



## ANZCCART WORKSHOP

### ***The Australian Code of Practice: Proposed revisions and their implications***

#### Report of Proceedings

The workshop, sponsored in part by the NHMRC, was held on Friday May 23 2003 at the University of Melbourne, and was attended by 45 individuals. A list of attendees is appended to this report.

#### **BACKGROUND and AIMS**

The workshop was organised in response to a public request from the Animal Welfare Committee of the NHMRC, for submissions by individuals and organisations on the Draft Revision of the ***Australian code of practice for the care and use of animals for scientific purposes*** (6<sup>th</sup> Edition 1997).

The aims of the Workshop were:

- i) to stimulate discussion and debate on the Code, and particularly on the revisions that have been proposed;
- ii) to identify any key aspects of the code that may require amendment or further clarification; and
- iii) to produce a constructive and helpful report for forwarding to the Code Liaison Group and to delegates who attended the workshop.

#### **PROGRAM & INTRODUCTION**

The program, a copy of which is appended to this report, comprised a mixture of presentations by invited speakers, and informal discussion and debate amongst workshop participants.

In welcoming delegates to the workshop, Dr Rory Hope (ANZCCART Director) emphasised that the Code is a critically important document in the context of animal welfare and biomedical research in Australia. He welcomed the consultative approach adopted by the Code Liaison Group (CLG) in deriving a final version of the Code that was acceptable to a wide cross section of individuals, institutions and groups.

Mrs Elizabeth Grant, who Chairs the CLG, then provided a brief history of the Code and the ways in which it has been developed and modified. The first Code was developed by the NHMRC in 1969, and since that time it has been revised on at least five occasions. Revisions are carried out by the CLG, which is comprised of representatives from the NHMRC, CSIRO, Australian Research Council, Australian Vice-Chancellor's Committee, State and Territory governments, and animal welfare groups. There is also input from the public consultation process. The Code is an influential document, not only because it is incorporated into State and Territory animal welfare legislation in Australia, but also because,

increasingly, it is looked upon internationally as providing a model policy for conduct in the use of animals for scientific purposes and for teaching.

Aspects of the code that often attracted debate were:

- i) Where to draw the line between excessive bureaucracy and effectiveness?
- ii) Category E membership of Animal Ethics Committees (AECs) – advisory or mandatory?
- iii) The responsibilities of AECs to monitor the work that they approve, and the special problems with monitoring in remote areas.
- iv) The role of the code in relation to genetically manipulated organisms.
- v) The usefulness of Standard Operating Procedures (SOPs).

## ISSUES RAISED AND MAJOR FINDINGS

### **Setting the scene: A set of short presentations to highlight issues and expectations from different perspectives**

**Ms Robyn Sullivan**, a Category C member on several Victorian Animal Ethics Committees, spoke from the point of view of an animal welfare representative. She focused on six issues.

1. Development of Alternatives [Draft Code: Introduction - Purpose of the Code page 7].

The current revision is an opportunity to review the Code's performance in the context of objectives set. The Code nominates six key purposes; the last of these is to "promote the development and use of techniques which replace animal use in scientific and teaching activities." While some progress has been made with respect to the application of alternative techniques, the same cannot be said for the "development" of alternatives. It is now time to 'lift the bar' and explicitly incorporate, within the Code, standards of performance for the development of alternatives for institutions, AECs and investigators.

2. Assessment of proposals against criteria [Draft Code: General Principles - Section 1.1 page 10].

AECs are charged with the responsibility of assessing whether scientific and teaching activities using animals are "essential" to achieve specified criteria. The Code, however, does not provide any guidance to assist AECs in their approach to this assessment. The practical reality is that most AECs are over-worked and under-resourced; they are not well positioned to explore the assessment methodologies available. In the same way the Code provides guidance on the minimum requirements for written proposals, a framework to guide AECs through assessment of scientific and teaching activities would provide valuable leadership in an area that goes to the heart of the Code.

3. Accountability [Draft Code - Section 2.1.2 page 14].

The proposal for triennial independent reviews is strongly supported by animal welfare representatives. While regulatory inspections focus on compliance with minimum legal standards, independent reviews offer the opportunity for a largely self-regulated system to demonstrate a commitment to transparency and to promote good practice/ best practice standards. Independent reviews of all aspects of care and use of animals would address serious public concerns about uneven performance across institutions.

4. Refinement.

My experience on a number of AECs is that many investigators do not fully appreciate what is intended by "Refinement". Investigators often focus on "Reduction" and pay less attention to experimental design, which minimises both the severity and the number of procedures on individual animals. It would be helpful,

when reviewing the Code, if every opportunity is taken throughout the text to ensure that minimisation of the procedural burden on individual animals is emphasised.

5. Composition of AECs [Draft Code - Section 2.2.3 page 15].

The involvement of animal care personnel in AEC operations is critical. Animal care personnel bring specialist input to AEC deliberations and provide an important feedback loop to assist the AEC in monitoring its own effectiveness. AEC attendance by animal care personnel should be a mandatory requirement of the Code.

6. Minimum Operating Standards.

Poor meeting practices persist in some AECs, in particular the tabling of proposals or amendments on the day of the AEC meeting or the circulation of agenda papers without a reasonable notice period. These practices are in direct conflict with the spirit of the Code yet they continue. We should take this opportunity for the next version of the Code to establish minimum standards for the circulation of agenda papers.

**Dr Carol Ginns**, Animal Welfare Officer at the University of Melbourne.

1. Personal contact between the AWO and scientists is very helpful in promoting animal welfare.
2. More guidance on the proposal in the Code for triennial reviews would be useful.
3. Concern was expressed about the increased workload on AECs and the consequent difficulties in recruiting members.
4. In annual reports, “adverse effects” are rarely reported.
5. Although AEC applicants may cite the use of a SOP, the extent to which they actually comprehend and follow the procedure needs to be monitored.
6. There are a number of “unknowns” surrounding the production and breeding of genetically modified organisms – while these are difficult to address in the code, further clarification would be helpful.
7. Section 4.4.23 of the code recommends that AECs, in establishing species-specific needs for animal accommodation and management, may take into account “commercial considerations”. More guidance in the code would be useful on this point.

In summary, in a self-regulatory environment, a level of reporting and documentation is required to ensure accountability. The changes outlined in the revision of the code would substantially increase the level of reporting and documentation required by all who use the system. Resources at all levels (administrative, committee, animal care and management and researchers and teachers) would be stretched to accommodate these changes, but will compliance increase and animal welfare be enhanced?

**Ms Debra Ramsey**, Operations Manager, Precinct Animal Centre, Baker Heart Research Institute. In speaking on the topic of implementation of the code from an animal facility managers perspective, Debra raised the following issues:

1. The code would impact on the husbandry approval process, creating an increased workload for animal facility managers (e.g. Sections 3.3.54, 4.5.8).
2. It was necessary to provide clearer guidelines as to what constitutes “routine husbandry” (Section 4.5.8, 4.6), particularly in relation to genetically modified animals (3.3.51-58).
3. AEC Membership (Section 2.2.3): In the invitation to make a submission on the draft it is noted that the CLG agreed not to introduce Category E member as mandatory but were strongly divided on this issue. It is suggested that the CLG give further consideration to i) the definition and role of Category E, ii) the reporting function of Category E members. Category E could be a person with suitable and extensive

experience in animal husbandry either internal or external to the organisation. They would not necessarily form part of a quorate at an AEC meeting.

4. It would be useful if the code recommended a standard procedure for animal facilities to report to AECs. How will the AEC evaluate the total animals produced to supply a particular genotype in the context of the study justification? As research moves towards evaluating more than one manipulation through crossing strains, the ratio of number of animals produced to number of animals used will increase. As the person in charge is responsible for the records pertaining to production, the draft needs to explore mechanisms of reporting. The code should consider Animal Facility (where applicable) reports to be made at each AEC meeting and to include data on general activities, as well as on production, health and care.
5. Workload for AECs: Many AECs / Institutions already embrace the operating principles proposed in the draft code and the changes may only slightly increase their workload. However, for some AECs and Institutions, the proposed changes will significantly impact on their workload? Can such AECs function effectively, given the consequent difficulties in the provision of institutional support and in attracting members?

**Professor Michael McKinley**, Senior Principal Research Fellow, Howard Florey Institute.

1. The significant improvements that have been made to the code over the years have improved the quality of scientific research.
2. AEC members received positive recognition amongst the scientific community for the important work they did.
3. Delays in approvals by AECs could lead to discontent and inefficiencies and any guidelines that encouraged a more streamlined approach would be welcomed. The use of face-to-face meetings between scientists and AECs, while producing long meetings, often ironed out minor problems with applications and enabled decisions to be taken promptly.
4. Projects that presently needed consideration by more than one institutional AEC had the potential to become bogged down in beaurocracy. Perhaps a mechanism could be recommended in the code whereby a single AEC took overriding responsibility for a project.
5. Pilot experiments, as recommended in the code, were very useful from both a scientific and animal welfare perspective.
6. The standardisation of application forms would improve efficiencies.

**Professor Ross Day**, Chairman, Animal Welfare Committee, Monash University.

Professor Day commenced by outlining the role of the Monash University Animal Welfare Committee. The AWC, which meets six times per year, oversees the operations of 12 geographically dispersed AECs associated with Monash University. Minutes from individual AECs are scrutinised and a selection of applications are considered. The AWC has overall responsibility for policy development and for the resolution of disagreements. It carries out regular inspections of animal facilities and, where necessary, recommends to the University that improvement be made. The AWC forms a useful conduit between Monash University and the Victorian Bureau of Animal Welfare, with which it cooperates closely.

Amongst the recommendations made by the Monash University AWC to the Code Liaison Group were:

1. Terminology needed to be clarified in the code by using a set of definitions. The term "consensus" causes particular problems. "Animal" for the purpose of the code, needs to be defined (does it include crustaceans? fish?).
2. The increasing involvement of commercial organisations in research with animals causes difficulties associated with the confidentiality of data and experimental protocols. What are the rights and responsibilities of AECs in inspecting and

monitoring research of a commercial nature? Clearer guidelines in the code would assist institutions and AECs.

3. The requirement of a Category E member on AECs is supported.

**Dr Philip Towers**, Presiding Officer, Animal Care and Ethics Committee, Charles Sturt University.

#### Animal Ethics Committee Meetings using Videoconferencing

Charles Sturt University is a multi-campus regional university in New South Wales with three main campuses: Bathurst, Wagga Wagga and Albury, with a total of over 34000 students. The amount of animal based research and teaching at CSU does not warrant the establishment of multiple Animal Ethics Committees, however, distances between campuses preclude conduct of true “face to face” meetings. Consequently ten of the 11 meetings held each year are conducted by videoconference. The final meeting each year is a formal “face to face” meeting usually with opportunity for round table discussion sessions before the formal meeting is held. The use of videoconferencing allows CSU to have a single AEC and meet the requirements of the Code. Nevertheless, there are various constraints placed on the committee such as strict time limits, and there are challenges to ensure member participation on campuses remote from that of the Chair. Technological difficulties do arise (infrequently) and an approximate ½ second delay in speech/video from other sites needs to be managed carefully by the Chair. Nevertheless, the benefits of videoconferencing far outweigh the difficulties that would occur in trying to organise true “face to face” meetings at CSU.

**Dr. Kate Blaszak and Dr Stephen Tate** (*in absentia*). Bureau of Animal Welfare, Victoria.

The following three issues were raised:

1. The use of animals in schools may require a modified licensing and code requirement compared to that used for the scientific establishments and scientific teaching institutions.
2. NHMRC have an audit requirement associated with funding. How does this integrate or compare to government audits of licensing. Could compliance with a state audit suffice for the NHMRC?
3. While reference material is given in the Code, there are no recommended animal housing standards for the species nominated in the Victorian Act: mice, guinea pigs, rabbits and rats (and, in the future, non-human primates). Standards for adoption across all Australian states would be useful.

#### **Scoping the issues: Identifying groups of key issues arising from the Code**

In this session, individuals raised a number of issues for subsequent discussion by the four working groups. Amongst the issue raised were:

##### Group A

- The responsibilities of Institutions, Chairs of AECs and Investigators in implementing the code
- The proposed triennial review of AECs – resource implications and State differences
- Annual reports
- Compliance
- Conflicts of interest
- The development of alternatives

- Definitions of “ethics” and “consensus”
- C and D member “isolation”
- Training in ethics for research workers

#### Group B

- Problems associated with genetically modified organisms
- How (and when) is work with animals, including wildlife studies, classified as “routine” or “experimental”?
- Reporting breaches of the code
- Proscriptiveness of the Code
- Input for veterinarians – 2.2.31
- Housing guidelines.

#### Group C

- Proposals and applications
- Standard Operating Protocols
- Pilot projects
- Use of plain English
- Duration of projects / approvals
- Inadvertent welfare issues (e.g. the inadvertent capture of species in wildlife studies)
- post-operative care – the choice of appropriate analgesics
- Recognising pain

#### Group D

- Operation of AECs
- Category E membership
- Commercial conflicts
- Workloads / delays / nit picking
- Synopsis of the Code
- Turnover of Membership of AECs
- Development of work procedures for AECs
- Quorate / video conferencing
- Delegation for inspection
- Monitoring distant sites

#### Additional points raised in general discussion by individuals:

1. The involvement of veterinarians in animal welfare had been watered down in the code.
2. Reporting requirements were excessive.
3. The boundaries between husbandry and research in relation to wildlife studies were blurred and should be more clearly defined.
4. The NHMRC Statement of Compliance had been redesigned and would provide a useful basis for feedback to institutions.
5. It was essential that “correct” analgesics be used in postoperative care. The problems of pain recognition and treatment are being addressed in the NHMRC document “*Ways of Minimising pain and distress in animals in research*” – currently under review.
6. Research personnel should receive some training in basic ethics as a requirement for their work with animals.
7. There was a problem of duplication in relation to the proposed triennial review of AECs and present State reviews such as those conducted by the Animal Welfare Bureau in Victoria. It was suggested that procedures be developed so that State

- reviews, which may need modification, could be accepted as the triennial reviews proposed in the code.
8. The code should clarify what needs to be reported by researchers in their annual reports.
  9. It is essential that adequate support be provided to Category C and D members, to enable them to carry out their job properly.

### **3. Reports by working groups**

**Group A:** Chaired by Dr Hazel Johnston, Animal Welfare Officer, University of Adelaide.

#### 1. Triennial Review

The importance of audit of the functioning of AECs was appreciated but concerns were raised from representatives from some states, principally Victoria and NSW that there could be duplication of processes already undertaken by the state regulators; review activity already undertaken should be considered to see if it could satisfy some or all of the proposed requirements. There was support from SA for the development of national standards in AEC review given the varied levels of state regulatory surveillance between states.

Concerns were raised about possible conflicts between the requirements of Freedom of Information legislation and the drive for transparency within research and confidentiality requirements of AECs. Specific examples regarding “commercial in confidence” applications and the disclosure of personal details of applicants and AEC members were raised.

Clarification of the nature and extent of a Triennial Review was sought; would it focus on the processes of the AEC or make wider assessments?

#### 2. Annual Reporting

The Code should give guidance on what should be included in annual reports. The group felt that the effort required to complete and process annual reports should be comparable across institutions and jurisdictions. Reports should be concise. Most members of the group were satisfied with the operations of their annual reporting systems: almost all used a pro forma report, required reports on the anniversary of approval, reviewed the paperwork at routine AEC meetings and used a reminder system with suspension of approvals for non-compliance.

#### 3. Independent Members

Some independent members expressed concerns about isolation and the technical difficulty of submitted papers. Contact with other independent members was deemed very valuable in terms of support. It was suggested that the Code should include a “Job Description” for C and D members and direct institutions to offer support with specific reference to independent members, for example in funding external members to attend meetings such as those organised by ANZCCART.

**Group 2:** Chaired by Dr Sue Peirce, Veterinary Surgeon, St. Vincent’s Hospital, Melbourne.

The following topics were nominated for discussion:

- Monitoring
- Veterinary input
- Routine husbandry SOP’s
- Wildlife studies

Participants added other items – most were readily accepted by group. If there was much discussion this is indicated.

1. Page 9 - Definitions – pain, anxiety and suffering should be added.

2. Section 1.2 - insert '*potential*' before scientific
3. Section 2.2.31 - replace with '*Large institutions with multiple sites of animal care and use should consider the appointment of an animal welfare officer, full or part time, with veterinary qualifications or relevant experience. This person would be authorised by the AEC to ensure compliance with the Code and may be a source of general veterinary advice.*'
4. Section 3 – the following decisions were made, after considerable debate in an attempt to clarify the intent of this section:
  - 3.3.55 - add to paragraph "*as part of annual report*'
  - 3.3.56 - delete and replace with existing code paragraph 3.3.57
  - 1.3.59 & 3.3.60 - these statements should be combined.
5. Section 4.5.7 - delete "*these procedures should be submitted to AEC for approval.*" It was strongly felt routine husbandry would not be improved by a requirement for the AEC to approve SOP. This could discourage active and immediate improvements in animal welfare, increase the workload of the AEC for no perceived benefit, and undervalue the knowledge and experience of the animal carers. (One participant did not agree with this opinion but was not able to convince the others by argument).
6. Section 6.3.1 - delete as unworkable and covered by Codes of practice for livestock
7. Section 6.3.4 add to this sentence, "*from the activity*".
8. Sections dealing with wildlife: Wildlife procedures are limited in their scope and assume wildlife studies are field studies and do not include translocations, habitat modifications and re-introductions. Although these could be considered as 'husbandry' perhaps opportunities for research and refinement were being missed.

**Group 3: Chaired by Dr Kate Blaszak, Bureau of Animal Welfare, Victoria.**

The following six points were considered under the heading: "Scientific proposals and applications to Animal Ethics Committees".

1. PILOT PROJECTS: This was discussed in the context of adjunctive projects that may arise as a result of an existing project being carried out (which may provide a preliminary suggestion of a new hypothesis). If positively supported by this "adjunctive project"-full scientific evaluation (protocol etc) of a new hypothesis would then need to be applied for in the standard manner via the AEC etc. It was suggested that such an "adjunctive pilot project"- might be considered an addendum to the original application, thus not requiring a full AEC application process, but perhaps as a minor modification or a rapid review by an appropriate AEC member. Such a study- would not in theory require many animals and thus would not be attempting statistical significance- purely a preliminary investigation of a suspected hypothesis on a small scale. The ultimate aim of such a preliminary step would be to avoid unnecessary use of animals/ AEC application preparation and time if such a preliminary step was not supportive of the new hypothesis in question. Please note- this could perhaps come under minor modifications? Also, the above suggestion is to be differentiated from " a pilot study" as defined under Section 3.2.1.
2. SOPs: (Section 2.2.17). The relevant points of how these should be used, small modifications, review dates etc., were discussed. The Section was accepted as it stands.
3. WELFARE ISSUES ASSOCIATED WITH INADVERTENT TRAPPING OF NON-TARGET SPECIES- RE WILDLIFE STUDIES (Section 5.2.3). It was suggested that the following be included; " there should be a management plan for non-target species captured with compliance with relevant legislation".
4. POST OPERATIVE CARE (including sections 3.3.24, 1.18, 1.21 etc.). See guidelines for pain and distress under revision (as a large and detailed area).

5. DURATION OF APPROVAL/DENIAL OF APPLICATIONS THROUGH THE AEC:  
This is not prescribed in the Draft Code and is considered acceptable by the group, in that it is not prescriptive on a time scale regarding approval of scientific applications. The group felt that this was a matter for the individual management of AECs.
6. PLAIN ENGLISH: the group supported the requirement of plain English in light of the lay and technical members on each AEC.

**Group 4:** Chaired by Dr Denise Noonan, Animal Welfare Officer, Monash University.

Amongst the issues that had been previously flagged for discussion under the heading "Operations of AECs" were:

- Category E members of AECs- inclusion of the animal carer as a compulsory category
- Commercial conflicts
- AEC Workloads, delays and nit picking
- Turnover of membership of AECs (period or term of membership)
- Tools and statement of values to assist the AEC evaluate the justification and "cost-benefit analysis" of AEC projects
- Development of working or operating procedures for AECs
- Defining and achieving a quorate meeting
- Inspection and monitoring of facilities and fieldwork sites-delegation and agents

The group focused its discussions on two main issues: i) Category E membership of AECs, and ii) Monitoring of distant fieldwork sites. There were significant points of overlap between these two issues.

**1. Category E membership of AECs.**

The Code Liaison Group was strongly divided by this issue and had requested wide-ranging discussion on it. The points raised concerning the inclusion of an Animal Carer as a compulsory member of an AEC were:

- I. Requires attendance of Animal Carer in order to have a quorate meeting. The institution would be forced to ensure that a representative from the animal facility was available from the "coal face" where animal use was occurring. This enables the AEC to ask questions and to receive comments and reports from someone with day-to-day contact with the research animals. Although the AEC can monitor by way of investigator's reports and committee inspections, the viewpoint of the animal carer is invaluable. The presence of a person with day-to-day contact with the actual research animals was highly valued by the breakout group.
- II. Viewed by some as a conflict of interest as the animal carer may be put in the position of serving two or three masters- the investigator, the institution and the AEC. This type of argument could also be directed at any of the other member categories; therefore the group did not view this point as sufficient reason to reject the proposal to include the animal facility manager or animal carer as a compulsory category.
- III. Possible complication concerning the membership balance on the committee (the 1/3rd membership must be external C+D categories rule). As an animal carer is likely to be an institutional member, it may be necessary to appoint additional category C or D member(s) for balance. One suggestion was to appoint an "external" animal carer to the committee, however this meant that the important feedback on the day-to-day animal care and animal facility issues would be missing. Appointing additional C and D members to achieve the correct balance had the advantage of enabling a quorate meeting easier to achieve.

- IV. Inclusion of an additional compulsory member might make it more difficult to schedule and hold a quorate meeting. Appointing additional members for each Category may make it easier to achieve a quorate meeting. Alternately, the definition of a quorum may not require inclusion of the Category E member; just as it currently does not require inclusion of an Animal Ethics/Welfare Officer, Chair or Secretary.
- V. In some cases there may not be a person who could be identified as an animal carer with each project- especially for wildlife observation studies in the field where there was no animal facility. Requiring or defining the Category E member, as a person with animal facility responsibilities would be too limiting in these situations.
- VI. There need not be an animal carer identifiable for each project if the category E member is performing a role that is relevant to most of the projects conducted at or by an institution. If an institution has a number of animal facilities then more than one animal carer might be appointed as Category E member, and therefore input could be received on the majority of projects over time if one or more facility representative was present at each meeting.
- VII. In the case of institutions which ONLY conduct fieldwork projects, and have no animal facilities or regular fieldwork sites, the Category E member role might be performed by a person who is given the responsibility of monitoring the fieldwork projects and sites on behalf of the AEC. This could be an experienced wildlife biologist, or an Animal Welfare/Ethics Officer, if this was in accord with the spirit (or letter) of the Code in this particular situation.
- VIII. Depending on the wording of the Code with regard this category, there may be latitude to require an animal carer member to be compulsory in those institutions with animal facilities, and recommended but optional for those institutions which have no animal facilities or which conduct very few animal use projects.

In conclusion, the most highly valued aspect of the role of the Category E member was the input from someone in daily (or frequent) contact with the research animals in the projects considered and approved by the AEC. This role is a monitoring and reporting role. This person needed to be someone other than the investigator associated with the project, if at all possible. Two suggestions were made as to how these values might be expressed in the description of this membership category (Section 2.2.3):

1. Reword to strengthen. *“A person responsible for (with appropriate knowledge of?) the daily care of animals within the institution must attend AEC meetings”.*
2. Reword to make mandatory. *“A person responsible for (with appropriate knowledge of?) the daily care of animals within the institution must have membership of the AEC except where there is no institutional animal facility in which case this category does not apply”*

## 2. Monitoring fieldwork carried out at distant sites (Sections 2.2.27 – 2.2.32).

There was a consensus within the group that this was a difficulty experienced by many AECs from time to time. The difficulties arise from the lack of institutional resources to enable a representative from the AEC to travel to sites, which are either remote, or overseas. In many situations, personnel may not be in a position to travel to remote sites due to time constraints. For example, a journey to Antarctica to monitor a wildlife study might be a 6 month round trip.

The draft Code proposes that the AEC might appoint a delegate, or co-opt an independent person as an agent (e.g. Parks & Wildlife Ranger, local police officer). For this solution to be

successful, the delegate or agent would need to be trained in animal welfare, and would need to appreciate the concerns and issues raised by the AEC concerning the project.

The group agreed that it is desirable to give increased emphasis to monitoring of fieldwork, as these projects may be more visible to the public or may have aspects that are contentious. The group was not able to propose a solution to the problems of insufficient personnel time or institutional resources to support the monitoring role in all situations. However, it was suggested that the statements in the code relating to distant site monitoring be strengthened and extended.

Conclusion:

The group agreed that this issue was worthy of further development and deliberation by the Code Liaison Group.

**4. Concluding remarks** (Professor Mike Rickard)

Three issues were raised:

1. The key role played by Category C and D members in AECs should be continually emphasised. Over 50% of delegates at last years ANZCCART Conference belonged to these categories, suggesting that there is a strong desire for relevant knowledge and discussion amongst C and D members. Perhaps ANZCCART could develop a forum or some other means of providing support for C and, more particularly, D members.
2. There was a need amongst those who carry out research and teaching using animals, to receive formal training in animal ethics and animal welfare. Institutions could share resources in establishing appropriate training programmes.
3. In the longer term, the burden falling upon AECs may be reduced if a “culture of care” permeated more widely into the psyche of those who use animals for teaching and scientific purposes. A worthwhile goal is to move towards placing a greater reliance on individual care, rather than on legislation.

R.M.H.  
04/06/2003