

## Inside this issue

<i>The Australian Welfare Strategy</i>	1
<i>Changes in the Board of ANZCCART</i>	3
<i>Report on the ANZCCART Conference 2005</i>	4
<i>Changes to the Use of Animals for Teaching Scientific Concepts in Victorian Schools</i>	8
<i>News and Views</i>	9

### ANZCCART Conference 2006

*The ANZCCART conference is planned to take place in Canberra in Spring 2006, timed to coincide with the Floriade festival.*

*We are planning to hold the conference back to back with ANSLAS/AATA.*

*Information will be added to our website as details are finalised.*

## The Australian Animal Welfare Strategy

Geoff Dandie, Director of ANZCCART

There has long been a need for a more uniform approach to animal welfare across Australia, as unlike our New Zealand based colleagues, we have traditionally regarded animal welfare as the political domain of State and Territory Governments. The notable exception to this principle of course being the use of animals in research and teaching, where the Australian Code of Practice for the Care and Use of Animals for Scientific Purposes has been fully incorporated into the relevant legislation in each State or Territory. It is only now, after over 100 years of federation, that an increasing level of awareness and desire to maintain a level of consistency in the approach to animal welfare issues across Australia has led to the recent release of a draft National Animal Welfare Bill as well as the formulation of the Australian Animal Welfare Strategy (AAWS). The AAWS has been prepared and released under the auspices of the Department of Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry and has been in the offing for a number of years now, while the draft National Animal Welfare Bill has been put forward for public comment by one of the minor parties in the Australian Senate\*.

The AAWS has been developed with a view to providing the national and international communities with an appreciation for the animal welfare arrangements that are in place in Australia and to outline future directions for improvements in the welfare of animals in this country. It has been developed over a number of years, jointly by the national, state and territory governments along

with industry and representatives of the community. Unlike the Code of Practice and various Institutional policies that most readers of ANZCART News are used to working under, the AAWS is aimed at the entire Australian community, including people in charge of animals, animal users, veterinarians, livestock producers, processors and transporters, the governing bodies that control sports and recreational organizations, educational facilities, consumers, government agencies, primary producers and harvesters as well as researchers and teachers. However, like the Code of Practice, its preparation has involved consultation with and input from a large number of stakeholder organizations so it may reasonably be expected that, like the Code of Practice, the AAWS should be to be readily accepted by the community at large. In releasing the AAWS, Senator McGauran (Minister for Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry) said that like all Australians, the Government believes in practical, effective and humane animal welfare standards and that was why a comprehensive strategy had been put together that covers all animals.

For the purposes of implementing the AAWS, the various groups and organizations that are involved have been divided into six separate sectors. These are:

- Animals used for the production of food and fibre
- Animals used in Research & Teaching
- Aquatic Animals
- Companion animals

- Animals used for work, recreation, entertainment and display
- Animals in the wild – both native and introduced species.

Australia has deservedly had a good reputation in the area of animal welfare in general for many years and certainly has long been seen as a leader in ensuring the maintenance of the welfare standards for animals used in research and teaching. The latter being largely due to the universal acceptance of the Australian Code of Practice for the Care and Use of Animals for Scientific Purposes, which is now in its seventh edition. However in recent years, international attention has been focussed more on problems that have arisen during the export of livestock or with mulesing of sheep to prevent fly strike, than on the more positive aspects of Australia's animal welfare standards. While this has obviously resulted in some negative publicity for our rural and export industries, it also serves to raise the profile of the animal welfare debate in all areas. Such an increase in public awareness obviously helps keep people working in unrelated sectors such as research and teaching on their toes, and that may be seen as a positive outcome. However, it can unfairly impact on the public perception of all people who work with animals, again including those involved in research and teaching and potentially diminish the value of their work in today's society.

Accordingly, in an effort to redress any perception that our international standing may have been damaged, particularly among our trading partner nations, the Australian Government has put together the AAWS. The AAWS has been designed to be the overarching policy document that will be seen to set the tone for all issues relating to animal welfare. It will be used internationally, to exemplify Australian commitment to animal welfare in every aspect of our lives including the use of animals in research and teaching. Importantly, the AAWS will not replace or in any way diminish the scope of the Australian Code of Practice for the care and Use of Animals for Scientific purposes, but rather, will help to draw together animal welfare legislation from all states and territories along with the various guidelines, codes of practice and documents outlining minimum standards that relate to holding, housing and transporting animals that apply in the agricultural, domestic, sporting and research settings and importantly it will strive to ensure that all such guidelines will be based on sound scientific evidence. So it would be hoped that any research project based on the use of agricultural or native / wildlife species, might in fact be enhanced by

improvements in standards and the health and welfare of any such animals used for scientific purposes.

The AAWS acknowledges that Australia enjoys a favourable animal health status, so a high priority is placed on the control of endemic diseases and emergency animal disease preparedness and response, including the biosecurity controls that are in place to protect animal welfare, animal health and public health and so this is one area where issues such as feral animal populations are considered. Importantly, it establishes a framework for sustainable animal welfare outcomes based on scientific evidence, with a focus on achieving a balance between education and regulation and it will also strive for greater harmony and consistency across jurisdictions. The AAWS recognises that animal welfare is a complex issue with both science and ethics playing an essential part in any issue under consideration. It is therefore stated that science should provide the body of evidence to be used for moral and ethical judgements about the welfare of any animal species. At the same time, decisions about animal welfare are influenced by cultural, social, economic and occupational health and safety considerations. Equally, industrially important considerations such as the standards of stockmanship, the skills and responsibilities of animal carers and their role in good husbandry and the delivery of acceptable animal welfare outcomes are clearly spelled out.

Bearing in mind that the AAWS has at least in part been developed in response to problems in the rural and export sectors and also the substantial proportion of Australia's controlled animal population that falls within that sector, it is not surprising that much of its content relates to animals in these categories. It does build upon historic and existing animal welfare arrangements in Australia and perhaps by way of illustrating the stronger affiliation between the AAWS and the rural sector, specifically recognizes the intimate connection that exists between animal welfare and animal health and production.

The AAWS clearly recognises that animals play an important role in Australian daily life due to:

- An increasing recognition in the community that animals have an intrinsic value;
- The important role of animals as a source of food, fibre and other products;
- The important role of animals in Australia's history and development as a nation;
- Australia's diverse and unique native animals, many of which figure prominently in indigenous culture;
- The ongoing tourism importance of Australia's diverse and unique native animals;
- The strong cultural and sporting significance of animals, including the use of animals as a subject across the arts and as icons for our sporting

- teams;
- The ongoing economic importance of the animal industries to Australia; and
  - The dependence of many Australians on animals for companionship.

It also emphasizes that animal industries (including aquaculture and commercial fishing) producing food and fibre and other products, together with the tourism value of Australia's diverse and unique native animals, will continue to play key roles in maintaining the nation's economic well-being in the 21<sup>st</sup> century. Accordingly, far more emphasis is placed on these areas than research and teaching related activities. The AAWS does however make it quite clear that the Australian Code of Practice for the Care and Use of Animals for Scientific Purposes is, and shall remain, an important part of all animal welfare legislation in this country and certainly the defining standard for all such work.

The next, and perhaps most important phase for the AAWS will be the process of fully implementing it and this was the subject of a strategic planning workshop held in Canberra 4 weeks ago. The list of organizations and industry bodies invited to attend, ratify the AAWS and help plan the process of implementing it was comprehensive to say the least. It included representatives from all relevant government agencies and statutory authorities, the pet shop industry, recreational fishermen, rural and farming sectors, the aquaculture industry, horse and dog racing industries, transport industry representatives, CSIRO, NHMRC, etc. and of course, ANZCCART. The process of implementation will be coordinated by the Primary Industries Standing Committee (PISC) in consultation with key stakeholders. The meeting set out a series of detailed action plans, which spelled out who was to be responsible for putting each one into effect. It also outlined key components such as resources, funding, national coordination, and monitoring and evaluation of progress. In endorsing the AAWS, the federal government has set aside a sum of \$6 million to ensure that it will be possible to fully implement the AAWS in a timely manner and it is planned that ANZCCART will play a significant role in ensuring a smooth implementation process for those involved with research and teaching. What will be interesting to see, is how much the research & teaching sector can be used as an example for others. It is quite clear that the way in which our code of practice has been incorporated into the appropriate laws of all states & territories, along with its general acceptance by researcher, teachers and the community at large, could be seen as an example for other sectors within the community.

For those wishing to read the AAWS in detail and I would suggest that anyone interested in the use of animals at any level, should take the time to read though this document, it is now available on-line at:

[www.daff.gov.au/aaws](http://www.daff.gov.au/aaws).

#### (Footnotes)

- \* More details on both the draft Bill and the public comment procedure may be obtained from ANZCCART. ANZCCART will be reviewing this draft bill with particular emphasis on portions that relate to the use of animals in research and teaching and submitting a detailed response to the Senate. All ANZCCART member organizations have been invited to submit comments to our office for collation into this response. If you are interested in commenting either directly or via ANZCCART, please contact us at [anzccart@adelaide.edu.au](mailto:anzccart@adelaide.edu.au)

---

## Changes in the Board of ANZCCART

There have been two important changes on ANZCCART's Board of management in recent times. Both Professor Roger Holmes (AVCC Representative) and Dr Mike Rickard (CSIRO delegate) have recently retired from the Board after working closely together during the decade they shared overseeing the operations of ANZCCART. Each of these gentlemen has not only served on the board with distinction, but they have also shared the role of Board Chair during the majority of their time on the Board and spent a substantial amount of extra time working behind the scenes to ensure that ANZCCART has developed into the successful organization it is today.

A Biochemist by training, Professor Holmes served on the Board of ANZCCART from February 1996 until June 2004. He took over as the AVCC representative on our Board from Prof Mal Nairn shortly after he moved from Griffith University (where he was Deputy Vice Chancellor – Research) to take up the position of Vice Chancellor & President of the University of Newcastle. During the nine years he served on the Board of ANZCCART, Professor Holmes worked tirelessly in support of the organization and served as Chairman of the Board from December 1999 until December 2001 and again from November 2003 until he stepped down in June 2004 in preparation for his retirement from the University of Newcastle in October last year.

Roger Holmes has now been replaced on the Board as the AVCC representative by Professor Roger Dean, Vice-Chancellor and President of the University of Canberra. Professor Dean trained in biochemistry at Cambridge University, UK and received his PhD for work at Strangeways Research Laboratory, Cambridge. He subsequently worked at University College, London, then for the Medical Research Council and from 1979 was at Brunel University, West London, where he was awarded his DSc, in 1984 and a DLitt in 2001. Roger was appointed an Associate Professor in 1979 and a full Professor of Cell Biology at 35 years of age. He has published more than 270 scientific papers, written four books and edited another five books. He has worked in

many countries including the USA (Merck Institute for Therapeutic Research; Harvard University and the University of California at Berkeley), France, Norway, Japan, Switzerland and in 1984 he spent three months at Sydney University. Roger then became the Foundation Executive Director of the Heart Research Institute Ltd, in Sydney, in December 1988, and an Australian citizen in 1992. He became Vice-Chancellor and President of the University of Canberra in early 2002. In addition to his distinguished academic career, Roger is an accomplished musician and has made more than 30 commercial recordings released all over the world, performed in more than 30 countries, and he has been composing to commissions for chamber groups (such as the Australian Chamber Orchestra), in computer music, and for improvising ensembles. Professor Dean certainly brings a wealth of internationally acquired experience to the Board of ANZCART.

Professor Mike Rickard joined the ANZCART Board in August 1995. Prior to this he had worked as a veterinary immunoparasitologist for more than 20 years and was central to the production of a highly effective vaccine to protect sheep against parasite infections. He then became the Director of the CSIRO's Australian Animal Health Laboratory in Geelong, Victoria and Director of CSIRO Livestock Industries. He also served as CSIRO's Special Advisor on Animal Welfare for a number of years. During his time on the Board of ANZCART, Professor Rickard's specialist interest and expertise in animal welfare was invaluable, as was the guidance and leadership he provided during his terms as Chairman. Professor Rickard was Chairman of the Board from December 1997 until November 1999 and again from December 2002 through until November 2003 and finally from June 2004 until our current Chairperson, Professor Julie Owens (ARC Representative) took over in December 2004.

Professor Rickard has now been replaced as the CSIRO representative on our board by Dr Chris Prideaux. Chris was formerly program leader of the vaccines and therapeutics section of CSIRO Livestock Industries, based at the Australian Animal Health Laboratory (AAHL), in Geelong. Dr Prideaux was awarded a Bachelor of Science with first class honours in microbiology in 1984, graduating first in class from the University of Sydney. In 1988 he received his PhD from the Australian National University, John Curtin School of Medical Research. The research undertaken during his PhD contributed to the development of the fowlpox virus as vector for the delivery of foreign proteins to animals. This technology was originally

aimed at producing cheaper and more effective poultry vaccines. He has also developed a bovine respiratory disease vaccine, which was launched in September 2004.

Dr Prideaux joined CSIRO in 1990, when he became a Post-Doctoral Fellow, working on the Avian Viral Vectors Project. He became project leader of the bacterial products project in 1994. His ability to apply cutting edge science to the development of products for the benefit the agriculture industry through increased production and reduced disease has been a major theme of his career. Dr Prideaux is the author of numerous articles and conference papers, and three international patents covering various areas of vaccine development and is now the Deputy Director of CSIRO Livestock Industries and CSIRO spokesperson for Animal Welfare. Dr Prideaux is very well qualified and we look forward to a long and productive association with him as the CSIRO delegate on the Board of ANZCART.

---

## ANZCART CONFERENCE 2005

**"Animal Ethics Committees and animal use in a monitored environment: is the ethics real, imagined or necessary?"**

This highly successful conference was held from 26 to 28 June 2005 at the Royal Society of New Zealand. Potential disruption by animal activists was minimised by enlisting the services of a security firm before, during, and for a short period after the conference, with support from the New Zealand police during the conference itself.

The conference focussed on what Animal Ethics Committees do in regulating and monitoring the use of animals in research and teaching, and the public's and scientists' expectations of the process. Questions considered during the conference included: Who is responsible for striving for best practice? Are ethical standards necessary, should they be raised, and by whom? Are AECs just compliance gatekeepers or do they have a role in defining ethical standards? Is public opinion of animal ethics known or just imagined? What can AECs learn from human ethics committees?

The conference programme was structured into six sessions over the two days.

***Session 1: Animal Ethics Committees: what do they really do, what should they do, and why should they do it.***

Dr John Schofield, University of Otago, discussed whether Animal Ethics Committees (AEC) are a help

or a hindrance to researchers. He presented a virtual Animal Ethics Committee meeting to discuss a scientific proposal from an institution, to illustrate issues of accountability and responsibility.

Professor Graham Nerlich, University of Adelaide, tackled the issue of the "ethics" of Committees. He considered that AECs do good ethical work but asserted that AECs don't (and shouldn't) "do ethics" and explained why he thinks that.

After these two talks the delegates split up into 6 groups to discuss one of three fictitious protocols and to report back to the whole conference whether or not approval should be given for such an experiment. The feedback from the breakout session was that it was a great icebreaker at the beginning of the conference to initiate networking.

### **Session 2 "Ethics Committees: their function"**

Professor Don Evans, University of Otago, delivered the *Cam Reid Oration*. This paper noted and evaluated the varying degrees with which an affirmative answer has been given to the question "Are animals our equals?" It considered what guidance, if any, might be contained in these affirmative responses for members of AECs who have responsibility for providing ethical approval of research proposals.

Dr Deborah Middleton, Australian Animal Health Laboratory, Melbourne, discussed, from an Australian perspective, how to get all the elements of an AEC working successfully together. She explained how AECs are set up, their composition, the stakeholders, and operating guidelines, and how engagement with the highly committed animal welfare representatives on the AECs is critical to preserving the validity of the AEC process.

### **Session 3: Animal Ethics Committees: the social dimension**

Dr Mark Fisher, Kotare Bioethics Ltd, discussed the necessary, the real, and the imagined aspects of AECs. AECs have a unique perspective of animals, science and people. They represent the social contract between animals and humans, and between institutions involved in research, testing and teaching and the public. Mark suggested that engaging in the manifestations of these contracts will help society develop the science and educational objectives it wants. Thus while AECs reflect society, they inevitably help shape the future of the relationship between people and animals. He said that is possible to imagine AECs playing a greater leadership role in this process but questioned whether they should.

Dr Tim Dare, University of Auckland, considered

personal attitudes and public regulation with respect to animals and ethics. Our attitudes towards non-human animals contain deep inconsistencies. We distinguish without very clear grounds between companion animals and other species; we create systems of animal welfare regulations but carefully design them so they only minimally restrict our conduct. Dr Dare explored some of these tensions to try to see what a genuine respect for non-human animals might require of us. He felt that consideration of ethics by AECs, rather than just ensuring compliance with regulations, was important.

### **Session 4: Animals in research: the laboratory**

Dr Simon Festing, Research Defence Society, UK, explained that although the UK is a world leader in medical research and produces more new medicines, more scientific papers and more Nobel Prize winners per head of population than almost any other country in the world, it paradoxically has the most vitriolic and influential anti-vivisection movement in the world, as well as the most aggressive animal rights extremists. Since there is limited room for debate or dialogue to find common ground with abolitionist organisations he said that in order to safeguard the future of biomedical research in the UK, it is vitally important that those involved in the use of animals understand the tactics of these groups and deploy appropriate counter-measures. This means engaging with the media and with politicians to ensure that animal research is not seriously undermined. Proactive lobbying is required to ensure that the Government takes appropriate measures to crack down on animal rights extremists and protect those involved in legitimate bio-medical research. The research community cannot go it alone, but must work with those who are skilled in communications and public affairs. He said it is far better to be open and transparent so that the public can get information about what goes on in research centres, and so that researchers do not give the impression of having something to hide. This message is equally applicable to New Zealand in safeguarding the future of animal research.

Dr Ailsa McGregor, University of Auckland, spoke about neurodegenerative disease modelling and why it is necessary. She described the importance of whole animal models in neurodegenerative disease research and also their limitations. She discussed how these models have been refined to provide, as far as possible, clinically relevant information within the constraints of an animal.

### **Session 5: Alternatives and cost**

Dr Richard Clothier, FRAME Alternatives Laboratory, UK, talked about the development of acceptable alternative methods. The process of validation is an important one

when considering how alternative assays are going to be acceptable as replacements for the present animal-based methods. There is a formal process in the EU whereby *in vitro* assays can be validated, and these criteria are being extended to new proposed animal tests. He reviewed the issues that underlie the FRAME Research programme which funded the work on alternatives that he described in his talk.

Dr Robert Baker, Department of Primary Industries and Resources, South Australia, talked about public accountability in animal use for scientific purposes in Australia and national data and auditing of AECs and institutions. As there is no national animal welfare legislation regulating the use of animals for research and teaching in Australia, each of the eight States and Territories has its own legislative requirements. This has made the collection, collation and interpretation of national data on animal use in research and teaching very difficult. This paper provided the Australian data for five of the eight jurisdictions for 2003, together with some interpretations and comments. Compliance with the *Australian Code of Practice for the Care and Use of Animals for Scientific Purposes* is a legal requirement in all jurisdictions. The 7<sup>th</sup> edition published in 2004, included for the first time a requirement for regular external review of the operation of institutions and their AECs, defined the required scope and outcomes of the reviews and recommended how they should be conducted. While such reviews are already undertaken in some states, this is a new requirement in many jurisdictions. This paper briefly outlined how this may be undertaken and concluded with some general comments on public accountability of AECs in Australia.

### **Session 6: Out of the lab and into the wild**

Bruce Warburton, Landcare Research, spoke about managing ethical issues in vertebrate pest control research. New Zealand has a range of introduced vertebrate pests that have negative impacts on conservation, animal health, and production values. Species such as possums, ferrets, stoats, feral cats, rats, mice, pigs, goats, deer, and tahr all receive some form of lethal control in order to minimise the impact they have. For possums alone, more than \$80m is spent annually on control using poisons (1080, cyanide, anticoagulants, and cholecalciferol), traps and shooting. This significant control effort is underpinned by a range of research projects that, by necessity, use a considerable number of experimental animals. This paper detailed Landcare Research's animal use, and highlighted some specific challenges that research on wild animals pose for researchers and AEC members.

Peter Mason, NZSPCA, outlined considerations and perspectives in animal welfare at home. New Zealanders, like many Westerners, make their homes

in a variety of places—from high-rise urban apartment buildings, to the traditional bungalow on the quarter acre section, to country houses on extensive farms. But no matter where they make their home, they will in all likelihood interact with a variety of animals there. Typical categories of animals found at home include companion animals, wildlife and insects. The nature of interaction with these animals will be influenced by the individual's make-up; the animal's make-up; the physical environment; and applicable laws and regulations. Interactions between humans and animals have the potential to both enhance and compromise the welfare of both. For most Westerners, their interaction with animals at home represents most, if not all, of their interaction with species other than their own. It is not then surprising that they struggle to comprehend animals, and animal welfare, in other contexts, such as in farming or research. With technological advances occurring at an exponential rate, it may be that the future will see greater use of technology, such as mobile phones and the internet, as vehicles for facilitating interaction with animals at home. This will in turn potentially impact on the welfare of those animals.

The conference concluded with an update on the recommendations that arose from the 2003 ANZCCART Conference in Christchurch and agreement for inclusion of two new recommendations from the 2005 conference. The update is printed below.

### **FOLLOW-UP ON RECOMMENDATIONS FROM 2003 ANZCCART CONFERENCE**

A number of recommendations arose from the 2003 ANZCCART Conference in Christchurch. It should be stressed here that these recommendations were essentially action points that were extracted from discussions during the conference break-out session. The recommendations were configured to issues that were subsequently handled by representatives of three New Zealand bodies: ANZCCART (NZ), the Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry (MAF), and the National Animal Ethics Advisory Committee (NAEAC).

Issue	Responsibility
1. Lay Summaries	ANZCCART
2. Annual Statistics	NAEAC, MAF
3. Degrees of Suffering	NAEAC, MAF
4. Noxious procedures	NAEAC
5. Independent Chairs	
6. Rigour of AEC process	NAEAC, MAF
7. Public Views	MAF
8. Need for Balanced Information Lay Summaries	ANZCCART

**Aim:**

*That AECs and all organisations that use animals and report animal use statistics to MAF should provide lay summaries (without Institutional affiliations) to MAF for loading on the internet.*

**Action:**

ANZCCART (NZ) discussed this at great length during 2004 and it was considered important to take regard of issues surrounding the commercial sensitivity of some work involving the use of animals in research, testing and teaching, and to ensure that lay summaries contain no overt Institutional affiliations. Lay summaries should also be submitted at the conclusion to the project, as opposed to the time at which AEC approval is given.

In terms of providing some direction, it was noted that the UK Home Office, which deals with issuing personal and project licenses to those undertaking animal-based research under the Animals (Scientific Procedures) Act 1986, now publishes abstracts of all new project licenses granted on applications made from early 2005. The abstracts are written by the project license holders, and they own the copyright to the abstracts. The information includes: the specified permissible purposes of the research; the fact that there are no non-animal alternatives; that the expected benefits must outweigh the likely adverse effects on the animals concerned; and that the number of animals and their suffering must be minimised.

In view of the above, it was considered important that the lay summaries should address the following objectives:

- Provide the context of the study by way of a brief background.
- Describe the aim of the study.
- State the necessity of using animals for the study with a consideration of alternatives.
- Describe the outcomes of the study.

ANZCCART (NZ) will send a letter to all New Zealand AECs and organisations reporting animal use statistics to MAF, in order to seek their input on the terms of reference and the format of lay summaries. This letter will be sent by the end of September 2005. It is likely that MAF could host the web site of lay summaries.

## 2. Annual Statistics

**Aim:**

*That more detail be provided in annual statistics.*

**Action:**

More explanatory comments have been provided in the 2003 NAEAC annual report and the same will apply for the 2004 report, which will be released soon. For the statistics collected for the 2005 year, new categories have been provided for: testing; the production of biological agents; and the development of alternatives.

## 3. Degrees of Suffering

**Aim:**

*Consideration should be given to examining the degrees of suffering with a view to providing better guidance and examples of each category.*

**Action:**

MAF has commissioned an operational research project to review the severity scale. This work is under way.

## 4. Noxious Procedures

**Aim:**

*That noxious procedures be replaced.*

**Action:**

NAEAC will, through its annual report and NAEAC News, continue to publicise alternatives to noxious procedures

## 5. Appointment of external/independent chairs of AECs

**Aim:**

*That AECs are chaired in an independent manner.*

**Outcome:**

There was no support for the appointment of independent chairs. The role of chair requires accessible person-to-person interaction with staff of an Institution with a Code of Ethical Conduct, and knowledge of the use of animals in research, testing and teaching. This recommendation was not advanced further.

## 6. Rigour of AEC Process

**Aim:**

*That AECs should be given the opportunity to exchange ideas regarding best practice in terms of ethics deliberations and issues that recognise and address welfare concerns.*

**Action:**

NAEAC will develop a strategy for allowing AECs to submit their application forms to NAEAC for review and a "big tick". NAEAC is currently working on a mechanism to allow AECs to share information/forms with each

other, and a national workshop for AECs is scheduled for September of this year. MAF are also actively engaged in this workshop.

## 7. Public Views

### **Aim:**

*That it is desirable to achieve evidence of the NZ public's view of the use of animals in research, teaching and testing.*

### **Action:**

MAF commissioned some attitudinal research on New Zealanders' attitudes to the use of animals in research, testing and teaching. This research began in June 2005 and is currently being assessed. The outcomes of this research will be published.

## 8. Need for Balanced Information

### **Aim:**

*That greater dissemination of unbiased information is required at all levels to convey the facts.*

### **Action:**

ANZCCART (NZ) is examining the means by which information on animal-based research could be presented to school students. The NZ Board is still considering the target audience. Importantly, Australia is addressing educational material for primary school students.

## RECOMMENDATIONS FROM 2005 ANZCCART CONFERENCE

1. That closer collaboration occur between New Zealand and Australia with regard to information-sharing and striving for best practice in using animals for research, testing and teaching.

2. That "ethics" should be put back into Animal Ethics Committees.

The Australian perspective here is that a lot of ethics occurs within Australian AECs and many have an "ethicist" or "philosopher" on their AEC. This is not the case in New Zealand. It is planned that a future edition of ANZCCART News will include perspectives from AEC members on the ethics component, and NHMRC will supply a survey they did in Australia a few years ago.

## Changes to the Use of Animals for Teaching Scientific Concepts in Victorian Schools

Community attitudes towards animals have been steadily changing. "Cruelty Free" products are now common place, standard farming practices have come under intense scrutiny, and the use of animals in science continues to spark controversies the world over. It should come as no surprise then, that changing community standards have made their way into the classroom.

The Prevention of Cruelty to Animals Act 1986 requires that the use of animals for the teaching of any aspect of science can only be done by licensed organisations. This year Victorian schools will fall in line with NSW, WA, SA, QLD and the ACT in licensing both Primary and Secondary schools for the use of animals to teach scientific concepts.

Animals should not be used to teach science unless the teacher knows the school is covered by a Scientific Procedures Premises License (SPPL). To be covered by an SPPL a school must have access to an Animal Ethics Committee (AEC).

Each use of animals for teaching any aspect of science will have to be approved by an AEC and teachers must notify the AEC of their intention to use animals.

An AEC for DE&T schools will be established later this year.

It is planned that the AEC will provide detailed lesson plans, reviews of new and different ways to teach with or without animals, as well as detailed guidelines on how to care for animals in schools.

The Bureau of Animal Welfare (BAW) is assisting the three school sectors (Government, Catholic, and Independent) in implementing these changes in a way that minimises the administrative burden on teachers, and maximises the educational benefits to schools in Victoria.

One of the changes is that scientific teaching activities involving animals will have to be approved by an Animal Ethics Committee (AEC). It is intended that the AEC website will provide lesson plans for a set of "pre-approved" activities on a range of topics. If a teacher wishes to run any of these activities they would need to take a minute or two to notify the AEC by filling out a simple form prior to downloading the lesson.

Teachers wishing to do their own (non pre-approved)

activities would need to go through a slightly more involved website application process which outlines the intended activity and its educational aims. The application would be considered at the AEC's next meeting and the teacher notified of their decision. Principals will be personally responsible for the welfare of animals in the school and may wish to nominate an Animal Welfare Officer (AWO) to ensure that all activities comply with the relevant code. These AWO's (eg. interested teachers, lab technicians, other staff) may require training and the RSPCA has already offered to help in running a short AWO course.

Whilst these changes are mandatory, they also represent a unique opportunity to produce a quality educational resource to help make teacher's jobs easier. It is hoped that the AEC website will become a valuable resource for teachers by providing a host of useful information. It should be possible to include modules of work using animals (as well as alternatives to animals), reviews of relevant software/videos/models/books, FAQ's, links to other useful sites, guidelines on how to care for animals typically kept in schools, power point presentations, an animal ethics forum, perhaps an "Ask a Vet" forum, student forums etc. etc.

As yet there is no AEC for schools in Victoria, but negotiations are under way and at least one AEC and its website should be established later this year. If you have any questions, or better yet **any suggestions** of how such a site might be made more useful to **you**, please contact the BAW. Similarly if you have lesson plans you would like to submit for consideration and possible pre-approval by the AEC you can also send them through via email or snail mail.

It is hoped teachers will seize this opportunity to help produce a quality resource, and embrace the spirit of these changes that will ensure Victorian schools continue to respond to, and meet, the needs and expectations of the Victorian community.

## NEWS AND VIEWS

### Upgrade of ANZCCART Australia's Web page

*Over the past few months we have been reviewing the look and content of the web site and will continue to do so over the coming months. We encourage you to contact our office (anzccart@adelaide.edu.au) if there are any additional resources or links to other web sites that you think should be added to the site. Similarly, if you find any broken links or information which you believe should be updated we would be grateful for your input. Please be aware that some links to our site may have changed and you may need to update bookmarks to specific pages.*

---

### UFAW/BVA Ethics Committee Symposium 2006

#### Quality of Life: The Heart of the Matter

13–15 September 2006 at The Royal Society, London,  
UK



#### Announcement and call for abstracts and expressions of interest

The Universities Federation for Animal Welfare (UFAW) and the British Veterinary Association (BVA) Ethics Committee are organising an international symposium on 'Quality of Life: The Heart of the Matter'. The aim is to bring together leading scientists, practicing veterinarians, animal scientists and keepers, and medics to discuss recent advances in the science underpinning our understanding of animals' feelings, recent advances in methods for assessment of quality of life in man and other animals, species variation in factors affecting quality of life, ethical and practical implications for veterinarians and others of advances in understanding in this field, and, in doing so, to emphasise and to promote concern for quality of life as the centre of care for companion animals.

The main focus will be on animals kept for companionship, which covers a very wide range of species including all those commonly kept as farm and laboratory animals. We hope that contributions will be made to the conference by experts in farmed and laboratory animal welfare to

help inform thinking about quality of life in companion animals.

Places are limited so please contact us without delay to register a preliminary interest in attending; this will ensure that you receive all future symposium mailings. For further details, or if you would like to present a paper/poster, or wish to register an interest in attending, please send the following information to the Scientific Officer, UFAW, The Old School, Brewhouse Hill, Wheathampstead, Hertfordshire, AL4 8AN, UK. Tel: +44 (0)1582 831818; Fax: +44 (0)1582 831414; Email: [scioff@ufaw.org.uk](mailto:scioff@ufaw.org.uk)

**Name; Title (Dr, Ms etc); Address; Telephone/Fax; Email; University/Organisation**

Please indicate whether you **wish/do not wish** to submit a **paper/poster**. Further details can be found at [www.ufaw.org.uk](http://www.ufaw.org.uk).

---

### **Swiss scientist honored for excellent contribution to the principle of 3R's for the development and production of veterinary medicinal products**

Boxmeer, August 22, 2005 – At the “5th World Congress on Alternatives”, on 22 August in Berlin, Germany Prof. Andrew Hemphill, University of Bern, Switzerland was honored with the Intervet Dieter Lütticken Award for his excellent contribution to the principle of 3R's for the development and production of veterinary medicinal products.

Professor Hemphill's work focused on the development and evaluation of in- vitro approaches for culture and investigation of helminthic and protozoan parasites, in particular *Neospora canium* and *Echinococcus multilocularis*. Receiving the award he stated: 'I feel very honoured, and at the same time this also acknowledges the input of my colleagues who have participated and put a lot effort into our projects.'

The panel of expert judges - with participation of Prof. Coenraad Hendriksen, NVI, Netherlands Vaccine Institute and Prof. Franz J. Conraths, Friedrich-Loeffler-Institute, Federal Research Institute for Animal Health, Germany - assessed the work as being coherent and integrative with the set of studies being performed in a multi-disciplinary setting with national and international

contributors.

The award of 20,000 Euro was presented by Dr. Dieter Lütticken, Intervet: “The work of Prof. Hemphill and his colleagues is highly relevant in terms of the 3Rs, particularly “Replacement”. Government regulations mandate the use of animals in many instances to ensure that animal medicine is safe and efficacious. During product development, we actively look for methods to prevent or reduce the use of test animals. Where the use of test animals cannot be avoided, we look out to reduce the number of test animals and to refine the experiment set-up. Intervet supports initiatives that contribute to the principle of 3R's for the development and production of veterinary medicinal products, both internally and outside our organization. I appreciate very much that we can honour today the studies of Prof. Hemphill and I hope that spin off of the methods to related areas will take place.’

With his ambition, creativity and broad knowledge in basic and applied science Dieter Lütticken guided and shaped Intervet's R&D for many years. He established what became tradition – Intervet's sound support and close collaboration with basic research. Dieter Lütticken retired in June 2003 from his position as Vice President and Intervet's Head of R&D.

The award covers the work on the development of in-vitro models used in R&D which replace animal testing for licensing purposes as well as studies avoiding the use of animals in efficacy, safety and quality testing or in the production of biological and pharmaceutical products for animals. For example, research areas can include residue testing, new toxicological methods, challenge test replacements, epidemiological studies focusing on the correlation of field data and protection of animals by vaccination, genomics or proteomics.

---

### **InterNICHE provides training in alternatives at 5th World Congress**

As part of its international promotion of alternatives in education, InterNICHE was invited to organise the Multimedia Exhibition at the 5th World Congress on Alternatives & Animal Use in the Life Sciences held recently in Berlin.

Over 100 different alternatives were included for their potential to replace harmful animal use and to enhance the quality of education and training were presented at

the Multimedia Exhibition. The majority of the products are part of the InterNICHE Alternatives Loan System, a free library open to teachers, students and campaigners from across the world.

Focusing on pharmacology and physiology, zoology and anatomy, and clinical skills and surgery, the alternatives were demonstrated at different stations by InterNICHE trainers and by a number of producers. Media included software, video, training mannequins and simulators, including self-experimentation apparatus.

Delegates could also self trial alternatives and show their own newly developed software within the Multimedia Exhibition. A post-conference option to borrow items from the Alternatives Loan System was made available, and some freeware alternatives whose development was supported by InterNICHE were also distributed.

Applying modern technology and other innovations to the learning process can help ensure that teaching objectives of practical classes are met in fully ethical and highly effective ways. The successful Multimedia Exhibition demonstrated the value of practical training in alternatives to support the implementation of best-practice tools and approaches.

InterNICHE has organised a number of alternatives training seminars, with a growing focus in recent years. In August-September 2004, over 400 university teachers were trained at the 'Alternatives, Animal Welfare and the Curriculum' series of seminars in India. Held in over 10 cities, the project was organised by InterNICHE in conjunction with the World Society for the Protection of Animals (WSPA) and many committed local organisations and teachers from across India. The international project was the first of its kind providing training at a national level to such a large number of delegates.

InterNICHE is able to organise training for teachers, students and campaigners at conferences and seminars in most countries. Please contact <coordinator@interniche.org> for more information. To borrow items from the Alternatives Loan System, please visit <[www.interniche.org/alt\\_loan.html](http://www.interniche.org/alt_loan.html)>.

The 6th World Congress will be held 21-25 August 2007 in Tokyo, Japan.

**ANZCCART NEWS ©**

**is free of charge and is published by the  
Australian and New Zealand Council for the Care of  
Animals in Research and Teaching Limited.**

**It is a publication for researchers and teachers; members  
of Animal Ethics Committees; staff of organisations  
concerned with research, teaching and funding; and  
parliamentarians and members of the public with  
interests in the conduct of animal-based research and  
teaching and the welfare of animals used.**

**The opinions expressed in ANZCCART NEWS are not  
necessarily those held by ANZCCART Ltd.**

**Contributions to ANZCCART NEWS are welcome and  
should be sent to:**

**ANZCCART**

**The University of Adelaide**

**South Australia 5005**

**Australia**

**Tel. 61-8-8303 7585 Fax. 61-8-8303 7587**

**E-mail. [anzccart@adelaide.edu.au](mailto:anzccart@adelaide.edu.au)**

**<http://www.adelaide.edu.au/ANZCCART>**

**or**

**ANZCCART New Zealand**

**PO Box 598**

**Wellington**

**New Zealand**

**Tel. 64-4-472 7421 Fax. 64-4-473 1841**

**E-mail. [anzccart@rsnz.org](mailto:anzccart@rsnz.org)**

**<http://anzccart.rsnz.org/>**

**ISSN 1039-9089**