

Hello Anne-Marie and Maggie,

Sorry to ask again, but we are still finding the below email a little unclear, are you able to help at all?

- 1) *For killing, physical performance of the IV euthanasia under supervision is appropriate and required until competency demonstrated (all after Module K and entry to register of persons competent to kill). This could be used as part of evidence of supervision / competence for IV injection with any further modifications relevant to recovery.*
- 2) *Q- Does the above sentence indicate that if AZ wanted to kill using IV route this is acceptable? I think you will find there is a divergence of view within UBS facilities about the use of CO2 as a means of euthanasia. Setting that aside and to answer your question the answer is a 'Yes'. We believe that some of the AZ -team are not comfortable to kill using any other method and we would ideally like them to use CO2 and cervical dislocation where possible. If they were to kill using this method, then this evidence could be used to support further IV training however this method is not to be used for the primary use of IV training? If the trainee is signed off to kill using the intravenous administration of an overdose of anaesthetic then this would count toward their competence to use the IV route as an administration route.*
- 3) *Non-animal methods would be expected first e.g. use of cadavers or model rigs.*
- 4) *Q- As above we would expect for them to first use cadavers for IV training If cadavers prove challenging because circulation has stopped they should use one of the simulation models that are available.*
- 5) *Sedation or anesthesia pre-schedule 1 can be used as part of the killing process without licence authority, providing administering it does not cause greater distress that killing without it (Schedule 1, part 3).*
- 6) *Q- This is not part of the killing process that we have ever adapted, and we are unsure on which occasions this may be relevant, are the vets aware of when this may be used? When the Act was amended in 2012 a change was made to Schedule 1. The text now reads:
3. (1) A requirement in Table A for the prior use of a sedative or anaesthetic:
(a) is subject to sub-paragraph (2) and
(b) is not to be read as prohibiting the prior use of sedative or anaesthetic in any cases where it is not required by that Table.
(2) Nothing in this Schedule require or permits the prior use of sedative or anaesthetic where the distress likely to be caused by administering it is greater than the distress likely to be caused by using the appropriate method of killing without sedative or anaesthetic.*
- 7) *But – if doing IV other than for killing, or using sedative where that causes greater distress than killing alone, this would require to be done under PPL authority with a PIL – usually this would be achieved using IVs which are already required as part of a program of work.*
- 8) *Q- for all IV training we would normally request for evidence of training on cadavers and then a competent person would assist with the training on an agreed program of work or study plan, Not sure what the question is. If you are training using cadavers this is acceptable as covered in point 3) above*
- 9) *Moving from an unsuccessful killing method / attempt to another to safeguard animals is appropriate and could be termed an emergency procedure and may not be regulated.*
- 10) *Q- We were a little unsure of what the above meant, are you able to help at all? This means that if the IV administration of the overdose of anaesthetic is incomplete and the animal is not rendered dead then another method Schedule 1 method could be used (e.g. cervical dislocation) to ensure the animal is promptly killed.*

Please see below the paragraph requested from Matt Clayton- AZ lead requesting a process for IV training. On reading the above advice from HOL, I cannot see where this would be authorised, are you able to help with our interpretation please so that I do not advise AZ incorrectly?