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1 From the Chair

Society’s expectations about the welfare of animals, and the means for enhancing it, are constantly evolving. In undertaking its functions under the Animal Welfare Act 1999 the National Animal Ethics Advisory Committee (NAEAC) seeks to keep abreast of these changes and assist with constantly improving the culture of care amongst those who are involved with the use of live animals in research, testing and teaching.

To this end, NAEAC published a guide A Culture of Care for people working with animals in research, testing and teaching, namely scientists, technicians and teachers who use animals in their place of work and are responsible for their welfare. The guide emphasises that anyone responsible for the welfare of animals used in research, testing and teaching has a duty of care as defined under the Act. This duty involves more than the basics of animal care. A duty of care requires a genuine commitment to the welfare of animals, a respect for the contribution animals make to the works of scientists, researchers and teachers, and a commitment to their well-being beyond the minimum standard. It is based on the universally accepted principles of replacement, reduction and refinement (the Three Rs). These principles are the cornerstone of modern research and teaching practice involving animals.

In addition, a duty of care involves the prevention of undue pain or distress to animals when they are used for research, testing and teaching. Any potentially adverse effects of a manipulation should be anticipated by the researcher and all steps to avoid or minimise pain and distress should be foreshadowed and implemented.

It has been a practice for NAEAC to schedule some of its meetings to coincide with visits to code holding institutions. These visits are an opportunity for NAEAC members to familiarise themselves with the activities of code holding institutions. It is also an opportunity to exchange information with the staff and members of animal ethics committees. Such visits are valuable for many reasons. They often raise questions from staff and members of animal ethics committees which gives NAEAC an insight into the manner in which the Act is being implemented.

As a result of these visits, and other meetings and workshops held to assist animal ethics committee members in undertaking their responsibilities, NAEAC has published a good practice guide and a guide on codes of ethical conduct. These documents are designed to further assist those responsible for animals used in research, testing and teaching to adopt the highest standard of husbandry and animal care. Reference to both guides is made in this report.

The Good Practice Guide for the Use of Animals in Research, Testing and Teaching encompasses all aspects of the care and use of animals for scientific purposes in medicine, biology, agriculture, veterinary and other animal sciences, industry and teaching. It provides general principles for the care and use of animals, and specifies the responsibilities of investigators and teachers. There are guidelines for the humane conduct of experiments and for the acquisition of animals and their care. The Guide to Codes of Ethical Conduct was prepared to give direction to applicants on the preparation of a code of ethical conduct when making applications as required under the Act.

The use of NAEAC News has also been valuable in communicating NAEAC policy decisions and relevant information to animal ethics committees and interested parties. It was reassuring to learn that a recent readership survey revealed considerable support for this form of communication in terms of relevance and interest.

Mention is made in the annual report of independent reviews of code holders and their
animal ethics committees. This was a new matter for N A E A C, as was the accreditation of independent reviewers. The Act requires code holders to periodically engage an accredited reviewer to conduct a review, its purpose being to assess the extent to which the code holder and the animal ethics committee are complying with the Act, its regulations, and its code of ethical conduct.

N A E A C has been well-served by the staff of the Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry over the past year. Their advice and assistance has been timely, relevant and focused. I would like to thank our N A E A C members for their efforts over the past year and acknowledge the contribution of retiring member Mrs Jeanette Crosado. N A E A C members join me in paying tribute to the valued work of the late Dr Barry McPherson and his service to the Committee while he was a N A E A C member until May 2003.

Wyn Hoadley
Chairperson
2 New Zealand Animal Welfare Infrastructure

2.1 Legal Status of the Committee

The Animal Welfare Act 1999 came into effect on 1 January 2000. At that date NAEAC became a statutory committee with its functions and membership set in law. Prior to that, NAEAC had existed since 1984 as a committee that the Minister of Agriculture was required by the Animals Protection Act 1960 to establish, using powers under the Ministry of Agriculture and Fisheries Act 1953 and later the Ministries of Agriculture and Forestry (Restructuring) Act 1997.

2.2 Infrastructure

The diagram below illustrates New Zealand’s animal welfare infrastructure and the National Animal Ethics Advisory Committee’s role within that framework.
3 Functions

Section 63 of the Animal Welfare Act prescribes the following functions for NAEAC:

• advising the Minister on ethical and animal welfare issues arising from research, testing and teaching
• providing advice and information on the development and review of codes of ethical conduct
• making recommendations about the approval, amendment, suspension or revocation of codes of ethical conduct
• making recommendations concerning the setting of standards or policies for codes of ethical conduct
• providing information and advice to animal ethics committees
• making recommendations on the appointment of accredited reviewers
• considering the reports of independent reviews of code holders and animal ethics committees
• making recommendations about declaring procedures not to be manipulations (under section 3(3))
• making recommendations about the manipulation of non-human hominids (under section 85)
• making recommendations on the approval of research or testing in the national interest (under section 118(3)).

4 The Committee

4.1 Selection of Members

NAEAC members are appointed by the Minister of Agriculture in accordance with sections 64 and 65 of the Animal Welfare Act 1999. The committee has a maximum of 10 members, and a member’s term of office may not exceed three years, although members may be reappointed. Appointments are normally for a maximum of two terms, except in exceptional circumstances.

Under the transitional provisions of the Animal Welfare Act 1999, those individuals who were members of NAEAC when the Act came into force on 1 January 2000 continue in office until the expiry of their term of appointment.

While the Minister has the authority to appoint members, in recent years it has been the policy of successive governments to require appointments to statutory committees to be considered by the Cabinet Appointments and Honours Committee and the Cabinet.

In selecting members (other than the chairperson) the Minister is required to have regard to the following factors:

• the public interest in relation to the use of animals in research, testing and teaching;
• the need for balance between those involved in research, testing and teaching and those who are not; and
• the need for the committee to possess knowledge and experience in the following areas:
  – veterinary science
  – medical science
  – biological science
  – the commercial use of animals in research and testing
  – ethical standards and conduct in respect of animals
  – education issues, including the use of animals in schools
  – environmental and conservation management
  – animal welfare advocacy
  – any other area the Minister considers relevant.
4.2 Members

The table below lists members of the committee during 2002.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Members</th>
<th>Expiry of Appointment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mrs Wyn Hoadley LLB (Hon), MA, Dip Tchg, AMNZPI, Barrister (independent Chairperson)</td>
<td>31.10.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr A C David Bayvel BVMS, DTVM, MPP, MACVSc, MRCVS, Director Animal Welfare, MAFF Biosecurity Authority, Ministry of Agriculture &amp; Forestry nominee – ex officio</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mrs Barbara J Benson BSc, Dip Tchg, Director of Secondary Education and Senior Lecturer in Science, Dunedin College of Education (nominated by the Ministry of Education)</td>
<td>31.10.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mrs Jeanette Crosado Post-graduate Secretary, University of Otago Department of Medicine, Royal New Zealand Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals National Councillor (nominated by the RNZSPCA)</td>
<td>31.10.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr Simon C Malpas BSc (Hon), PhD, Associate Professor, Department of Physiology and Bioengineering Institute, University of Auckland (nominated by the Health Research Council of New Zealand)</td>
<td>31.10.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professor John Marbrook MSc, PhD, FRSNZ, Professor Emeritus, University of Auckland (nominated by the Royal Society of New Zealand)</td>
<td>31.10.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr W Barry McPherson BVSc, Manager, Veterinary Technical Services and Regulatory Affairs, Merial NZ Ltd (nominated by AGCARM)</td>
<td>31.10.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mrs Lynne M Milne BAgSci (Hon), Project Leader, Landcare Research New Zealand Ltd (nominated by Landcare Research New Zealand Ltd)</td>
<td>31.10.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr Kathleen H Parton BS, DVM, MS, Senior Lecturer, Institute of Veterinary, Animal and Biomedical Sciences, Massey University (nominated by the New Zealand Veterinary Association)</td>
<td>31.10.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mrs Jennifer M Prattley Shelter Manager and Personnel Co-ordinator, Canterbury Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals, Royal New Zealand Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals National Councillor (nominated by the RNZSPCA)</td>
<td>31.10.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mrs Joanna J Roberts Reg OT, rural tourism operator (nominated by Local Government New Zealand)</td>
<td>31.10.05</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

During 2002 Mrs Wyn Hoadley and Mrs Joanna Roberts were reappointed for further terms. Mrs Jeanette Crosado retired from the committee, having served two terms. She was replaced by Mrs Jenny Prattley.

4.3 Secretariat

Ms Kate Hellström (now Ms Kate Hellström-Park) took over from Mrs Kathryn McKinnon as the committee's secretary early in 2002. Mrs Pam Edwards, Ms Linda Carsons and Mrs Margaret Handscomb of the Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry's Biosecurity Authority assist with the work of the committee.

4.4 Deputy Chairperson

The Animal Welfare Act requires the committee to elect a deputy chairperson at the first meeting of each year. Professor Marbrook was, once again, elected to fulfill this role.
4.5 Fees

Government policy requires disclosure of fees paid to members of statutory boards and committees. The daily fee paid to committee members is $270 for members and $360 for the chairperson.

Members are paid the fee for attending meetings with an allowance of a half-day’s fee for preparation time. Members are also reimbursed for travelling expenses. In addition, the chairperson and, on occasion, other members may be paid additional fees for representing the committee at other meetings or for carrying out significant extra work on the committee’s behalf.

The table below lists the fees paid during 2002.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Member</th>
<th>Fees paid during 2002 (gross)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>W Hoadley</td>
<td>$4140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D Bayvel1</td>
<td>Nil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B Benson2</td>
<td>$2700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J Crosado</td>
<td>$3510</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S Malpas</td>
<td>$2430</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J Marbrook</td>
<td>$5670</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B McPherson3</td>
<td>Nil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L Milne</td>
<td>$3240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K Parton2</td>
<td>$1755</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J Prattley4</td>
<td>Nil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J Roberts</td>
<td>$2270</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Mr Bayvel is employed by the Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry and thus does not receive meeting fees.
2 Fees are paid directly to the member’s employer to recompense them for time lost from the member’s primary employment.
3 Merial NZ Ltd employees forego acceptance of meeting fees in accordance with company policy to act as a good corporate citizen and materially assist public good operations where practicable.
4 J Prattley was appointed to the committee late in 2002 and did not attend any meetings.

4.6 Operations

4.6.1 Meetings

NAEAC generally meets four times per year, although an additional meeting was scheduled during 2002 to deal specifically with applications for codes of ethical conduct to replace codes that were due to expire.

Temporary working groups are formed to deal with specific issues where necessary. Visitors to the meetings assist the committee with their special expertise or keep the committee informed of significant current developments.
4.6.2 Performance review

Since 1997, the committee has implemented a policy of undertaking an annual performance review. The committee has now adopted a review template that allows it to objectively measure its own performance over the preceding 12 months. The system provides members with an opportunity for considered reflection and debate on the way the committee operates.

The committee critically reviews its performance under the following headings:

- committee approach
- interface with MAF
- meetings
- communications.

A review was undertaken during 2002 and results were largely positive. The two-way benefits of undertaking visits to code holder organisations and interaction with animal ethics committees was emphasised.

4.2.3 Annual Reports

Since 2000, N A E A C has been required by law to provide the Minister of Agriculture with an annual report. In practice, the committee has been doing so for many years. A list of these reports and other relevant publications can be found in appendix 3.

4.2.4 Policy Manual

Policies of relevance to AECs will continue to be promulgated in N A E A C News. As a longer-term priority, N A E A C is developing a policy manual covering its operations and policy positions, primarily as a reference document for members.

5 Codes of Ethical Conduct

All organisations or individuals which manipulate live animals for the purposes of research, testing, teaching are required to do so in accordance with a code of ethical conduct recommended by the committee and approved by the Director-General of the Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry.

5.1 Transitional Arrangements for Codes of Ethical Conduct

Under the transitional provisions of the Animal Welfare Act, all those codes that were approved and in force on 31 December 1999 continue to have approval for a limited period under the new legislation. Similarly, formal arrangements by organisations/individuals to use another organisation’s code and animal ethics committee remain in force for a specific period also.

The table below sets out the expiry provisions for transitional codes:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date of approval of original code of ethical conduct</th>
<th>Expiry date of code under the transitional provisions of the Animal Welfare Act</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>On or before 31.12.90</td>
<td>31.12.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1.91 – 31.12.94</td>
<td>31.12.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On or after 1.1.95</td>
<td>31.12.04</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Where there is an arrangement to use another organisation’s code, the arrangement is deemed to cease on the date that the code expires.

All code holders and all those who have an arrangement to use a code have been notified of the expiry date of their code or arrangement.
To continue to operate, code holders will have to submit a new code to MAF for approval. This code will have to comply with the provisions of the Animal Welfare Act. It must be accompanied by the report of an independent reviewer, accredited by MAF for the purpose, on the operation of the code of ethical conduct and the animal ethics committee. MAF is required to consult NAEAC on all such applications.

5.2 Requirements of the Animal Welfare Act

From 1 January 2000, new participants in animal research, testing and teaching have been required to follow the provisions of the Animal Welfare Act, which differ somewhat from those of the previous legislation.

Under the Animal Welfare Act, codes of ethical conduct may be approved by the Director-General of MAF, as can amendments, suspensions or revocations of approvals. Except in the case of suspension or revocation at the request of the code holder, NAEAC must be consulted before a decision is made.

For those wanting to use another organisation’s code and animal ethics committee, this requires the parties concerned to reach an agreement and for MAF to be notified of the arrangement, in writing, before any manipulations take place. Termination of the arrangement should also be notified to MAF. Such arrangements, or terminations thereof, are not published in the Gazette.

In addition, while major amendments to codes must be approved by MAF, minor amendments may be made by code holders. However, MAF must be provided with written details of the amendments as soon as practicable after the end of the calendar year in which they were made (and no later than 31 March of the succeeding year). Minor amendments are described in the Animal Welfare Act as ones ‘that would not materially affect the purposes of the code’.

5.3 Activity during 2002

The table below outlines the applications processed and notifications made during 2002.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Approvals of new codes</th>
<th>10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Notifications of arrangements to use an existing code</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approvals of amendments to codes</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notifications of minor amendments to a code</td>
<td>Nil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revocations of approved codes or arrangements to use a code</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terminations of a notified arrangement to use an existing code</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Codes expired and not renewed</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arrangements to use an existing code lapsed</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2002 saw an increase in activity. This is attributed to three factors:

- the first group of codes in place prior to the Animal Welfare Act expired and, in most cases, applications for new codes were made
- a number of organisations with arrangements to use an existing code let the arrangement lapse because it was no longer required
- a number of organisations with arrangements to use an existing code changed code holders for various reasons.

Since 2000, in order to heighten awareness of the entire process, details of all codes approved or revoked and arrangements notified or terminated are published in NAEAC News and Biosecurity.
5.4 Approvals in Force

The following table gives details of the number of approvals in force as at 31 December 2002.

| Number of organisations with an approved code | 87 |
| Number of approvals in force | 89 |
| Number of animal ethics committees (AECs) established | 40 |
| Number of organisations using another organisation's AEC | 51 |

It should be noted that two organisations have two approvals in force: one uses a different AEC for different types of projects, the other is in the process of changing the AEC it uses. In addition, some organisations have more than one animal ethics committee (AEC). This usually occurs where work is carried out at more than one campus/location.

Appendix 1 lists the organisations with an approved code as at 31 December 2002 and indicates those which have their own animal ethics committee(s). Appendix 2 lists those organisations whose codes of ethical conduct have been revoked, most commonly because their activities no longer necessitate a code or after company/organisational mergers where both parties had a code (69 at 31 December 2002).

It is important to note that the Animal Welfare Act contains a provision that approval of a code is personal to the code holder and not transferable without the consent of the Director-General of MAF. Thus, if a company changes its name as a result of a sale or merges with another entity, this has the legal effect of revoking the code of ethical conduct approval unless the assignment or transfer is effected with the Director-General’s consent. This consent is not given retrospectively.

5.5 Approvals Not Made by Animal Ethics Committees

5.5.1 Non-human Hominids

The Animal Welfare Act precludes the use of non-human hominids for the purposes of research, testing and teaching unless it is carried out with the approval of the Director-General of the Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry and in accordance with any conditions imposed by the Director-General.

The Director-General is required to consult NAEAC before exercising the powers under these provisions. Furthermore, the Director-General may not approve such research, testing or teaching unless satisfied that the use of the non-human hominid is in the best interests of that hominid or that it is in the interests of that species and the benefits to the species outweigh any harm to the individual animal.

No research, testing or teaching involving non-human hominids was approved by the Director-General during 2002.

5.5.2 Research or Testing in the National Interest

The Minister of Agriculture may authorise research or testing without the approval of an animal ethics committee where the Minister is satisfied that such research or testing is necessary in the national interest.

In reaching a decision, the Minister is required to take into account whether the research or testing:

- is necessary to protect New Zealand’s biosecurity interests;
- relates to New Zealand’s international obligations;
- is necessary to protect human or animal health.

Unless exercising emergency powers under other statutes, the Minister is required to consult NAEAC before making a decision. No research or testing in the national interest was approved by the Minister during 2002.
6 Animal Ethics Committees

6.1 Communication with Animal Ethics Committees

6.1.1 Visits

NAEAC generally schedules some of its meetings to coincide with visits to code holding institutions. In 2002 it visited code holders in the Hutt Valley in conjunction with the July meeting. NAEAC members value the opportunity to meet with those involved in research, testing and teaching and those serving on, or administering, animal ethics committees.

6.1.2 Newsletters

NAEAC continues to publish NAEAC News to communicate policy decisions, relevant information and items of interest to AECs and other interested parties. Sufficient copies of each issue of NAEAC News are sent to all AECs to ensure that each AEC member receives an individual copy. However, the onus remains on recipient organisations to ensure that others within the organisation to whom the publication is relevant (e.g., researchers, teachers, animal care staff, senior executives) do, in fact, have ready access to it.

Two issues of NAEAC News were published in 2002 (Nos. 17 and 18). For a complete list, see appendix 3.

NAEAC was also presented with the results of a readership survey carried out on NAEAC News recipients the previous year. A high proportion of recipients find the newsletter to be relevant and interesting. The number of readers who obtained an article, book or video, visited a website or registered for a conference as a result of something they read was also pleasing.

Another mechanism for communication with AECs is the MAF Biosecurity Authority publication Biosecurity. This six-weekly publication is distributed to those with an interest in animal, plant and forest biosecurity issues and animal welfare. It contains articles that are likely to be of interest and relevance to animal ethics committees.

6.1.3 Conferences

From time to time various NAEAC members, or members of the secretariat, attend conferences of relevance to the committee’s work. Information and proceedings from such conferences is circulated or its availability publicised for the benefit of NAEAC and others involved in the use of animals in research, testing and teaching.

During 2002, the following conferences were attended:

- Australian Veterinary Association Conference, Research, Ethics & Teaching stream, Adelaide, Australia, May 2002;
- New Zealand Veterinary Association Conference, Hamilton, June 2002;
- SciCon 2002, Biennial Conference of the New Zealand Association of Science Educators, Auckland, July 2002;
- Fourth World Congress on Alternatives and Animal Use in the Life Sciences, New Orleans, USA, August 2002;
- Australian and New Zealand Council for the Care of Animals in Research and Teaching Conference, ‘Animal Welfare and Animal Ethics Committees: Where are the Goalposts Now?’, Surfer’s Paradise, Australia, October 2002;
6.2 Assistance for Animal Ethics Committees

6.2.1 Workshops for Animal Ethics Committee Members

During April and May 2002, NAEAC, in conjunction with the Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry, held a series of one-day workshops entitled ‘Expanding Horizons for AECs’. The workshops were for members of AECs, the external members in particular, and were held in Auckland, Hamilton, Palmerston North, Wellington and Christchurch. A total of about 125 people took part, including:

- lay people
- animal welfare organisation nominees
- veterinarians
- scientists
- animal technicians
- animal ethics committee secretaries.

Topics covered included:

- the Three Rs and humane science
- protocol approval and a culture of care
- the sort of questions to ask in reviewing a protocol
- lay member support
- the role of technicians
- the value of animal models
- duties and responsibilities.

Attendees were asked to provide feedback on the workshops. All respondents thought the workshop material was relevant and aided them in their role with the AEC, with 57% reporting that the workshop had increased their confidence and understanding of AEC responsibilities.

A number of worthwhile suggestions were made for future workshops.

6.2.2 Guide on Codes of Ethical Conduct

This guide, to assist those who need to draft a code of ethical conduct that meets the requirements of the Animal Welfare Act, was published in May 2002.

See appendix 3 for availability details.

6.2.3 Good Practice Guide for the Use of Animals in Research, Testing and Teaching

As foreshadowed in last year’s report, this publication was issued by the National Animal Ethics Advisory Committee in September 2002. It aims to encourage those responsible for animals used in research, testing and teaching to adopt the highest standard of husbandry and animal care.

See appendix 3 for availability details.

6.2.4 A Culture of Care

This publication, subtitled ‘A guide for people working with animals in research, testing and teaching’, was produced last year by the National Animal Ethics Advisory Committee for scientists, technicians and teachers who use animals in their work and are responsible for their welfare.

See appendix 3 for availability details.
6.3 Independent Reviews of Animal Ethics Committees

As indicated in last year’s report, the Animal Welfare Act 1999 makes independent reviews of code holders and their animal ethics committees mandatory. Reviews must take place within two years of code approval for new code holders and prior to the expiry of the code for existing code holders who wish to renew their code approval. The first reviews in the latter category were due by 31 December 2002 while the first review for a new code holder will be due early in 2003.

Reviews may only be carried out by people who have been accredited by the Director-General of the Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry to carry out such reviews.

At the time the 2002 reviews were scheduled, two reviewers had been accredited. Twelve organisations were originally scheduled for reviews but two decided to allow their codes to lapse and another two decided that the volume of work undertaken no longer warranted the organisation having a code of their own. These organisations made arrangements to use the code and animal ethics committee of another code holder. Thus, eight reviews were conducted.

Both NAEAC and the Director-General of MAF are supplied with a copy of reviewers’ final reports (as required by the Animal Welfare Act). NAEAC’s role is to take the report into account when considering the recommendation it will make to the Director-General on applications for a new code of ethical conduct. It is MAF’s responsibility to determine whether the results of the review are satisfactory or unsatisfactory and to determine what steps the code holder must take to achieve a satisfactory level of compliance.

Reports also contain non-binding recommendations from the reviewer that code holders may find useful.

Informal feedback from reviewers and code holders indicates that both parties found the experience to be a positive one. Reviewers described code holders as well prepared, keen to comply with the requirements and the spirit of the Act and welcoming of feedback and suggestions. All organisations have demonstrated a willingness to address issues and recommendations highlighted by the reviewers.
7 The Year's Issues

7.1 Genetically-modified Animals
NAEAC’s policy statement, ‘The production of genetically modified animals’ was finalised and distributed to animal ethics committees in June 2002.

7.2 Commercial Cloning
The issue of the commercial cloning of animals was raised with NAEAC early in 2002. Recent advances mean that there are a number of potential applications in cloning technology, from rapid multiplication of desired livestock to wildlife conservation. NAEAC sought a legal opinion on whether the commercial cloning of animals is covered by the research, testing and teaching provisions (Part 6) of the Animal Welfare Act 1999.

The opinion determined that cloning for commercial gain, using methods that were no longer experimental or investigative, would not fall within Part 6 of the Act.

NAEAC established a small subcommittee to consider the implications of this and eventually concluded “that the welfare of animals resulting from commercial cloning by an established process, used routinely, is fully covered by the general provisions of the Animal Welfare Act 1999, although it does not fall within the research, testing and teaching (part 6) provisions”.

7.3 Prescription Animal Remedy Use
There are a number of animal remedies that may be used only by a veterinarian or under veterinary supervision. However, scientists in research establishments also use these prescription animal remedies (PARs). The Royal Society of New Zealand’s Code of Practice for the Use of Veterinary and Human Medicines in Research, Testing and Teaching Organisations was approved under section 28 of the Agricultural Compounds and Veterinary Medicines Act 1997 in December 2002. It facilitates the use of human and veterinary medicines by research, testing and teaching organisations in order to comply with relevant legislation such as the Agricultural Compounds and Veterinary Medicines Act 1997, the Misuse of Drugs Act 1975, the Medicines Act 1981 and the Hazardous Substances and New Organisms Act 1996.

7.4 Inspectors Appointed under the Animal Welfare Act 1999
The Animal Welfare Act may be enforced by the Police or by inspectors appointed for that purpose under the Animal Welfare Act. Such inspectors may be Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry staff or from an ‘approved organisation’. Organisations approved to date are the Royal New Zealand Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals and the Animal Welfare Institute of New Zealand.

The use of animals in research, testing and teaching is a specialist area governed by a specific and separate part of the Animal Welfare Act (Part 6). Last year it was reported that MAF had been reviewing the role of inspectors enforcing Part 6 of the Act to determine whether or not specialist inspectors were needed for this area. NAEAC and approved organisations were consulted by MAF on various options for dealing with enforcement of Part 6.

MAF’s decision was that all inspectors would continue to have the power to investigate complaints regarding the welfare of animals in research, testing and teaching institutions. To assist in such investigations, a set of procedures and guidelines was developed in consultation with approved organisations and the MAF Special Investigation Group.
7.5 Killing as a Manipulation

The Animal Welfare Act 1999 specifically excludes humane killing of animals for the purposes of undertaking research, testing and teaching on the dead animal or its tissues from the definition of 'manipulation'. Thus approval from an animal ethics committee to undertake such work is not legally required, although it may be an ‘in-house’ requirement in some organisations.

The rationale for this is that animals are killed for a variety of purposes (e.g. food production or because they are unwanted) and killing them for research purposes is essentially no different.

Prior to the Act coming into force in 2000, NAEAC recommended to the Minister of Agriculture that killing animals for research, testing and teaching purposes should be included in the definition of manipulation. The Minister declined to seek an amendment at that time but indicated a willingness to reconsider the matter if the issue continued to generate concern after the Act had been in force for a period.

NAEAC has discussed the issue from time to time and remains of the view that killing animals for research, testing and teaching should require ethical approval (and inclusion in statistics).

NAEAC expects to make a formal recommendation to the Minister on this matter in 2003.

7.6 Official Information Act 1982

The Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry and some code holders are subject to the Official Information Act 1982. The Act is based on the principle of availability i.e. that information should be made available unless there is good reason for withholding it. The Act sets out what those reasons are.

If information requested is withheld, the applicant has a right to make a complaint to the Office of the Ombudsman. Two particular cases of relevance to animal ethics committees were determined by the Ombudsman in 2002. One related to a request to AgResearch Ltd for the names of animal ethics committee members. The Ombudsman upheld AgResearch’s decision not to release members’ names on the basis of section 6(c) of the Act – that is releasing the information would be likely to prejudice the maintenance of the law, including the prevention, investigation and detection of offences. The other case related to a request to MAF to identify code holders that manipulated guinea pigs and to identify code holders that reported animals in the severe suffering or very severe suffering categories. MAF’s decision was upheld on the grounds of section 9(2)(g)(ii) of the Official Information Act. MAF’s decision covered protection from improper pressure or harassment.

MAF, however, released the information submitted by those organisations which had no objection to its release and provided the applicant with the number of code holders which reported animals in the severe/very severe suffering categories and the number of code holders which reported manipulating guinea pigs.

Further details on these cases can be found in issue 19 of NAEAC News.
7.7 Accredited Reviewers

As indicated in section 6.3, independent reviews may only be carried out by reviewers accredited by MAF for the purpose. In accrediting reviewers, MAF must be satisfied that the applicant is 'a fit and proper person to conduct reviews' having regard to the person's competence, character and reputation, and ability to maintain an appropriate degree of impartiality and independence.

A list of reviewers appears in appendix 4. When additional reviewers become accredited, their names are published in NAEAC News and Biosecurity.

MAF has prepared the following documentation:

- Accreditation of Independent Reviewers
- Performance Standards for Independent Reviews of Code Holders and Animal Ethics Committees
- Checklists for the Review of Code Holders and Animal Ethics Committees.

In addition MAF's Compliance Team, part of the Special Investigation Group, is required to audit that each reviewer meets the performance criteria within the first year of accreditation and every three years thereafter.

At NAEAC's suggestion, after the 2002 reviews were completed, arrangements were made to have discussions with reviewers and representatives of MAF and NAEAC to obtain feedback on the process. This was scheduled for early 2003.

7.8 Liaison with Other Bodies

7.8.1 National Animal Welfare Advisory Committee

The committee needs to maintain a close association with the activities of the National Animal Welfare Advisory Committee (NAWAC). This inter-committee liaison is facilitated by NAEAC's chairperson being an ex officio member of NAWAC.

7.8.2 Australian and New Zealand Council for the Care of Animals in Research and Teaching

NAEAC has continued to liaise with ANZCCART over relevant issues.

7.8.3 Bioethics Council

NAEAC noted with interest the appointment of members to the Bioethics Council in December 2002 and looks forward to developing an appropriate relationship with the council.
8 Statistics

All code holders are required to keep records specified in the Animal Welfare (Records and Statistics) Regulations 1999 in a readily accessible manner. (For record keeping purposes, the term ‘code holder’ includes any person or organisation that has made arrangements to use an existing code and animal ethics committee.)

The records must be retained for a period of five years after the year to which they relate and an annual return of the figures for the previous calendar year must be submitted to the Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry by 31 January each year. In addition, the regulations empower the Director-General of MAF or any inspector appointed under the Animal Welfare Act to obtain copies of records or details from them at any time.

The regulations provide penalties for non-compliance, including late submission of returns or supplying false or misleading figures.

As the statistics are collected by MAF, NAEAC raised with MAF the issue of whether the NAEAC annual report was the appropriate vehicle for publishing the statistical summaries. The Director-General of MAF expressed the view that this is an appropriate and efficient way of disseminating the information and asked that NAEAC continue to include it in its annual report.

8.1 Animal Usage

The year showed a decrease in the number of animals manipulated – from 318,583 in 2001 to 263,684 in 2002. This figure includes 474 unborn mammals and 2454 birds prior to hatching.

The animal types most commonly used in 2002 were mice, cattle, fish, and sheep. Apart from 1999, when birds replaced fish, these species, in varying orders, have been the most commonly used since 1995.

The numbers of various species manipulated fluctuate from year to year. While there was a 17% decrease overall in 2002 compared with 2001, this was not evenly spread across species. The two biggest decreases in percentage terms were for possums and fish. As more fish were used in research, testing and teaching last year than any other species, this also represents a large drop in absolute numbers of fish used.

In respect to percentage increases, the largest were in the numbers of miscellaneous species (namely cephalopods/crustacea), marine mammals and reptiles manipulated.
Whereas last year the largest number of animals were captured, this year most came from breeding units or farms. This reflects the decrease in the number of fish manipulated, as a large proportion of these are captured.

8.2 Source of Animals

Animal users are required to report on the source of the animals manipulated according to specified categories. The table below shows the percentage of animals that came from each source.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of animals</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Breeding units</td>
<td>35.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial sources</td>
<td>16.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farms</td>
<td>26.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Born during project</td>
<td>5.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Captured</td>
<td>15.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imported</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public sources</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Whereas last year the largest number of animals were captured, this year most came from breeding units or farms. This reflects the decrease in the number of fish manipulated, as a large proportion of these are captured.

8.3 Status of Animals

Animal users are required to categorise the status of the animals they use.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Status of animals</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Normal</td>
<td>88.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPF/germ free</td>
<td>4.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diseased</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transgenic/genetically modified</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protected species</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unborn/prehatched</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The percentage of transgenic/genetically modified animals reported increased marginally although the actual number dropped from 1556 in 2001 to 1510 in 2002. This is the smallest number of genetically modified animals reported in the last six years.

8.4 Outcome

Appendix 3 shows animal use by species and the percentage of animals that died or were destroyed during, or after, manipulations. Usually about half of the animals used die or are destroyed during or after the manipulation. The figure for 2002 (51%) reflects this pattern.

Miscellaneous species used in 2002 include cephalopods/crustacea (90% of the miscellaneous species total), stoats, ferrets, bats, wallabies, hedgehogs and otters. All the cephalopods/crustacea were reported as used for basic biological research.
8.5 Organisation Type

Appendix 4 shows animal usage by organisation type and the pie chart below depicts this information graphically. The top three user groups were (in order) commercial, crown research institutes and universities. The main change was the large decrease in the government sector, which last year was inflated by large piscicide trials.

8.6 Animal Re-use

Only 4.9% of animals used in projects reported in 2002 had been used before. This compares with 2.3% in 2001, 17% in 2000 and 5% in 1999. Livestock such as sheep, cattle and goats are more likely to be reused than rodents. Amphibia and reptiles had particularly high rates of re-use in 2002. While this was true for amphibia in 2001, there was almost no re-use of reptiles that year.

8.7 Purpose of Manipulation

Organisations provide information on the purpose of the manipulation. The table on page 23 shows the breakdown and compares the figures with those reported last year.
The most marked change is the huge decrease in animals used for environmental management purposes. Once again, this is attributable due to the large piscicide trials undertaken in 2001.

Other noteworthy changes are in the number of animals used in basic biological research and medical research.

8.8 Grading of Animal Manipulations

Animal manipulations are graded according to the following five-point severity scale:

- a manipulation that causes no stress or pain or virtually no stress or pain (‘no suffering or virtually no suffering’)
- a manipulation that causes stress or pain of a minor intensity for a short duration (‘little suffering’)
- a manipulation that causes stress or pain of a minor intensity for a long duration or of a moderate intensity for a short duration (‘moderate suffering’)
- a manipulation that causes stress or pain of a moderate intensity for a long duration or of a severe intensity for a short duration (‘severe suffering’)
- a manipulation that causes stress or pain of a severe intensity for a long duration or of a very severe intensity for any duration (‘very severe suffering’).

Appendix 5 summarises this information by species. The figures indicate that 78% of animals experienced no or little suffering (34.7% of animals experienced ‘no suffering’, 43.6% experienced ‘little suffering’, 15.7% experienced ‘moderate suffering’, 1.1% experienced ‘severe suffering’ and 4.9% experienced ‘very severe suffering’). The number of animals in the ‘severe’ and ‘very severe’ suffering categories combined (6%) is similar to last year’s figure (5.4% in 2001) but significantly lower than in the previous two years (14.7% in 2000 and 10.6% in 1999).

### Manipulation Grading of Animals Used in 2002

The vast majority of animals in the ‘very severe suffering’ category were mice. Other species were cattle, fish and guinea pigs.
8.9 NAEAC Comment

In considering the annual animal use statistics, it is important to emphasise that every manipulation having a high negative animal welfare impact must be supported by a strong cost benefit justification. The justification is individually assessed and approved by the appropriate institutional animal ethics committee (all of which contain three external members) before the work may proceed. The final approval of a research proposal is often the result of a significant iterative process and every animal ethics committee benefits from the input and perspective of the three external independent members. N A E A C , as such, plays no role in the decision making process.

NAEAC will continue to promote the concepts of humane science and the Three Rs and to actively pursue specific initiatives that contribute to those strategic goals. These include:

- maintaining contacts with ‘Alternatives Centres’ in Europe and North America;
- actively participating in the triennial international Congress on Alternatives and the Use of Animals in the Life Sciences;
- drawing attention to state of the art articles on alternatives and the Three Rs in NAEAC News;
- sponsoring conferences on humane science;
- sponsoring workshops on pain control and its amelioration;
- encouraging regulatory acceptance of alternative non-animal tests where and when applicable;
- encouraging the use of non-animal teaching programmes;
- distributing copies of the publications ANZCCART News and RDS News to all animal ethics committees;
- secondment of New Zealand personnel to the Home Office to gain experience in the United Kingdom animal research regulatory system.

Although the New Zealand animal use statistics collection system is recognised as one of the most comprehensive in the world, N A E A C will continue to pursue refinements and improvements.

In N A E A C ‘s experience, in all projects associated with moderate, severe or very severe suffering, all possible steps are taken to reduce or ameliorate the negative animal welfare impact. Those steps include a high level of veterinary care where practical, pre- and post-operative pain relief where appropriate and removal from the study or euthanasia immediately the research objective is achieved.

8.10 The Three Rs

New Zealand examples of the successful implementation of the principles of replacement, reduction and refinement of the use of live animals in research, testing and teaching that have come to N A E A C ‘s attention include:

- the use of demonstrations rather than ‘hands on’ practicals with the reticulation of records to students at work stations in undergraduate teaching programmes;
- the development of accurate mathematical models of electrical activity of the heart;
- the development of equipment for remote wireless monitoring of the cardiovascular system;
- the use of cell culture methods to develop, test and characterise potential cancer treatment drugs isolated from sponges;
- ongoing development of a tissue culture veterinary vaccine, which replaces the use of animals in the vaccine production process;
- ongoing development of computer teaching models to replace the use of animals in undergraduate teaching programmes.

Readers of this report are invited to provide any further examples for inclusion in next year’s annual report to Ms Linda Carsons, Senior Policy Advisor Animal Welfare, at the address on the inside cover page or email naeac@maf.govt.nz
9 Strategic Plan

The committee reviewed its strategic plan in 1995, 1998 and 2002. Operational plans are developed each year based on the strategic plan.
APPENDIX 1

Organisations with an Approved Code of Ethical Conduct or with Notified Arrangements to Use an Approved Code (As at 31 December 2002)

*Use another organisation’s animal ethics committee

AgResearch Ltd (3 AECs)
Ruakura Agricultural Centre
Private Bag 3123
HAMILTON

*Agri-Feeds Ltd
Tasman Quay
P O Box 4180
MOUNT MANGANUI SOUTH

‘AgriQuality NZ Ltd
P O Box 182
WANGANUI

*AgVax Developments Ltd
P O Box 40-882
UPPER HUTT

AGVET Consultants Ltd
P O Box 46153
Herne Bay
AUCKLAND 1030

Ambreed New Zealand Ltd
P O Box 176
HAMILTON

Ancare New Zealand Ltd
P O Box 36-240
Northcote
NORTH SHORE CITY

*Ancrum Consultancies
18 Vanderbilt Place
Halswell
CHRISTCHURCH

*Animal Health Centre
P O Box 21
MORRINSVILLE

Animal Health Services Centre
Massey University
Private Bag 11-222
PALMERSTON NORTH

*Auckland University of Technology
Private Bag 92 006
AUCKLAND 1020

Auckland Zoological Park
Private Bag, Grey Lynn
AUCKLAND 1

*Baker, Allan J
Centre for Biodiversity & Conservation Biology
Royal Ontario Museum
Toronto
CANADA M5S 2C6

Bay of Plenty Polytechnic
Private Bag TG 12-001
TAURANGA

*Bayer NZ Ltd
P O Box 2825
AUCKLAND

Bomac Laboratories Ltd
P O Box 76-369
MANUKAU CITY

*Caledonian Holdings Ltd
PO Box 82
Takanini
SOUTH AUCKLAND

*Captec (NZ) Ltd
P O Box 75340
Manurewa
MANUKAU CITY

Christchurch Polytechnic Institute of Technology
P O Box 540
CHRISTCHURCH

Crown Research Institutes
Palmerston North Campus

C/- AgResearch
Grasslands Research Centre
Private Bag 11-008
PALMERSTON NORTH

Department of Conservation
P O Box 10-420
WELLINGTON

*Dexcel Ltd
Private Bag 3123
HAMILTON

Diatranz Ltd
P O Box 23-566
Hunters Corner
AUCKLAND

*Duirs NZ Ltd
P O Box 959
HAMILTON

*Elanco Animal Health
9 Gladding Place
MANUKAU CITY
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Company Name</th>
<th>Address</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ethical Agents Ltd</td>
<td>P O Box 97-110, South Auckland Mail Centre, AUCKLAND</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Falkirk Scientific Foundation Ltd</td>
<td>Mairoa Road, PIOPIO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fort Dodge NZ Ltd</td>
<td>Private Bag 92-903, AUCKLAND</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Genesis Research &amp; Development Corporation Ltd</td>
<td>P O Box 50, Parnell, AUCKLAND</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Green Lane &amp; National Women's Hospitals</td>
<td>Green Lane West, AUCKLAND 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Hillcrest High School</td>
<td>P O Box 11-020, HAMILTON</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Horticulture &amp; Food Research Institute of NZ Ltd</td>
<td>Private Bag 3123, HAMILTON</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HyClone New Zealand Ltd</td>
<td>P O Box 658, TAURANGA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Immuno-Chemical Products Ltd</td>
<td>P O Box 1607, AUCKLAND 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*ImmunoEthical Associates (NZ) Ltd</td>
<td>Crofton Park, 4 Marshs Road, CHRISTCHURCH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Impian Technologies Ltd</td>
<td>P O Box 17263, WELLINGTON</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Institute of Environmental Science &amp; Research Ltd</td>
<td>Private Bag 92021, AUCKLAND</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*InterAg (DEC International NZ Ltd)</td>
<td>P O Box 20-055, HAMILTON</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Intervet Ltd</td>
<td>702/9 Hopetoun Street, AUCKLAND</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Invitrogen NZ Ltd</td>
<td>P O Box 12-502, Penrose, AUCKLAND 1135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Karori Reservoir Wildlife Trust Inc</td>
<td>P O Box 9267, WELLINGTON</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Kiwi Ingenuity Ltd</td>
<td>PO Box 39373, Howick, AUCKLAND</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landcare Research NZ Ltd</td>
<td>P O Box 69, LINCOLN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lincoln University</td>
<td>P O Box 94, Lincoln University, CANTERBURY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Livestock Improvement Corporation Ltd</td>
<td>Private Bag 3016, HAMILTON</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Massey University</td>
<td>Private Bag 11-222, PALMERSTON NORTH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Merial NZ Ltd</td>
<td>P O Box 76211, MANUKAU CITY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Ministry of Agriculture &amp; Forestry National Centre for Disease Investigation</td>
<td>P O Box 40-742, UPPER HUTT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Institute of Water &amp; Atmospheric Research Ltd</td>
<td>P O Box 8602, Riccarton, CHRISTCHURCH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nelson Polytechnic</td>
<td>Richmond Campus, NELSON</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Neuronz Ltd</td>
<td>PO Box 9923, Newmarket, AUCKLAND</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Zealand Forest Research Institute</td>
<td>P O Box 3020, Rotorua</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Novartis NZ Ltd</td>
<td>Private Bag 19-980, Avondale, AUCKLAND</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
*Nufarm Ltd
P O Box 75340
Manurewa
MANUKAU CITY

*Otago Polytechnic
Private Bag 1910
DUNEDIN

*P A Biologicals NZ
Taupara Station, R D 12
HAVELOCK NORTH

*P J McNaughton Family Trust
R D 1
HUNTLY

*Parnell Laboratories NZ Ltd
P O Box 58502
Greenmount
AUCKLAND

*Pest Control Research Ltd
P O Box 7223
CHRISTCHURCH

*Pest-Tech Ltd
P O Box 40
LEESTON

PharmVet Solutions
PO Box 46153
Herne Bay
AUCKLAND

*Plade Holdings Ltd
Private Bag 3203
HAMILTON

*Pyne Gould Guinness Ltd
PO Box 3100
CHRISTCHURCH

RisqA Veterinary Consulting
PO Box 6014
PALMERSTON NORTH

*Samuel Marsden Collegiate School
Marsden Ave
Private Bag
WELLINGTON

Schering-Plough Animal Health Ltd
Private Bag 908
UPPER HUTT

*Slacek, Brigitte
23 Karina Terrace
PALMERSTON NORTH

South Pacific Sera Ltd
Blue Cliffs Station
R D 24, St Andrews
SOUTH CANTERBURY

Southern Institute of Technology
Private Bag 90-114
INVERCARGILL

*Tatua Co-operative Dairy Co Ltd
Main Road
Tatuauui
R D 4
MORRINSVILLE

*Tompkins, Daniel M
Department of Zoology
University of Otago
PO Box 56
DUNEDIN

*Unitec Institute of Technology
Private Bag 92025
AUCKLAND

University of Auckland
Private Bag 92-019
AUCKLAND

University of Canterbury
Private Bag 4800
CHRISTCHURCH

University of Otago (3 AECs)
P O Box 913
DUNEDIN

University of Waikato
Private Bag 3105
HAMILTON

*Venous Supplies 1990 Ltd
P O Box 26
TUAKAU

Victoria University of Wellington
P O Box 600
WELLINGTON

*Virionyx Corporation Ltd
P O Box 91-806
AUCKLAND

Waikato Institute of Technology
Private Bag 3036
HAMILTON 2020

*Wakefield Gastroenterology Research Trust
Private Bag 7909
WELLINGTON SOUTH

*Wanganui Veterinary Services Ltd
PO Box 911
WANGANUI

*Wool Research Organisation of New Zealand
P O Box 4749
CHRISTCHURCH

*Wrightson Research
P O Box 939
CHRISTCHURCH

*Zenith Technology Corp Ltd
P O Box 1777
DUNEDIN
APPENDIX 2

Codes of Ethical Conduct Revoked and Notified Arrangements Terminated (As at 31 December 2002)

- Agrimm Biologicals Ltd
- Agriculture NZ Ltd
- Alexander and Associates
- Animal Control Products Ltd
- Animal Health Advisory
- Animalz Napier Ltd
- Aoraki Polytechnic
- Arthur Webster (New Zealand) Pty Ltd
- Aspiring Animal Services Ltd
- Auckland Area Health Board (formerly Auckland Hospital Board)
- Autogenous Vaccines
- Bioscience Corporation Ltd
- Biotechnology Division, DSIR
- Central Institute of Technology
- Cook, Trevor George
- Cooks Laboratories
- Coopers Animal Health New Zealand Ltd
- Crusader Meats NZ Ltd
- Department of Education
- Ecology Division, DSIR
- Get Real Productions
- Grasslands Division, DSIR
- Health Waikato
- Info-Brok
- Kristin School
- Longburn Adventist College
- Lowe Walker Hawera Ltd
- McGuire, Paul (Calf Collection Services)
- Meat Industry Research Institute of New Zealand
- Medlab Hamilton
- Ministry of Forestry
- Mulvaney, Christopher John
- National College of Security Personnel and Technology
- Nelson Hospital
- New Zealand Aluminium Smelters Ltd
- New Zealand Institute for Crop and Food Research Ltd
- New Zealand Leather and Shoe Research Association Inc.
- New Zealand Sheepac Ltd
- New Zealand Water Management Ltd
- New Zealand Wildlife Rehabilitation Trust
- Orana Park Wildlife Trust
- Palmerston North Campus, DSIR
- Palmerston North Hospital Board (later known as Manawatu-Wanganui Area Health Board)
- Parkway College
- Paxarms
- Pfizer Laboratories Ltd
- Queen Margaret College
- Rhône-Poulenc (NZ) Ltd
• Roche Products NZ Ltd
• Saint Mary's College
• Salmond Smith Biolab Ltd
• Scots College
• Shell Chemicals New Zealand Ltd
• Smith, Catherine H
• Smith Kline Beecham (New Zealand) Ltd (formerly Smith Kline & French NZ Ltd)
• South Auckland Health
• South Greta Farms Ltd
• Sovereign Feeds Ltd
• Tauhara Furs Partnership
• The New Zealand King Salmon Company Ltd
• Travenol Laboratories (New Zealand) Ltd (later known as Baxter Healthcare Ltd)
• Van Wijk, Niek
• Veterinary Enterprises Ltd
• Ward, Christopher G
• WatPa Enterprises Ltd
• Wellington High School and Community Institute
• Wellington Polytechnic
• Wrightson Breeding Services Ltd
• Young's Animal Health (NZ) Ltd
APPENDIX 3

Publications

Guides to the Animal Welfare Act 1999
- Guide to the Animal Welfare Act 1999, policy information paper no. 27

Both documents are available from:

The Manager
MAF Information Bureau
P O Box 2526
Wellington
New Zealand

The documents are also available on MAF’s website at http://www.maf.govt.nz

Annual Reports
- Report for the Period August 1984 - 30 June 1989
- Report for the Period 1 July 1989 - 31 December 1991
- 1994 Annual Report
- 1995 Annual Report
- 1996 Annual Report
- 1997 Annual Report
- 1998 Annual Report
- 1999 Annual Report
- 2000 Annual Report
- 2001 Annual Report

Newsletters (NAEAC News)
- Issue 1 - August 1991
- Issue 2 - May 1992
- Issue 3 - August 1993
- Issue 4 - October 1994
- Issue 5 - March 1995
- Issue 6 - December 1995
- Issue 7 - May 1996
- Issue 8 - October 1996
- Issue 9 - April 1997
- Issue 10 - November 1997
- Issue 11 - June 1998
- Issue 12 - December 1998
- Issue 13 - July 1999
- Issue 14 - March 2000
- Issue 15 - September 2000
- Issue 16 - March 2001
- Issue 17 – January 2002
- Issue 18 – July 2002
- Issue 19 – May 2003

NAEAC Guides
- Guide on Codes of Ethical Conduct (May 2002)
- Good Practice Guide for the Use of Animals in Research, Testing and Teaching (September 2002)

These publications are available on the Internet at the following addresses:

or by contacting:
Animal Welfare Group, MAF Biosecurity Authority
PO Box 2526, Wellington, New Zealand
Phone 04 474 4129, fax 04 498 9888, email: animalwelfare@maf.govt.nz
APPENDIX 4

Accredited Reviewers

Reviewers Accredited Pursuant to Section 109 of the Animal Welfare Act 1999

Dr Howard V BROOKS
AgriQuality NZ Ltd
PO Box 585
PALMERSTON NORTH
Phone: 06-3517935
Fax: 06-3517919
Email: brooksh@agriquality.co.nz

1Dr Norman R BURTON
The Home Office
PO Box 31
Shrewsbury
Shropshire SY3 7WN
UNITED KINGDOM
Phone: 0044-1743241612
Fax: 0044-1743344691
Email: –
norman.burton@homeoffice.gsi.gov.uk

Dr K J P (Pat) COOPER
61 Amapur Drive
Khandallah
WELLINGTON
Phone: 04-4795092
Fax: –
Email: –

Dr A B (Nita) HARDING
AgriQuality NZ Ltd
Private Bag 3080
HAMILTON
Phone: 07-8341777
Fax: 07-8385846
Email: hardingn@agriquality.co.nz

2Dr Pat E HARTLEY
The Home Office
PO Box 1138
Swindon SN1 2RZ
UNITED KINGDOM
Phone: 0044-1793514029
Fax: 0044-1793432979
Email: –
cpd.aspa.swindon@homeoffice.gsi.gov.uk

Mr David R MORGAN
Landcare Research NZ Ltd
PO Box 69
LINCOLN
Phone: 03-3256700
Fax: 03-3256705
Email: morgand@landcare.cri.nz

Dr Keith D PATERSON
AgriQuality NZ Ltd
PO Box 951
ROTORUA
Phone: 07-3458720
Fax: 07-3458729
Email: patersonk@agriquality.co.nz

Dr Virginia M WILLIAMS
15 Tongariro Street
Mt Eden
AUCKLAND
Phone: 09-6301197
Fax: 09-6301197
Email: vwilliams@xtra.co.nz

1 Dr Burton wishes to undertake reviews for professional development reasons. He will pay for his own travel to New Zealand. He will be visiting New Zealand in August 2003.

2 Dr Hartley is moving to New Zealand later this year. She will be available to undertake reviews in 2004.
## Animal Usage Report: Summary by Species

### Reporting Period

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Species</th>
<th>1998</th>
<th>1999</th>
<th>2000</th>
<th>2001</th>
<th>2002</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Amphibians</td>
<td>603</td>
<td>1152</td>
<td>740</td>
<td>792</td>
<td>409</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Birds</td>
<td>10797</td>
<td>30067</td>
<td>15811</td>
<td>16041</td>
<td>17983</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cats</td>
<td>421</td>
<td>479</td>
<td>332</td>
<td>309</td>
<td>373</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cattle</td>
<td>55172</td>
<td>33579</td>
<td>36313</td>
<td>36368</td>
<td>49432</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deer</td>
<td>1553</td>
<td>918</td>
<td>1253</td>
<td>2503</td>
<td>4443</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dogs</td>
<td>864</td>
<td>399</td>
<td>985</td>
<td>383</td>
<td>231</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fish</td>
<td>99674</td>
<td>31761</td>
<td>72896</td>
<td>103546</td>
<td>44992</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goats</td>
<td>329</td>
<td>1957</td>
<td>648</td>
<td>844</td>
<td>553</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guinea Pigs</td>
<td>207</td>
<td>2692</td>
<td>3793</td>
<td>2915</td>
<td>2912</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hamsters</td>
<td>402</td>
<td>412</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>354</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horse/Donkeys</td>
<td>285</td>
<td>434</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>525</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marine Mammals</td>
<td>2504</td>
<td>619</td>
<td>457</td>
<td>208</td>
<td>628</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mice</td>
<td>53612</td>
<td>71277</td>
<td>98805</td>
<td>71985</td>
<td>73100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pigs</td>
<td>467</td>
<td>858</td>
<td>507</td>
<td>858</td>
<td>606</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Possums</td>
<td>5038</td>
<td>3151</td>
<td>4440</td>
<td>5325</td>
<td>2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rabbits</td>
<td>1994</td>
<td>1881</td>
<td>2227</td>
<td>2785</td>
<td>2108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rats</td>
<td>14244</td>
<td>14056</td>
<td>10776</td>
<td>15352</td>
<td>17616</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reptiles</td>
<td>2338</td>
<td>5099</td>
<td>1371</td>
<td>2578</td>
<td>6091</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheep</td>
<td>5948</td>
<td>42815</td>
<td>70055</td>
<td>53266</td>
<td>34811</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous Species</td>
<td>1889</td>
<td>2387</td>
<td>1048</td>
<td>1485</td>
<td>5214</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>30856</td>
<td>248272</td>
<td>324395</td>
<td>318588</td>
<td>263884</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group</td>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Hamsters</td>
<td>Rats, Mice</td>
<td>Guinea Pigs</td>
<td>Rabbits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Universities</td>
<td>1998</td>
<td>26437</td>
<td>11928</td>
<td>2123</td>
<td>6798</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1999</td>
<td>28852</td>
<td>7938</td>
<td>2048</td>
<td>6250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>39838</td>
<td>13327</td>
<td>1726</td>
<td>13110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2001</td>
<td>28136</td>
<td>8621</td>
<td>2704</td>
<td>10411</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2002</td>
<td>25887</td>
<td>10156</td>
<td>1103</td>
<td>10601</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schools</td>
<td>1998</td>
<td>50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1999</td>
<td>60</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>56</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2001</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2002</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polytechnics</td>
<td>1998</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1999</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>233</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2001</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>242</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2002</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>330</td>
<td>263</td>
<td>156</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial Organisations</td>
<td>1998</td>
<td>22549</td>
<td>54644</td>
<td>523</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1999</td>
<td>37732</td>
<td>35164</td>
<td>151</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>40528</td>
<td>62230</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2001</td>
<td>37912</td>
<td>44118</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>158</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2002</td>
<td>44104</td>
<td>48816</td>
<td>676</td>
<td>165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crown Research Institutes</td>
<td>1998</td>
<td>8383</td>
<td>33614</td>
<td>1259</td>
<td>386</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1999</td>
<td>12538</td>
<td>34741</td>
<td>623</td>
<td>6452</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>27242</td>
<td>34211</td>
<td>1216</td>
<td>844</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2001</td>
<td>26178</td>
<td>37609</td>
<td>1663</td>
<td>1355</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2002</td>
<td>25697</td>
<td>25259</td>
<td>4037</td>
<td>3168</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government Departments</td>
<td>1998</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>10156</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3588</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1999</td>
<td>75</td>
<td></td>
<td>12770</td>
<td>19220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>1722</td>
<td>4124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2001</td>
<td>239</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4090</td>
<td>346</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2002</td>
<td>228</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>3303</td>
<td>5023</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1998</td>
<td>14694</td>
<td>629</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1999</td>
<td>11892</td>
<td>583</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>2832</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>29</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2001</td>
<td>407</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2002</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>193</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>1998</td>
<td>72714</td>
<td>110994</td>
<td>4036</td>
<td>10797</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1999</td>
<td>91227</td>
<td>78451</td>
<td>3078</td>
<td>32067</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>110761</td>
<td>109816</td>
<td>3255</td>
<td>15811</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2001</td>
<td>92987</td>
<td>90468</td>
<td>4753</td>
<td>16041</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2002</td>
<td>96090</td>
<td>84796</td>
<td>6148</td>
<td>17393</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### APPENDIX 7

#### Animal Usage Report: Summary According to Severity Scale

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Animal Type</th>
<th>No Suffering</th>
<th>Little Suffering</th>
<th>Moderate Suffering</th>
<th>Severe Suffering</th>
<th>Very Severe Suffering</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Amphibians</td>
<td>258</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>409</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Birds</td>
<td>10487</td>
<td>6493</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>17393</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cats</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>373</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cattle</td>
<td>31582</td>
<td>17521</td>
<td>309</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>49432</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deer</td>
<td>3291</td>
<td>1122</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4413</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dogs</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>231</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fish</td>
<td>15665</td>
<td>18299</td>
<td>10950</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>44992</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goats</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>489</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>553</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guinea Pigs</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>699</td>
<td>1207</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>805</td>
<td>2912</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hamsters</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>214</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>354</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horses</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>478</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>525</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marine Mammals</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>424</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>628</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mice</td>
<td>980</td>
<td>41116</td>
<td>18479</td>
<td>475</td>
<td>12050</td>
<td>73100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pigs</td>
<td>224</td>
<td>293</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>606</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Possums</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>473</td>
<td>797</td>
<td>443</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rabbits</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>1944</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rats</td>
<td>642</td>
<td>8634</td>
<td>6510</td>
<td>1830</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>17616</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reptiles</td>
<td>4797</td>
<td>1294</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6091</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheep</td>
<td>17939</td>
<td>14745</td>
<td>2127</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>34811</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous</td>
<td>4434</td>
<td>252</td>
<td>428</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>91556</strong></td>
<td><strong>114860</strong></td>
<td><strong>41451</strong></td>
<td><strong>2878</strong></td>
<td><strong>12939</strong></td>
<td><strong>263684</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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