of these groups had caused some confusion amongst stakeholders. At the last meeting of the AWERB-UK organisers (representatives of stakeholder organisations) the importance of not duplicating effort had been stressed along with the need to ensure that any future meetings should fulfil a defined requirement or need along with clear objectives.

### **Other Business**

- 16/99 The NVS told the Committee of an application to transfer primary availability on an existing project licence to the University. The change of availability would be submitted without further amendment to the licence. The short lay paragraph for the licence, which consisted of four protocols (2 mild, and 2 non-recovery), would be circulated to the Committee for information and comment. **Action: Administrator.**
- 16/100 Having been notified of the potential imminent change of HO inspector the NVS and administrator had raised the University's concerns about this, informally, with the HO Animals in Science Research Unit (ASRU) Chief Inspector. After giving the matter due consideration and consulting with colleagues, the ASRU Chief Inspector had confirmed that there would be no immediate change of inspector assigned to the University. The Committee welcomed this decision.

### **Date of next meeting**

- 16/101 The next meeting would be held from 1030 to 1200 on Thursday 11 May.

The PEL holder handed over to the NVS to chair the remainder of the meeting.

### **PPL amendments and reviews**

- 16/102 No amendments had been submitted since the last meeting.

**PPL reviews**

**S5B20**

- 16/103 The Committee was told that the licence was subject to a formal retrospective assessment under Section 5B due to having one severe protocol. The licensee was welcomed to the committee and introduced to members.
- 16/104 The licence holder delivered a short presentation to the Committee. This demonstrated the need for the project and explained both current and potential future work that would be done under the licence. Despite the fact that only a small number of animals had been used so far it was clear that, due to the application of early humane endpoints, the licensee had been able to reduce animal suffering to a mostly mild level even for animals being used under the severe protocol.
- 16/105 Following this a number of matters were discussed including severity of protocols; attention to animal welfare that had led to the provision of additional bedding for animals under the severe protocol; the current focus of the work; and the potential for diversification of research into other related diseases.
- 16/106 A report would be submitted to the Home Office along with the amended non-technical summary.

**MR13**

- 16/107 The NVS provided some background for the work which involved two species on two protocols involving alteration of diet and the taking of blood samples. The Committee was satisfied with the review and no concerns were raised.

**MR21**

- 16/108 The licensee was welcomed to the meeting and introduced to members. The applicant reported that due to considerable variability in the phenotype the work had been moving more towards cell-based research in structural biology which had been proving to be more reliable than the animal models. More simple systems were also being considered for undertaking the work, such as the worm *C. elegans*.
- 16/109 This move away from animal models was acknowledged and commended as a clear example of replacement. It was recommended that the licensee should contact the NC3Rs to make them aware of this for the possibility of wider publicity for and application of the work. The licensee was encouraged to explore the possibility of future NC3Rs funding, if available, to develop alternative model systems for disease states for rare recessive gene conditions.

**PPL applications**

16/110 **A332**

- 16/111 The NVS provided some background to the application and explained that this was one of a number of licence applications being submitted to split the work of a large research group between different licences and PPL holders. This approach had been agreed with the HO inspector who had recently met with the research group to discuss the proposals.
- 16/112 Matters discussed included standard GA protocols, severity limits for the protocols and the number of animals requested. The applicant would be asked to review the moderate protocol and specify the percentage of animals that were likely to be affected. In addition to this a number of minor changes were suggested that would be passed on to the applicant.
- 16/113 Subject to changes being made to the satisfaction of the NVS the Committee agreed that the application should be submitted to the HO.

**A333**

- 16/114 The Committee was told that the applicant had been working under a previous PPL held by a colleague but this was their first application to hold a PPL.
- 16/115 The Committee discussed some of the methods in the application and a member agreed to discuss these with the applicant. **ACTION: PPL holder.**
- 16/116 The severity of protocols, statistical methods and number of animals were discussed and also whether some of the work would require a pilot study. It was agreed that some suggestions for additional information and changes would be conveyed to the applicant.
- 16/117 Subject to changes being made to the satisfaction of the NVS the Committee agreed that the application should be submitted to the HO.