

Animal Welfare and Ethical Review Body (AWERB)

18/01 A meeting of the Animal Welfare and Ethical Review Body (AWERB) was held in Committee Room 2, Whiteknights House on Thursday 8 February 2018 at 10.00 am.

Present:

[Redacted. Sec.4(]

[Redacted. Sec.4(]

[Redacted. Sec.4(]

[Redacted. Sec.4(]

[Redacted. Sec.4(]

[Redacted. Sec.4(]

[Redacted. Sec.4(]

[Redacted. Sec.4(]

[Redacted. Sec.4(]

[Redacted. Sec.4(]

[Redacted. Sec.4(]

[Redacted. Sec.4(]

[Redacted. Sec.4(]

[Redacted. Sec.4(]

[Redacted. Sec.4(]

In attendance:

[Redacted. Sec.4(]

[Redacted. Sec.40] was welcomed to the meeting.

18/02 Minutes of the last meeting

The minutes of the last meeting held on 13 October 2017 were approved.

18/03 Matters Arising

17/21 17/13 17/03 Communications informed by feedback from the UAR visit
AWERB had previously ^Å
compete for and win an Openness Award from Understanding Animal
Research (UAR) in support of wider commitments on transparency towards
animal research.

AWERB now received a paper, prepared by [Redacted. Sec.40] outlining the
scope of the existing Openness Awards and recommending the actions
required in the coming months to enable the University to submit
competitive entries in future.

It was suggested that with the construction of the new Health and Life
Sciences building, and planned relocation of the Bioresources Unit to new
facilities over the coming few years, there would be opportunities to
undertake innovative communications activities - such as more media
visits, 3D imaging, live videos, public tours etc. In the meantime the
University should encourage innovative engagement and communication
projects - ^Å
facilities to demonstrate openness about animal research. Specifically the
following recommendations were proposed:

1. Reading entry for 2018: Animal Research website
 - x That AWERB encourages plans to improve the Animal Research section of the University website, taking account of best practice, and continues to innovate in line with planned improvements to the Research section over the next year.
 - x This would include, for example: greater transparency on statistics; explanations about specific projects, including relevant papers, lay summaries, videos and photographs; reports and explanations of AWERB activity; and better explanations of severity and harm, including with images.
 - x This could be undertaken without requirement of any additional funding beyond that which is already set aside for website improvements.
2. Reading entry for 2019: staff and student engagement project
 - x That AWERB encourages a project to engage University of Reading staff and students who are not usually involved with animal research involving animals.
 - x This would be organised with the combined expertise of research staff, events team, communications, and the ^Å - ^Å ver one day or a series of days, during the 2018-19 academic year.
 - x Timing could be co-ordinated with existing festivals or events, such as AHRC Being Human festival (in November 2018) or British Science Week (March 2019).
 - x Activities might include public debates over ethics; showcases of Reading research involving animals; tours of

farm or BRU facilities; coordination of communications on staff and student websites and via social media.

- x This would ensure that most Reading staff are unaware to the types of animal research undertaken by the University.
- x This was likely to require specific additional funding, likely from Research Endowment Trust Fund or University Strategic Fund.

To encourage individual participation from 2019 and beyond

- x That AWERB encourages all staff involved with animal research to submit proposals, via the University Research Committee, for funding to support public engagement activities to promote openness in research - including animal research.
- x This could include work to highlight and promote 3Rs, public visits, school engagement, media etc.
- x This could be managed with existing REF funding assessments, made via the REF and support of relevant REF panels.
- x This could be encouraged with the creation of new category within the existing Research Engagement and Impact Awards, specifically for any public engagement activities by Reading staff that encourage openness on animal research, research ethics, open data etc.
- x This was likely to lead to funding implications, both for activities and to support the research engagement awards, and would therefore require support of University Research Committee.

AWERB was supportive of the approach outlined, for its part, but noted that recommendations 2 and 3 would require discussion elsewhere.

17/21 17/13 1703 Severity Data

It was agreed that data on client numbers should also be included in the data published along with a clear explanation of what was included.

Action: [Redacted. Sec.40]

17/21 17/13 1703 Poultry Gun

It was reported that use of a poultry gun did not need to be included on the institutions licence but could be added on project licences if required in the future.

17/21 17/11 17/09 Work undertaken on non-APSA projects
AWERB received and noted a tabled paper on animals held not under the authority of A(SP)A.

It was reported that the responsibilities of the < 3 F E B D U F and 4 H E D >, interests of the < 3 F E B D U F Extended to the care and welfare of those animals held at licenced establishments, but not under the authority of the Act.

Whilst no concerns had been expressed concerning the welfare of these animals AWERB had requested further information to ensure that responsibilities were being met.

AWERB noted the number of animals held/used by species, the purpose for which these animals were held, their locations, the staff who were responsible for these animals care, and forecast 17.11 0 caties, J3gTnder9

In regard to the specific reviews it was noted that:

[Redacted. Sec40] .

- x [Redacted. Sec.43].
- x [Redacted. Sec.43]
- x [Redacted. Sec40] anticipated to use less animals than the 500 quoted.
- x AWERB was content with the submission. It was expected that if the photon microscopy facility was not purchased that there would be a reduction in the number of animals used.

[Redacted. Sec40] .

- x [Redacted. Sec40] had taken on the licence from [Redacted. Sec40].
- x The review suggested that more animals would be used than

Ä

Ä

animals (the pro-forma would be updated to be made clearer). It was noted that the project was likely to exceed the number of animals estimated in the licence for cows, but would not for other species. An amendment to the project licence would be sought for changes to the number of cows.

- x The llama work had proved successful with external sponsors to the extent that additional llamas had been purchased; the University now had 12 llamas, several of which were rescue animals. The University had worked closely with the Llama Society when it purchased the animals. It was noted that there was a limit of three procedures per year per animal.
- x Procedures had been limited as far possible. Lessons had been learnt in regard to refining procedures.
- x It was important to remember the environment that animals were being kept in including housing, husbandry, and farm management, as the vast majority of the time the animals were not involved in any studies.

18/07 Communications

The following communications were received and noted:

- a) Home Office (ASRU Operational Newsletter 5)
- b) Home Office (ELH Newsletter December 2017)
- c) RSPCA October 2017 Newsletter

18/08 Any other business

It was noted that fish tanks had now been installed in the BRU for Zebra Fish. AWERB agreed that the Establishment Licence would need to be amended accordingly and that the number of fish used should be reported. There was some discussion in regard to the fact that the use of fish would not contribute to a reduction or refinement, but that they were classed as a lower sentient animal.

18/09 Dates of meetings in the Session 2017-18

