

**ANIMAL WELFARE AND ETHICAL REVIEW BODY**

**Minutes of the meeting held on 26 May 2022**

Present:

[REDACTED]

Apologies:

[REDACTED]

In attendance:

[REDACTED]

**1. Minutes**

*Agreed:* That the minutes of the meeting held on 28 April 2022 were approved.

**2. Retrospective Assessments of Project Licences requiring full committee review**

**2.1. [REDACTED], PKC $\alpha$  and vascular calcification in kidney dysfunction**

*Considered:* A completed Retrospective Assessment form

*Interviewed:* [REDACTED]

*Discussed:*

- The committee were pleased to see the reduction in animal usage due to the new imaging methods.

- The committee ask that you include details of the change in the timing of the experiment in the publication discussed so that other people in this field become aware of this refinement.
- The committee ask that the Post-Doctoral Research Associate carrying out the surgeries receives refresher training when she returns from maternity leave to ensure that she is as highly competent in her work as you described during the meeting. The committee would ask this of anyone having a long break from performing surgeries.

*Revisions:* None

*Outcome:* Approval for submission to ASRU after PEL review and endorsement.

### 3. Applications for New Project Licences

#### 3.1. [REDACTED], Treatment of Short & Long Term Outcomes of Viral Lung Infection

*Considered:* A completed AWERB form, PPL application, and minutes from Local Management Committee Meeting

*Interviewed:* [REDACTED]

- Discussed:*
- The use of the scoring system was discussed and the benefits it has in taking away ambiguity when assessing animal health.
  - The benefits of tissue sharing and that other groups do share tissue where possible.
  - The strain of *Streptococcus pneumoniae* used (D39) was discussed.

- Revisions:*
- It was noted that the option for re-use had been left ticked; this has been corrected by [REDACTED] within ASPeL.
  - Please include the scoring sheet you showed during your presentation in the application if not already present. The committee note that images sometimes do not download correctly from the Home Office system so this may already be part of your application.
  - Reference to the LASA guidelines for ip injections should be removed and replaced with reference to the Joint Working Group on Refinement.
  - Page 13 – Please reword the sentence “Even without an infection, infection is one of the leading causes of death globally”.
  - Page 18 – Please expand on the answer for “Why will you use animals of a single sex in some protocols or experiments?” Can measures not be taken to ensure that there is a roughly 50/50 sex split?
  - Page 27 – please check the wording the sentence “Approximately 50 % of mice will experience only mild symptoms because their response has been modified by treatment of gene absence” in the ‘What proportion of animals will experience this severity’ Section. Should ‘of’ be ‘or’?
  - Page 29 and 36 - There is a discrepancy on the volume of virus injected, 20ul or 25ul. Please update.
  - Page 30 - in the section monitor, control, limit adverse effects "... such mice would be killed using a schedule 1 method" - is this out of

place here. The previous text seems to be referring to animals that DON'T reach a humane end point. The same happens in Protocol 3.

- Page 35 - should metacholine be methacholine?
- Page 44 - Many steps are preceded by numbers which could be deleted.
- Page 44 and 52 - There is a discrepancy on the volume of virus injected - 20ul or 75ul?
- Page 49 – in section 'How will you monitor for, control, and limit any of these adverse effects?' reconstitute would be better if it were reconstitution.
- Page 50 - In Step 6 it should be "larger" rather than "latger".
- A number of comments were made regarding your Non-Technical Summary which are listed below. Please update your NTS based on the comments and send it to the following lay members for their review

- Page 2,3 - "Define" has a particular sense here and might usefully be explained.
- Page 4 - You should be credited for your willingness to publish everything: could you say more about how and where this'll be done?
- Page 4 - Project Harms – the last sentence in 'Explain why you are using these animals' has a typo – 'we have employed tried'
- Page 5 - Expected impact paragraph: I found it difficult to track the different options here. I think that some mice aren't being infected, and others are being infected either with one of a variety of viruses, or with bacteria or fungi. Particularly in an NTS these options need to be more clearly spelt out.
- Page 6 - "Why where they not suitable?" paragraph: "Furthermore they do show how a virus infection leads to bacterial complications in the future" - should this be "do not show"?
- Page 7 - "Use of NC3R resources paragraph": maybe necessary to spell out the basic statistical terms here - not every reader of the NTS will understand 'null hypotheses'
- Page 8 - "Why can't you use animals that are less sentient" paragraph: this gets quite technical in its vocabulary and use of language, e.g. alveolar macrophages, pneumonitis, replication kinetics. Non-technical terms should be used or an explanation given for terms.

*Outcome:* The study was given provisional approval based on the applicant making the changes/clarifications listed above to the satisfaction of the Chair/AWERB.

### 3.2. [REDACTED], Neural Basis of Tactile Behaviour

*Considered:* A completed AWERB form, PPL application, and minutes from Local Management Committee Meeting

*Interviewed:* [REDACTED]

- Discussed:*
- The weight of the apparatus and wireless options.
  - The possibility for data obtained from the mice to be altered just through wearing the apparatus and how this is dealt with when analysing the data.
  - How mice are caged and if they can see/hear/smell other mice near them.

- Revisions:*
- Page 24 – please explain MGS.
  - Page 44 - Step 3 is mandatory in Protocol 4 and states animals will be killed. "Continued use in another protocol" as a fate for the animals does not therefore make sense. Please revise.
  - A number of comments were made regarding your Non-Technical Summary which are listed below. Please update your NTS based on the comments and send it to the following lay members for their review

- This is, on first reading, a very clearly written NTS, but it doesn't adequately reflect the varied procedures to which the mice will be subject according to the three Protocols. From the NTS: "Mice will typically be implanted with microelectrode devices using aseptic surgical procedures under anaesthesia. After recovery, using these devices, brain activity will be measured whilst the mice freely explore their environment." In my reading this sounds like "one operation followed by monitoring while the mice get on with life"... Protocols One and Two detail more complex and invasive procedures, none of which are inappropriate but all of which should be described or at least mentioned in the NTS.
- Page 3 – please include details of data sharing.
- Page 4 – please include more details about harms, monitoring, interventions and so on.
- Page 5 – please check consistency for the number of animals. 400 is mentioned here but 660 is listed on the Cat A form.

*Outcome:* The study was given provisional approval based on the applicant making the changes/clarifications listed above to the satisfaction of the Chair/AWERB.

#### **4. Report on licences processed from 09/04/2022 to 05/05/2022**

The following amendments were approved by the executive committee.

##### **4.1. Amendments to Project Licences**

[REDACTED], Circadian Regulation of Pulmonary Immunity.  
[REDACTED], Melanoma Formation, Immune Responses & Evaluating Novel Therapeutic Approaches & Agents.

**4.2. Amendments to Project Licence [REDACTED]; Generation, Breeding and Maintenance of Genetically Altered Rodents**

[REDACTED], Generation of csPER2::Y/R Mouse Line Using CRISPR.

**5. Update on applications outstanding from previous meetings and upcoming Project Licence applications**

5.1. The committee were provided with a document showing the status of applications considered previously and those pencilled in for future meetings.

**6. NACWO and Directors report**

6.1. No comments

**7. NVS report**

7.1. [REDACTED] highlighted the issues with the burns from the mats and that a project is going to take place to check all the mats.

7.2. [REDACTED] raised the issue of training. [REDACTED] explained that with [REDACTED] in her new role they will look into what documentation can be brought to future AWERB meetings to show how training and competency is monitored.

**8. Standard Conditions 18s and non-compliances**

8.1. [REDACTED] commended the BSF staff on the handling of the issue reported under non-compliances involving zebrafish escaping from their tank because a protective baffle was not placed on their tank which led to their deaths.

**9. Any other business**

**9.1. Updated Operational Processes document and Terms of Reference**

Revisions noted. Documents to be updated on the Document Store which will link through to relevant websites.

**9.2. Secondary availability**

CRUK MI at Alderley Park are in the process of renewing a number of Project Licences which may request access to facilities under the University of Manchester Establishment (secondary availability). The matter will be discussed by senior management and if secondary availability is supported on these licences they will be provided to AWERB for review, bearing in mind they fall under a different AWERB and Establishment Licence.

**9.3.**

[REDACTED] led the thanks to [REDACTED] for all her work as NC3Rs Regional Programme Manager (RPM) and welcomed her new role as Named Training and Competency Officer (NTCO) within the BSF. [REDACTED] explained that discussions will take place about how to replace the NC3Rs RPM role on AWERB.

**9.4. Call for people to become lay members within networks if you know of anyone**

Planning ahead, the Chair asked people to think about who in their networks could become lay members given AWERB members are appointed for a defined period rather than as an open-ended role.

**9.5. Be Open Animal Research Day**

The Be Open Animal Research Day (#BOARD22) will take place on 16 June 2022. Mike Addelman will be going and Andy Trafford is talking about his work.

---

**The next meeting will be on 23 June 2022 at 10am-12.30pm via Zoom.**

---

**Dates of upcoming meetings are:**

**Dates of meetings for the 2021/2022 academic year are:**

21 July 2022

**Dates of meetings for the 2022/2023 academic year are:**

22 September 2022

20 October 2022

17 November 2022

15 December 2022

26 January 2023

23 February 2023

23 March 2023

27 April 2023

25 May 2023

22 June 2023

20 July 2023

August break