

Minu	tes
------	-----

Date	Wednesday, 26/08/2020
Time	1pm
То	Standing Committee
At	
Subject	AWERB Standing Committee
Our Ref	Doc.UBS.AWERB.26.08.20
In att	tendance:
Scier	ntists in attendance for 1a) 1b) 1b) and 1c)
Apol	ogies:
1. Pr	oject Licences
	ew licence:
The o	committee discussed the following:

- Suggest further information about the attrition rate of the different organs and why and who determines organs are not suitable for transplantation.
- The inclusion of a comment about the demand for transplants in relation to the total UK population
- Including more detail in the Action plan box as suggested by the committee which expands on why you require this species and how you run *in vitro* and rodent studies in parallel to improved data resilience and how you have determined your animal numbers
- Review the Benefits section were the language used purveyed a sense of certainly about success
- Summarise more clearly likely animal experience in the Protocol Animal experience section
- Suggested use of the Protocol justification boxes in the protocol section to provide an explanation why animals of the weight and age intended for use, are the most appropriate model.

The committee agreed changes were needed before a draft was submitted to the Home Office.

(b) New licence:

was also in attendance)

The committee discussed the following:

- Further consideration to be given to the title of the application and the committee made suggestions
- Suggested including information in the background to the application regarding the failure of some drugs that have reached human clinical trials
- Recommend including more information about the drugs that might be tested, in particularly in Objective 7.
- Recommend providing more information regarding the source of the animals.



- Suggested the addition of an explanation in the Action Plan on how the objectives help to achieve the aim together with an explanation about achieving sustainable drug levels.
- It was noted that numbers in the Protocol summary table were incorrect and the committee was concerned that changes introduced by the primary establishment may be made to the application that they have no opportunity to consider.
- Recommend in the last paragraph of Protocol 1 step 2, an explanation be provided regarding tumours with lesions that will be injected and which will result in the killing of effected animals be clarified to ensure this is included in all protocols where tumour lesions are mentioned.
- Recommendation that in the Protocol justification section include the historic data that is available and give more information regarding the risk of urinary retention.
- Clarify the comment regarding single housing of animals Protocol 2.
- Noted concerns about some of the endpoints and the use of the Mouse Grimace Scale.
- Protocol 6 there is a need to align the humane endpoints with the assigned protocol severity category.
- Clarification in the application regarding re-use of needles.
- Expand the information provided regarding the animals being given a 'holiday'.
- Recommend revision of the Project Harms section.
- Recommendation to undertake PIL and PPL refresher training before this licence is required.
- Recommend a number of technical amendments to the majority of Protocols.

The committee agreed changes were needed before a draft was submitted to the Home Office.

(c) New licence:

was also in attendance)

The committee discussed the following:

- Recommend the funding section be updated if a further grant is secured before submission.
- Recommended that the severity may be amended to mild but to be guided by the inspector.
- Recommendation of inclusion of a statement in the box about the monitoring of the sheep.
- Recommendation to change the humane endpoint Body Condition Score to 2.
- Review and consider providing more information about how group sizes are determined and suggested including the level of detail provided to the **section** in the relevant box/es in this section.

The committee agreed changes were needed before a draft was submitted to the Home Office.

2. Retrospective Assessment

(a)

The committees recommend you consider addressing the following points please:

- Part A: The title of the licence on the RA document, PPL submission date of the 17/06/2020, is subtly different from that on the licence. The title should be identical and the box expanded so the full title is visible.
- Part B: Consider making sure that where technical words or concepts are necessary that an explanation is provided in a way that a lay reader can understand.
- Part B: Describe to what extent the programme of work has been carried out bearing in mind lay readers will not know what your objectives were.



- Part B: Describe if and to what extent, the objectives of this work have been achieved: The information provided is excellent, but a little too technical for the lay reader.
- Recommend explaining what action may have been taken to reduce any potential animal waste from the animals used, since this work is not to be progressed to completion.
- Part B: Describe the actual harms that have been caused to the animals.
- Part B: Describe what lessons, if any have been learned that contribute to the 3Rs.
- Recommend some short communications or methods and technique refinement papers would be worthwhile and might be a way to disseminate some of the excellent work that has been completed under this licence.

3. Minutes of last meeting 29/07/20

The minutes were not available.

4. Minutes of the AWERB sub-standing committee 10/07/20 and 07/08/20

10/07/20 – The minutes were noted. 07/08/20 – The minutes were not available.

5. Minutes of the AWERB 3Rs Committee 05/08/20

The minutes were not available.

6. Matters arising from the minutes and AOB

Non-Regulated Procedure Requests

The committee noted response regarding AWERB comments -

To note: New ARRIVE guidelines have been published

7. List items of note

None

Date of next meeting: 23/09/20