



## Minutes

Date Wednesday, 06/03/2019

Time 08.30am

To Committee Members

At Meeting Room, 1<sup>st</sup> Floor, [REDACTED]

Subject AWERB 3Rs Committee

### In Attendance:

[REDACTED]

### Apologies:

[REDACTED]

### Minutes

Approved.

### 2. Matters arising

The committee were asked how they would like to receive feedback from Retrospective Reviews which have passed through the committee. It was decided that an additional starred item will be added to the agenda for feedback and the option to put the final copy on the website was discussed.

### 3. Retrospective Reviews

#### (a) [REDACTED] – [REDACTED]

This licence was granted in January 2015 and a new one is being written to carry on the research.

- Under Protocol 4, the numbers did not add up
- A discussion regarding animal wastage took place and was referred to the next Named Persons Committee
- The committee advised that in Section 2.4, the recent unexpected death should be added to the table in 2.1
- More clarification could be provided about the types of checks that are performed and what the quality of checks mentioned in part 2 constitute of

#### (b) [REDACTED] – [REDACTED]

This licence was granted in May 2014.

- In Section 2.1, the numbers in Protocol 4, 5 and 6 do not add up. The total for Protocol 5 is at 98% of the allowance. The committee advised that if more work is planned under this protocol, the number of animals might need to be amended.
- The committee noted that the admirable work described in Section 3.1 could be considered a reduction rather than a replacement.
- The committee would like to know whether the list of mouse models are all represented in the numbers in Section 2.1



- In Section 4.8, the quoted paper [REDACTED], 2017, has the wrong title

(c) [REDACTED]  
[REDACTED] in 2015.

- In Section 2.1, the numbers do not add up
- The committee requested to know at what point the numbers of mice used under Protocol 2 were noticed to be higher and what monitoring was in place to try and prevent this from happening
- The committee would like to know why the paper mentioned in Section 3.1 has been so impactful only in the last two years, considering it was published in 2008
- In Section 3.7, the publications in which the refinements are published could be highlighted in Section 4.8

**4. Retrospective Assessments**

None

**5. Project Licence Applications**

None

**6. 3Rs information/reports**

Two issues of Tech 3Rs were circulated to the committee.

**7. Minutes of NPC meeting\***

**8. Minutes of AWERB Standing meeting\***

**9. Any Other Business**

None

**Date of next meeting:** Wednesday 3<sup>rd</sup> April 2019

\*Items for information only unless un-starred by committee member