



To [REDACTED]
From [REDACTED] Named Information and Compliance Support Officer
Date Thursday 7th December 2017
Time 14.00
Venue [REDACTED]
Subject [REDACTED] Mice left without food
Pages 4
Our Ref [REDACTED]

Policy-

Compliance Assurance Meetings (CAMs) are a management tool, designed to ensure Governance outside of the Act, to protect individuals, ensure due process and systems are implemented within the division of University Biomedical Services. This process will ensure the University upholds the highest standards of animal welfare and good practice relating to animal care and use.

NOTE: A CAM meeting does not replace the investigation of an incident by the Home Office or other authority. Therefore for example, where the local inspector deems appropriate a Home Office non-compliance investigation may run in parallel or sequentially with a CAM.

Event-

[REDACTED] (Facility Manager / NACWO) confirmed from discussions with [REDACTED] (PILh) of the [REDACTED], that on Monday 13th November one cage of 5 mice were anaesthetised for scarification and inoculation under study plan [REDACTED] (attached). On Tuesday 14th November one cage of 5 mice were split into two groups - two mice were to be used as control animals for the mice inoculated on the previous day and had no procedures conducted. These were the animals left without food.

The other three mice were left in the home cage.

An incorrect study plan reference ([REDACTED]) had been provided on the cage label which caused some confusion.

[REDACTED] highlighted a further discrepancy between the PPL authority and the study plan previously provided ([REDACTED]). [REDACTED] confirmed that he had previously (on probably 3 or 4 occasions) carried out inoculation 3 days post-scarification in 2015 (and also possibly early 2016).

[REDACTED] is reviewing his lab records to provide a full account of how many times he has used study plan [REDACTED]. His is also reviewing and updating all study plans and will discuss the simplification and potential amendment of the protocol with [REDACTED] (PPLh). [REDACTED] has been very open and communicative and is willing to provide any further information required.

[REDACTED] (Animal Technician) informed [REDACTED] that [REDACTED] was working in the [REDACTED] procedure area on this study during his Tuesday p.m. check. [REDACTED] confirms that he checked [REDACTED] mice on the rack and that they all had food and water at that time.

[REDACTED] (Animal Technician), at approximately 3pm when undertaking the first routine husbandry check for the day, found the cage was missing food on Wednesday 15th November. The

[REDACTED]



Compliance Assurance Meeting

animals were immediately health checked and given food. There were no signs of ill health upon examination by [REDACTED] and the Senior Technician [REDACTED]

These mice were athymic nude mice undergoing a papillomavirus infection experiment under protocol 3 of the [REDACTED] PPL [REDACTED]

Consideration has been given to possible non-compliance and therefore the incident was reported to the local inspector [REDACTED] by [REDACTED] on Monday 20th November.

A Compliance Assurance Meeting has been selected as the most appropriate means of action to ensure governance and compliance and, setting processes in place to impress there is no repetition of this event.

Study plans attached:



[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]



[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

Action-

The Establishment Licence Holder, [REDACTED] asked for clarification regarding the event as detailed in paragraph one overleaf. [REDACTED] (PILH) explained that 5 mice are held per cage as a maximum, he removed two nude mice from a cage of 5 leaving 3 in the home cage. These two mice were infected with wild type MusPV as a positive control, were scarified and left without food in error.

[REDACTED] (Facility Manager / NACWO) described systems which have since been put in place to prevent recurrence of animals being left without food, she has addressed the issue of am/pm checks and these have now been initiated. This change has been discussed with [REDACTED] (Welfare Director) and [REDACTED] (NVS) who have agreed the same person could do both checks following the introduction of revised procedures to address the risk balance to biosecurity of the facility regarding MCMV infecting other animals. [REDACTED] although confident of biosecurity measures now in place, intends to continue monitoring the situation. She intends instigating Direct Observational Procedures (DOPs) for scientists (these are currently being introduced for Animal Technicians throughout UBS) who need to split animals up into new cages and these would form part of each scientists facility induction. **Action 1**

[REDACTED] invited [REDACTED] (PILh) to describe the differences between the two Study Plans.

[REDACTED] began by apologising and explaining the food omission was a human error. He said he was confident the new steps [REDACTED] had put in place would prevent recurrence, and confirmed that he planned to avoid performing procedures after 3pm on Mondays to Thursday and would no longer undertake procedures on Fridays.

[REDACTED]



██████████ explained all experiments require scarification and inoculation and when optimising the experimental protocol these two procedures were initially performed on using different time interval, hence the difference between the Study Plans. This preliminary work confirmed the optimal protocol was scarification and inoculation on the same day. Since this means both procedures can be undertaken under the same anaesthetic, this finding be included as a refinement when this licence is retrospectively reviewed.

Since September 2015, 40 mice have been used according to Study Plan [REDACTED]. [REDACTED] suggested that either [REDACTED] could wait until clarification has been received from [REDACTED] or if [REDACTED] requires flexibility to scarify and inoculate on different days then he should amended protocol 3 step 10. [REDACTED] (PPLH) said he was preparing other amendments to his licence and would therefore amend the wording of step 10 of protocol 3. **Action 3**

██████████ sought clarification from ██████████ (NVS) that there were no welfare issues, ██████████ agreed that the checks had been performed in time to prevent this, the mice had water and were not dehydrated and they suffered no visible adverse effect of the actions. ██████████ was assured that the events were separate but that the absence of food was an oversight and genuine mistake.

Action 1 - Direct Observational Procedures (DOPs) for removing food and water will form part of facility induction. [REDACTED]

Action 2 - Section E Protocol 3 step 10 wording appears ambiguous, contact [REDACTED] (HOI) for advice. [REDACTED]

Action 3 - PPL amendment of section E to amend protocol-3 along with other amendments to this licence and progress through AWERB. [REDACTED] (PPLH).

CC of final report to [REDACTED] Home Office inspector

AA	A procedure performed without anaesthesia
AB	A procedure performed under anaesthesia, from which the animal recovers
AWERB	Animal Welfare and Ethical Review Body
CAM	Compliance Assurance Meeting
HOI	Home Office Inspector
NVS	Named Veterinary Surgeon
NACWO	Named Animal Care and Welfare Officer



**UNIVERSITY OF
CAMBRIDGE**

University Biomedical Services

Compliance Assurance Meeting

PIL	Personal Licence (Procedures Individual Licence)
PILh	Personal Licence (Procedures Individual Licence) holder
PPL	Project Licence (Procedures Project Licence)
SC	Standard Conditions (of either PIL or PPL)
UBS	University Biomedical Services

