

THE UNIVERSITY OF MANCHESTER
ANIMAL WELFARE AND ETHICAL REVIEW BODY

Tuesday, 6th June 2017

Present:

By invitation

Apologies:

In attendance:

1. Minutes

Confirmed: The minutes of the meeting held on 11th April 2017, subject to minor amendments

2. Matters arising

2.1 *Advanced Education in Pharmacology*

Reported: That the revisions requested by AWERB have been accepted and project had been approved.

2.2 *Glucocorticoids & Stress in the Development of Diabetes & Obesity*

Reported: That the revisions requested by AWERB have been accepted and project had been approved.

2.3 *New Therapeutic Approaches for Inflammatory Disorders*

Reported: That the revisions requested by AWERB have been accepted and project had been approved.

2.4 *Gene Function in Cardiovascular Disease*

Reported: That the revisions requested by AWERB have been accepted and project had been approved.

3. NW region AWERB hub

- (1) The Chair reported that the first meeting of the regional hub would be held shortly.
- (2) It was agreed that NC3Rs regional programme manager would work on 3Rs issues, such as the use of analgesics.

4. Report from CRUK MI AWERB

The Chair of CRUK MI AWERB summarized its work and approach to its tasks:

- All projects related to cancer studies.
- All projects at CRUK MI were with mice.
- It aimed to be an inclusive body.
- All project licensees came to meet the committee.
- The philosophy was to encourage rather than hinder research.
- Retrospective reviews were conducted in an open forum.
- AWERB followed an annual plan.
- A 3Rs network and a monthly seminar series was organized.

There was also a report on the Paterson Building fire:

- All animals were safely removed and transferred to the Stopford Building. No animal died or appeared to be harmed as a direct result of the fire and re-location, although a small number of animals which were anaesthetized in preparation for a procedure had to be culled. The BSF Director and his colleagues were thanked for facilitating the transfer.
- CRUKMI were considering re-locating some work to Alderley Park.

The Director reported that the fire had caused the Stopford BSF team to review their own contingency plans.

5. Report on licences processed 25.01.16 to 17.03.17

Reported: (a) That the following amendments to project licences had been approved by the executive group:

70/8504	<i>Pregnancy complications: targeted interventions.</i>
70/7873	<i>Embryo development and implantation.</i>
70/8686	<i>Models of tissue repair, reconstruction and regeneration of the limb.</i>
70/8558	<i>Circadian control of behaviour and metabolism.</i>

(b) Amendments to 70/8858, *Generation, breeding and maintenance of genetically altered animals:*

To produce a DENDRA2-COL 1A2 mouse using CRIPR.
To produce a Flx 11 Flx BIN1 (ex11BIN) mouse using CRSPR.

(c) Amendments to 40/3619, *Creation, breeding and maintenance of genetically altered rodents:*

To produce a C57Bl/6 MC1R^{V60L} mouse using CRISPR.

(d) Applications for secondary availability for new or current project licences

PPL P26605 Generation and breeding of genetically altered rodents (Primary at CRUK MI)

(d) That for Personal Licences there were 12 new licences, 1 amendment, 100 surrendered and 0 renewed.

6. Applications for new Research Project Licences

6.1 *Cell Therapy for Diseases of Striated Muscle*

Considered: A completed AWERB1 form, with written comments by the NVS, NACWO and NTCO, and NTS.

Interviewed: The applicant

Noted: That the following revisions were necessary:

- (1) Revising the statistics section of Protocol 3 (page 9 of the application). It was not clear from the form what this referred to but you explained that the calculations might change as different treatment conditions were tested. It was suggested that you add an assurance that a statistician would be consulted before each different treatment condition was tested.
- (2) You explained verbally how the muscles were injected and it would be helpful to add this to the AWERB1 form
- (3) Paragraph 2 of the Aims and Objectives section of the Non-Technical Summary could be simplified and one member offered to assist with this.

Resolved: To recommend approval, subject to the above concerns being addressed to the satisfaction of the Chairman.

6.2 *Maintenance of Barrier Immunity in Health & Disease*

Considered: A completed AWERB1 form, with written comments by the NVS, NACWO and NTCO, and NTS.

Interviewed: The applicant

- Noted:*
- (1) That it was explained that the animals which were subject to procedures in the moderate band were regularly monitored for weight loss, behaviour and feeding habits and, in the researcher's experience, no animal had gone beyond the moderate band or showed signs of respiratory distress. It was also noted that there was a commendable explanation of the reduction in the number of animals needed compared with the previous licence.
 - (2) That revision or clarification was needed in the following sections of the application:

(a) In the protocols that refer to neonates it should be made clear that their use was optional.

(b) The Home Office guidelines for the Non-Technical Summary (NTS) states that it should be limited to 1,000 words and the draft clearly exceeded this. Two members of AWERB agreed that they would be happy to meet or correspond with you to work through a revised NTS.

Resolved: To recommend approval, subject to the concerns specified in (2) above being addressed to the satisfaction of the Chairman and the two reviewers.

6.3 *The role of inflammation in cerebrovascular disease.*

Considered: A completed AWERB1 form, with written comments by the NVS, NACWO and NTCO, and NTS.

Interviewed: The applicant

Noted: (1) That guidelines and indicators were used to limit the number of animals that reached the severe category and that these guidelines had been published. It was also explained that the team was experienced in recognising at an early stage those animals which were likely to suffer more and that the applicant estimated that less than 5% of animals reached the severe band.

(2) That a short clarification was needed in the Non-Technical Summary (NTS) which stated, "None of these tests are harmful to the animals..." While this may be true it might be difficult in what will become a public document to understand this in the context of the procedures described earlier in the paragraph. One member offered to liaise with the applicant on this section

Resolved: To recommend approval, subject to the concerns specified in (2) above being addressed to the satisfaction of the Chairman and the NTS reviewer.

6. Application for Category B approval

Revision total hip arthroplasty implant removal testing

Received: A response to the committee's request for further information.

Interviewed The applicant

Noted: That most of the questions posed by AWERB were answered, but concern was expressed about the conditions under which the animals were to be penned. The welfare standards clearly did not meet those which would be expected in the UK by the University. The pigs, post-operatively, were to be kept in outdoor pens, which increased the risk of infection, and the surface of the pens was a rough concrete; even with straw added it was felt

that this would inhibit the recovery of the animals and might induce further injury.

Agreed:

That AWERB could not support the application and that the applicant could not, as a member of the University, conduct the research or contribute to any publication in the name of the University under the conditions set out in the Category B application. To do so would be a breach of the University's Policy on the Use of Animals in Research, and may constitute research misconduct.

Nevertheless, AWERB recognised the importance of the research itself and would encourage the applicant to seek other means of undertaking this and in ways which met the University's expectations on animal welfare. In this respect the Director of the BSF offered to show the applicant arrangements which the University made for the care and welfare of farm animals which were subject to scientific procedures.