Canadian Council on Animal Care
Conseil canadien de protection des animaux

CCAC Forum 2008 – Building on Strength

– Report –

Table of Contents

Introduction

Stakeholder participation has always been an essential aspect of the Canadian Council on Animal Care (CCAC). In keeping with this principle, 28 CCAC Council members and a cross-section of 30 constituents, selected for their sustained volunteer participation in the CCAC oversight system over the years, were invited to participate in a one-day forum that examined key questions relating to the development of the CCAC 2009-2014 strategic plan. This initiative, titled *CCAC Forum 2008 – Building on Strength*, was held in Ottawa on October 3, 2008.

In May 2008, the CCAC, assisted by the Natural Sciences and Engineering Research Council (NSERC) and the Canadian Institutes of Health Research (CIHR), broadly distributed the *CCAC Strategic Planning (2009-2014) Questionnaire* to the research community across Canada. The Questionnaire sought constituent opinion on the most important issues facing institutions and individuals using animals for scientific purposes, and facing the CCAC Program. A total of 184 responses were received (154 English and 30 French) and tabulated in a confidential manner by an external communications consultant.

In addition, academic institutions in Canada were invited to submit an open assessment of the CCAC as part of the review of the CCAC 2008-2011 grant submission to the granting Agencies. NSERC and the CIHR provided anonymous versions of 13 letters (8 English and 5 French) to the CCAC, further augmenting the pool of constituent feedback.

The issues identified from the letters and the Questionnaire formed the basis of questions addressed by the Forum attendees in a 'brain-storming' exercise to explore possible courses of action regarding those issues.

The Forum, as well as the Questionnaire and the open letters to the granting Agencies, are a valuable contribution towards ensuring the relevance of the CCAC 2009-2014 strategic plan and building a future that resonates with stakeholders across the country.

This Report contains the highlights and key events of the *CCAC Forum 2008 – Building on Strength*.

Forum Outline

Three weeks prior to the Forum, all participants received a background document containing the letters to NSERC and the CIHR, and the tabulated results of the Questionnaire.

The day before the Forum, all participants received a folder with information on the program of the Forum, as well as additional background information which included an overview of the CCAC's mandate and programs, achievements over the past three years, work plans for the coming three years, and performance for the last six months.

The Forum opened with *Welcome and Introduction – Moving forward: where we are, where we want to be*, delivered by Mr. Stephen Bjarnason, Chair of CCAC Council.

Dr. Clément Gauthier, CCAC Executive Director, presented introductions and brief biographies of the three speakers (see page 3 for Summary of Guest Speaker Presentations).

After presentations by the guest speakers, five breakout groups (A to E) assembled in their respective rooms at mid-morning. Each group consisted of 12-14 members, including: a facilitator, responsible for leading the session and recording suggestions on a flip-chart, a rapporteur, responsible for summation and presentation of key findings at the afternoon plenary, and a scribe, responsible for keeping a complete record of all suggestions posted on the flipchart.

Each breakout group was given five questions to respond to. For each question, suggestions were sorted into three categories:

1. Keep – what should the CCAC keep doing?
2. Stop – what should the CCAC stop doing?
3. Start – what should the CCAC start doing?

Each suggestion was further examined to determine if it was something under the CCAC's control or not, or whether there was a role for the CCAC vis-à-vis the suggestion. At the end of the session, each participant voted for the most important item in the Keep, Stop and Start categories for each question.

After a lunch break, the five groups continued the breakout sessions until mid-afternoon. At the plenary session, the rapporteurs presented the key findings of their respective groups, followed by a brief question period.

Dr. Jim Thornhill, Vice-Chair of CCAC Council, presented the *Summary of the Day's Events* (see page 15), and Mr. Bjarnason wrapped up the Forum with *Closing Remarks* (see page 16).

In addition to this report and the written notes taken by the scribes for each breakout group, presentations made at the morning and afternoon plenary sessions were video-taped by the CCAC and archived in DVD format.

Summary of Guest Speaker Presentations

Meeting the Needs of the Academic Community: the Views of the G-13 Universities

W.E. Hewitt, PhD, University of Western Ontario

The G-13 universities collectively receive 85 percent of all CIHR funding allocated in Canada; conduct approximately 70 percent of all research at Canadian universities; and conduct 80 percent of healthcare research at public institutions in Canada.

Dr. Hewitt explained the different research institute structures in place to meet distinct regional needs. He then spoke on the challenges of managing animal-based research, highlighting the chronic underfunding of research and how the G-13 institutions are managing to cope with the funding shortfall.

Voicing strong support of the objectives of the CCAC, and an excellent working relationship between the G-13 and the CCAC, Dr. Hewitt presented suggestions on how to better work together. Key recommendations included:

- the importance of CCAC and site review teams to understand the fiscal context and constraints under which the G-13 universities operate;

- the need to raise awareness of Canada's looming shortage of laboratory animal veterinarians and other specialized staff – and the need to develop training programs to resolve this shortage;

- the importance of verifying site visit information with multiple stakeholders before, during and even after the site visit timeframe;

- the need to strive for consultation and avoid tendencies to view and apply guidelines prescriptively; and

- the need to apply guidelines with a sensitivity to institutional size, scope, fiscal constraints and past performance.

Dr. Hewitt thanked the CCAC for being asked to participate in the current review exercise and for the opportunity to work together to achieve the collective goal of ensuring excellence in animal-based research.

Priorities of CCAC's Industry Clients

Simon Authier, DVM, LAB Pre-Clinical Research International

Dr. Authier began with a comparison of the animal care systems that he has worked with in Canada, the USA and Denmark. From an industry point of view, he judges the CCAC approach to be the best he has seen thus far. He also commented on his preference for a peer review system over a legislative system.

Dr. Authier's first topic was Global Perspective, and he stated that international recognition of CCAC certification is critical to industry. Many companies operate in multiple countries and have global requirements for animal care and must consider animal care requirements internationally. He stated that Europe has more stringent policy requirements in some cases for the use of animals in science and this could pose a competitive threat to Canada if companies moved their research elsewhere because they felt the standards here were not good enough. He recommended that CCAC undertake strategic surveillance to understand how Canada compares globally and advised a proactive stance for remaining competitive.

Dr. Authier noted that some guidelines are more suited to academic research, and not applicable to industry. He suggested the need for guidelines in areas that would benefit industry, including: post-approval monitoring; euthanasia endpoints in regulatory testing; protocol review process that distinguishes between regulatory testing and non-regulatory research; institutional structure, and the implementation of annual reports for regulatory testing.

To accelerate program improvements in regulated disciplines, he suggested facilitation of access to animal care practices used in programs that are approved by regulatory agencies, in addition to a survey of industry animal care practices.

Dr. Authier spoke of the threat posed by animal activists, and that, for fear of becoming a target, institutions are reluctant to promote the benefits of animal use. He added that there is a need for resources, integrated planning and national initiatives to educate the general public on animal research.

From a facility perspective, he stated that there is a need to focus on initiatives at the cage level. Efforts should be spent on practical initiatives that benefit the animals while avoiding complex bureaucratic processes and issues that have no real impact on the animals.

Dr. Authier commented on the challenges institutions face to provide training for technical and scientific staff, and suggested the potential for country-wide sharing of both staff and training programs.

Lastly, he noted the need to extend animal care guidelines and requirements to animal supply facilities that are not certified by the CCAC Program.

The CCAC as a Peer-based Quasi-Regulatory Body: Opportunities and Limitations

Patricia Wilson, LLB, Osler, Hoskin & Harcourt, Barristers and Solicitors

Ms. Wilson opened her presentation by describing the type of organization that the CCAC is: a hybrid between a private and public organization; one that does not exercise statutory authority, yet its standards are required of parties regulated by, or receiving funding from, public bodies that do have statutory authority.

The CCAC's purpose and objectives are "public" in nature, not private, and the CCAC is a consensual self-regulatory body, rather than a top-down enforcement agency. The consensual, voluntary and peer-based assessment and standard setting structure makes the CCAC compliance structure effective.

The best characterization of the CCAC, given its mix of public purpose and private operations, is as a "quasi-regulatory body", as opposed to a regulatory agency or private industry organization. Ms. Wilson described the various opportunities and limitations presented by quasi-regulatory status. She then summarized the relevant aspects of this status vis-à-vis the CCAC as follows:

- Public law requirements are primarily procedural.
- Public law requirements leave wide latitude for CCAC to make substantive decisions and develop a peer-based assessment structure.
- Meeting public law requirements insulates procedurally fair decisions from challenge or attack by holders of the CCAC Certificate of GAP–Good Animal Practice[®] and other groups.
- Quasi-regulatory status entails that CCAC maintain:
  — institutional independence from members, funders, certificate holders and interest groups;
  — objective and knowledge-based standard-setting;
  — procedurally fair assessments;
  — reason-based recommendations and decision-making; and
  — consistency in approach and decision-making.
- Public law norms require consistency of decisions, which in turn requires training and resource support to ACCs and assessment panel participants. CCAC's "community-based" structure and volunteer participation make training important.
- The CCAC has a procedurally sound assessment model and knowledge-based, disciplined standard-setting, as well as a robust decision-making structure.
- Recognition of public law criteria for fairness in the CCAC's decision-making strengthens the CCAC's peer-based standards and assessment model, and enhance its standing and reputation as a quasi-regulatory and standard-setting body.

Of particular note, the need for 'independence' from those that the CCAC regulates means that the CCAC should not promote or advocate on matters that extend beyond the adoption or use of CCAC standards, the attributes and value of a CCAC Certificate of GAP–Good Animal Practice[®], or concerns regarding animal care in general.

Note: Where the group has voted for the most important item in the Keep, Stop and Start categories of a question, the results appear in brackets following the item.

THEME I   Recognizing the Needs of Participants in the CCAC Programs

Q1 – What can CCAC do to recognize the reality of funding and cost issues faced by research institutions?		
	Group A	**Group C**
Keep	- recommendations should remain recommendations, **not** be prescriptive (5) - keep the same acceptable level of care regardless of size of institution (5) - database for assessment directors to act as consultants (2)	exit interview process and try to improve with further dialogue
Stop	- assessment panels need to be free and independent of possible "agendas" by local ACC members/researchers (10) - assessment panels need to be sensitive to components (facilities) of large institutions that result in some variability within the institution (2)	(no comments)
Start	- work with foundations (NGOs) to discuss actual costs to do research (6) - need to review best practices internationally to find out how other institutions are dealing with funding issues (4) - create mechanism for people to create their program with funding, e.g., CFI sensitivity to infrastructure for animal care (2) - set labs at arm's length from institutions, like universities, to avoid issues of conflict of interest - be **aware** of direct/indirect costs of the institution – protect money for animal care in operational budgets - the CCAC to be a better liaison with CIHR/NSERC on funding issues	- tiered CCAC Certificate of GAP–Good Animal Practice® based on facility resourcing and functions - extract standards from guidelines which allow retention of certificate of GAP per functional tier - infrastructure planning and forecasting tool (web etc.) for facilities planning new research functions

Q2 – What can CCAC do to reduce the administrative and regulatory burden on institutions and on researchers?			
	Group B	**Group D**	**Group E**
Keep	- keep the focus on animals at the cage level - keep the current pre-assessment documentation, but streamline it	provide information to animal care committees – explain why the information is requested, e.g., explain to investigators why lay description wording is important (11)	keep working on mechanism for scientific merit review
Stop	stop getting involved in issues that do not directly impact animal care; e.g., management of animal care committees (for example, benefits for ACC members)	- alignment of Assessment cycle with granting cycle (4) - for interim visits, decrease documentation requirements and look at the value added - more burden at the six year mark (1) - dead stock not reportable animals, but animal use protocols are required…why? Should be an institutional decision. The same issue applies to museum stocks. (1) - permit regular recommendations to be dealt with at the next assessment - document preparation for assessment visits is still onerous and mechanistic for large institutions with multiple facilities – very complex and lengthy	(no comments)
Start	- standardization and simplification of information provided at pre-assessment (for example, use of checklists) - financial pressures/constraints should be highlighted in the pre-assessment documentation - better alignment with the Tri-Council audit with respect to process, outcomes and expectations	- Animal Use Data Form (AUDF) – added value to animal welfare? Cost/benefit & added value to animal welfare (6) - if no added value it should be eliminated as a requirement - an added value may be public accountability – improvement of procedures etc. - CCAC database for reporting animal numbers – link with end-user institution software where possible (5) - tool(s) to measure success of the CCAC - success should be expressed in terms of the Three Rs. For Reduction – what should the denominator be? (e.g.: research dollars – other). Impact on institutions regarding admin burden (2) - harmonization of due dates and info required where there are multiple regulatory oversight obligations/accountabilities (e.g., the CCAC, OMAFRA) (2) - animals in education – can animal care committee filing requests be streamlined in some way?	- start using electronic refinements (AUDF, program review form) and improve search engine on the CCAC web site (6) - assess less often (every 4 years) (2) - ACC meetings to be held via teleconference once per year, with others to be held face to face - synchronize assessment with AAALAC - encourage large institutions to mentor smaller ones - be mindful of increasing the burden of administration

THEME II   Improving the Delivery of CCAC Programs

Q3 –	What can CCAC do to adjust assessments to the size and type of institution and the extent of the use of animals?	
	Group B	**Group D**

Keep	• pay attention to institutional capacities
	  – keep flexibility in the method of care delivery
	  – acknowledge the differences between large and small institutions in that the method of care, not the quality of care, may be dependent on the given institution
		• multiple assessment teams for large institutions, tailoring those specifically to on-site, off-site, and medical, pharmacy, agriculture, etc. (5)
		• availability of experts on the panel as needed (3)
		• continue to consider the assessment team pool to be certain that assessment teams are appropriately organized around exactly what is happening at that institute (2)

Stop	• being overly prescriptive in recommendations
	  – emphasize compliance with guidelines as opposed to regulations
	  – improved post-assessment dialogue
		• (no comments)

Start	• enhanced post-assessment dialogue • dialogue with industry with regards to consensus approach vs. regulatory approach – must ensure that CCAC standards will stand up to the best industry standards	• reconsider assessment team pool size to enhance competency and experience of assessors, especially for consistency and/or to bring in experts for assistance to review components (8) • establish means to ensure that animal care committees are able to appropriately and properly evaluate off-site operations, field studies or out of country operations (6)

Q4 –	What can be done to increase consistency in the application of CCAC standards from one assessment panel to the next, and from one ACC to the next?	
	Group A	**Group C**
Keep	• ensure recommendations are consistent **between** institutions (9) • provide information regarding why a suggestion is made to an institution, and the institution in turn should provide reasonable justification for declining to implement a suggestion (3) • staff participation (from the CCAC) on every panel • diversity of suggestions to be kept for improving animal care and use programs	• keep training assessment panel members on CCAC multi-agency policy • assessment panel members encourage administrators to ensure consistency on application of CCAC guidelines • ensure that assessment director has full opportunity to review necessary history and past reports with assessment panel
Stop	• (no comments)	• (no comments)
Start	• training modules for animal care committee members and assessment panel members (6) • assessment report viewed (goes through) assessment director of the CCAC (4)	• the CCAC to encourage institutions to use past assessment panel members on their staff to advise and guide their animal care program, and to recognize their service and create value • ensure assessment visit has one assessment panel member with specific previous site experience

• need a centralized way to collect information on issues, high risk or invasive animal care protocols, where animal care workers can go to access information, best practices or recommendations (1) • some overlap of panel members from one visit to the next (1) • streamlining important guidelines for each institution • answers must be consistent between assessment directors	• to differentiate the "standards" from the "guidelines" in CCAC guidance

Q5 –How could the assessment process facilitate more input from individual scientists?

	Group B	Group E
Keep	• (no comments)	• emphasis on meetings with committee and scientists, as opposed to just visiting facilities (6) • looking at individual protocols
Stop	• (no comments)	• (no comments)

Start	• ask institutions to involve the individual scientists in the pre-assessment process
	  – this is a recommendation to the institution, not a requirement
	  – use checklist to simplify this process
	• involve the investigators during the assessment process, if possible given the time constraints
		• increase time for collegial exchange during assessment visits (3)
		• encourage researchers to attend these meetings [with assessment panel] (3)
		• more dialogue pre-visit between the assessment panel and the ACC (3)
		• add more individual scientists as part of assessment panel
		• have scientists accompanying panels on site visits
		• guard against undercutting the ACC

Q6 –   How can institutions and researchers have more input as new guidelines document proceed through the drafting process?

	Group A	Group C	Group D
Keep	• continue to have guidelines based on "field observation", i.e. written by people who have actually been out to the field and participated in the process (8) • keep fellowship program going with the CCAC because of their involvement in the guidelines (4)	• keep the first draft review process as is	• continued buy-in from researchers is a critical component in the development and implementation of guidelines that are acceptable to the community (8) • is 60 days too long/short or just right? (2) • posting of guidelines on the CCAC website for 60 days - need to inform constituents of opportunities to respond
Stop	• (no comments)	• (no comments)	• reconsider distribution of drafts through institutional admin systems? – Impact on regulatory burden

| Start | • target individuals (experts) at institution level to review drafts (8)
• provide electronic tools to ease the job of working through the drafts– secure site for providing feedback (4)
• consult widely at early stage, as opposed to later stages | • request experts' names from institutions when drafts are circulated
• for widespread review, request from ACCs the names of possible expert reviewers | • constituents need to be informed of opportunities to respond when guidelines are posted on the CCAC website – feedback on how to distribute (7)
• notice and timing in context of academic calendars/grant cycles, etc. – not July/August (7)
• produce executive summaries of guidelines to help deal with the length of the guideline (6) |

THEME III   Working Together

Q7 – How can the CCAC, ACCs and other stakeholders increase the accessibility of ETC materials to researchers?		
	Group B	**Group D**	**Group E**
Keep	• commitment to producing new, as well as updating current, training modules • investigate possible collaborations and/or adoption of other training resources • keep and expand website and associated resources • keep Guideline Sector involvement in scientific conferences • keep encouraging institutions to invest in relevant continuing education	• continue explaining (and expand on) how use of animals is overseen and the use of the Three Rs, and improve dissemination of this information – without being an animal use advocate (8) • developing IT approaches for disseminating information, including novel communication tools (3) • identify audiences, their needs and organizational (CCAC and other) needs (2)	• (no comments)
Stop	• (no comments)	• (no comments	• (no comments)

Start	• set up a speakers panel of CCAC or former CCAC members to visit institutions
	• web-based seminars and e-learning opportunities
	• send summaries/executive summaries of guidelines and other resources to ACC chairs and/or coordinators for transmission to investigators and other relevant personnel
		• increase resources to increase communications (6)
		  – tailor communications to targeted audiences
		  – enhance public image of the CCAC through enhanced website and resources
		  – enhance communication about the Three Rs for scientists and public alike
		  – expand on how use of animals is overseen and improve dissemination of this information – without being an animal use advocate plus use of the Three Rs
		  – how info is to be accessed and disseminated to community reps
		  – animal care committee training for local community reps
		• translation for international development (3)
			• start using webinars and videos for workshops, seminars and presentations (5)
			• examine the possibility of running training modules directly through the CCAC (2)
			• more effective use of the CCAC website
			• create a mechanism for dissemination from large to small universities
			• give direction to institutions on what they should do with policies and guidelines that the CCAC sends out for feedback, and the CCAC should express that it wants feedback and how universities should provide the feedback
			• develop guidelines for recertification

	entry level animal care staff – recruitment – training programs - money - job description – growth opportunity (2)
	• early exposure to career path (U Grad level) (1)
	• high school exposure
	• veterinary student recruitment based on interest/background
	• promotion of non-traditional career streams
	• summer jobs
	• CALAS materials on-line, support money for system management and testing of tech
	• funding models
	• offer more attractive salaries
	• access to veterinary resources and advertisement of resources

Q10 – **How can funders (granting Agencies, disease-specific foundations, Canada Foundation for Innovation, Genome Canada, federal and provincial science-based departments and agencies, zoos and aquaria, industry, etc) of animal based scientific activities (research, teaching and other educational purposes, regulatory testing) work together, and with CCAC, to use integrated communications to pro-actively achieve good animal practice in science?**

	Group A	Group C	Group E
Keep	• alliance of funders with the CCAC to promote good animal practice is important and would be good to see this continue and see more of it (10) • newsletters of funders of CCAC activities, e.g., NSERC and the CIHR participated in this particular forum to help gather comments – this is a positive move that shows how these pieces can link together (1)	• (no comments)	• (no comments)
Stop	• stop additional Tri-Council audits of animal usage/care or combine with CCAC assessment visits (3)	• (no comments)	• (no comments)
Start	• new competitions for research of best animal practice/ethics (use Three Rs as a model) (7) • funders to require more information from researchers regarding animal usage models (4) • acknowledge in our publications that good animal practice was followed for all granting agencies (1)	• the CCAC to survey funding agencies to assess interest in joint communications approach to achieve good animal science practice	• educate policy makers to secure funding for indirect costs as well as direct costs (7) • clarification of where the Tri-Council's involvement begins and where the CCAC's begins regarding audits (2) • funders should fund projects fully

Similarities and Qualitative Differences

Engagement of Constituents

Contrary to the 1998 Forum, where a questionnaire was circulated exclusively to those attending the forum, the questionnaire for the 2008 Forum was made accessible to all CCAC constituents with the assistance of the granting Agencies. The goal was to reach out to as many end-users of animals as possible across the country. The number of responses tripled expectations, and was a clear indication of a high level of interest and engagement between constituents and the CCAC.

It is also noteworthy that both institutional and individual respondents expressed strong support for the effective role played by the CCAC in providing excellent and comprehensive educational materials and programs, and timely guidance on emerging or expanding areas. Both groups took the time to clearly define their needs as CCAC stakeholders and to provide suggestions on avenues that the CCAC could explore to address those needs.

THEME I
Needs and Concerns of Stakeholders

The following are the most serious concerns identified by individual respondents to the Questionnaire. These concerns were echoed by the G-13 universities and in the letters sent to the granting Agencies in early 2008.

- Recognize the reality of funding and cost issues [36/180 = 20.0%] – assessment panel recommendations should not be prescriptive but tailor-made to the institution; the CCAC should work with foundations (NGOs) and other funders to discuss actual costs to do research

- Reduce administrative and regulatory burden on institutions and researchers [31/180 = 17.2%] – document preparation for assessment visits is still onerous and mechanistic for large institutions with multiple facilities; start using electronic refinements (e.g., AUDF, program review form) and improve search engine capacity

- Personnel shortages [24/180 = 13.3%] – continue to encourage technicians to move into lab animal research; make electives and internships attractive for undergraduate veterinarians and technicians; encourage active engagement of veterinarians in research

THEME II
Stakeholders Comments on CCAC Programs

There is a consensus between respondents to the Questionnaire and participants in the Forum on all but the first bullet below. The recommendation for the CCAC to champion the value of animal-based research was strongly rejected by participants in the Forum, probably on the basis of the clarifications provided by the CCAC legal adviser regarding the limitations imposed on the CCAC as a quasi-regulatory body. However, both Questionnaire participants and Forum attendees agree that the CCAC should play a role in educating Canadians on the programs and safeguards that are in place for the ethical use of animals for scientific purposes.

- The CCAC should champion the value of animal-based research to the media, the public, and the school systems; it should educate Canadians with regard to the oversight programs that are in place to ensure the ethical use of animals in research [46/119 = 38.6%]

- The scope of [CCAC] responsibilities and accountabilities that is in place now is good [33/119 = 27.7%]

- Input of the research community should be solicited and shared at the guidelines planning stages [10/45 = 22.2%]

- The availability of training programs and workshops across the country should be increased [6/32 = 18.8%]

- There are no concerns; the present Assessment Program is working well [7/39 = 18.0%]

THEME III
Working Together to Achieve Good Animal Practice

- [Funders] should help fund the real costs of animal care, including assistance for annual and indirect costs, and improvement and expansion of animal care facilities and infrastructure (perhaps with some sort of matching program) [27/93 = 29.0%]

- Standard training programs (including training on non-traditional species) should be developed and made available across Canada for animal handlers and research assistants [15/101 = 14.9%]

- There should be better educational and training programs that create veterinary and technical personnel with skills in science, medicine and animal care [11/90 = 12.2%]

- Institutions need to allocate appropriate resources to develop and maintain animal care and use programs, including facilities as well as veterinary and technical care [10/90 = 11.1%]

Summary of Day's Events

Jim Thornhill, Vice-Chair of CCAC Council

Dr. Thornhill thanked attendees for their participation in making the CCAC an even better organization. He summarized the significant strengths of the CCAC, including:

- peer-review;
- public engagement on all committees and levels – public trust;
- management style that is becoming more and more efficient;
- open communication to improve its mission;
- awareness of accountability for the ethical use of animals;
- balance of assessments, guidelines and education & training; and
- a sense of purpose to ensure client satisfaction.

Dr. Thornhill reviewed key points of the guest speaker presentations:

- [Ted Hewitt] Assessments should be a seamless process that is as constructive as possible, and cognizant of the fiscal restraints that the G-13 institutions face. Additionally, CCAC guidelines should be more adaptable to the specific institutions that they are meant for.

- [Simon Authier] For industry, there is recognition of the importance of CCAC guidelines and the necessity of ensuring that the guidelines are recognized internationally. Efforts should be focused on the animals at the cage-level.

- [Pat Wilson] The challenge of defining the legal status of the CCAC in terms of an organization was pointed out. The CCAC falls under the scrutiny of 'public law' requirements, i.e. scrutinized for the process of *how* it does its work and less for the outcomes of its work. Public law standards require the CCAC to be independent, to be objective, free of bias, transparent and fair. There are limitations in what the CCAC can promote – it can promote good animal practice but not good animal research in general.

Dr. Thornhill commented on the valuable suggestions arising from the five breakout groups. He thanked the attendees and pointed out that the task now is to prioritize and assimilate those ideas into the CCAC's planning exercise for the benefit of all stakeholders.

Closing Remarks

Stephen Bjarnason, Chair of CCAC Council

Mr. Bjarnason commented on the great diversity of people participating in the forum, and that they all share a unity of purpose – they all believe in the ethical use of animals in science.

He stated that his breakout group was able to reach a consensus on issues and suggestions, just as a natural course of dialogue rather than a planned objective – and that he was very impressed by this collaborative nature.

Mr. Bjarnason stated that a report on the Forum will be generated and that it will be used to help build on the strength of the CCAC. He mentioned that a copy of the report will be e-mailed to all attendees.

Mr. Bjarnason closed by thanking all of the participants for taking the time to participate in the Forum and for making their views known.

Appendix A
List of Groups and Participants

Group A

Assigned Questions: #1, #4, #6, #8, #10

Location: Salon B

Facilitator: Jim Thornhill

Rapporteur: Kathy Gottschall-Passott

Scribe: Jumoke Fasoyinu

Name	Category	Institution
François Auger	Scientist	Hôpital Saint-Sacrement, Québec
Simon Authier	Veterinarian	LAB Research Inc.
Stephen Barker	Manager Vivarium	St. Michael's Hospital
Martin Cole	Community Representative	Beaverton, Ont.
Marie Émond	Coordinator, Research Ethics	NSERC
Jumoke Fasoyinu	Manager Communications	Assessments, CCAC
Peter Flanagan	Scientist	University of Western Ontario
Kathy Gottschall-Pass	Scientist	University of Prince Edward Island
Gilly Griffin	Programs Director	Guidelines and Three Rs, CCAC
Hélène Héon	Veterinarian	Centre hospitalier Université de Montréal
Susan Marlin	Senior Administrator	Queen's University
Lynn Macdonald	ACC Coordinator	University of British Columbia
Carol Morgan	Veterinarian	University of British Columbia
Jim Thornhill	Scientist	University of Saskatchewan

Group B

Assigned Questions: #2, #3, #5, #7, #9

Location: Salon C

Facilitator: Stephen Bjarnason

Rapporteur: Joseph Davison

Scribe: Ashley Byrnes

Name	Category	Institution
Michael Baar	Assessment Director	CCAC
Stephen Bjarnason	Scientist	Defence R&D Canada - Suffield
Philip Byrne	Veterinarian	Fisheries & Oceans Canada - Charlottetown
Ashley Byrnes	Scientific Writer	Assessments, CCAC
Joseph Davison	Scientist	University of Calgary
Shawn Eccles	Community Representative	BC SPCA
Andrew Fletch	Veterinarian	Consultant, Ontario
Ted Hewitt	Senior Administrator	University of Western Ontario
Badru Moloo	Veterinarian	University Health Network, Toronto
Bruce Murphy	Scientist	Université de Montréal
Bill Pearce	Manager – Quality Assurance	Health Canada, Ottawa
Diane Trenouth	ACC Coordinator	Carleton University
Marina Von Keyserlingk	Scientist	University of British Columbia
Karen Wallace	Advisor – Research Ethics	Canadian Institutes of Health Research

Group C

Assigned Questions: #1, #4, #6, #8, #10
Location: Salon D
Facilitator: Henrik Kreiberg
Rapporteur: Luc Chouinard
Scribe: Pascale Belleau

Name	Category	Institution
Pascale Belleau	Scientific Writer	Assessments, CCAC
Craig Bihun	Veterinarian	National Research Council, Ottawa
Ronald Charbonneau	Veterinarian	Centre de recherche du CHUQ, Québec
Luc Chouinard	Veterinarian	Charles River Laboratories Preclinical Serv.
Julie Dale	Director	Guidelines Development, CCAC
Anne Marie de Passillé	Scientist	Agriculture & Agri-Food Canada, Agassiz
Mark Evered	Senior Administrator	Thompson Rivers University, Kamloops
Marco Festa-Bianchet	Scientist	Université de Sherbrooke
Lise Gagnier	Community Representative	Université de Montréal
Karen Gourlay	Asst. Dir., Animal Facility	McMaster University
Henrik Kreiberg	Scientist	Fisheries & Oceans Canada, Nanaimo
William McBlain	Senior Administrator	University of Alberta
Ernest Olfert	Veterinarian	University of Saskatchewan
James Pfaus	Scientist	Concordia University

Group D

Assigned Questions: #2, #3, #6, #7, #9
Location: Salon E
Facilitator: Marilyn Keaney
Rapporteur: Mark Torchia
Scribe: Linda Rhéaume

Name	Category	Institution
Denis Beauchamp	Scientist	Université Laval, Québec
Marie Bédard	Assessment Director	CCAC
Suzanne Carioto	Manager, Animal Facility	Centre hospitalier Université de Montréal
Ken Fisher	Scientist	Canadian Federation of Biological Societies
Jim Gourdon	Veterinarian	McGill University
Carolyn Hickey	Community Representative	SPCA – St. John's
Sara Iverson	Scientist	Dalhousie University, Halifax
Marilyn Keaney	Veterinarian	University of Ottawa
Denis Mayrand	Senior Administrator	Université Laval, Québec
Doug Morck	Veterinarian	University of Calgary
Linda Rhéaume	Administrative Assistant	Assessments, CCAC
Evelina Smith	Community Representative	Canadian Federation of Humane Societies
Mark Torchia	Scientist	Health Sciences Centre, Winnipeg
Patricia Turner	Veterinarian	University of Guelph

Group E

Assigned Questions: #2, #5, #7, #8, #10

Location: Salon F

Facilitator: David Buffett

Rapporteur: Edwin Kroeger

Scribe: Nicole Fenwick

Name	Category	Institution
John Batt	Manager, Aquatron Facility	Dalhousie University, Halifax
Toni Bayans	Veterinarian	University of Alberta, Edmonton
David Buffett	Community Representative	Canadian Federation of Humane Societies
Gilles Demers	Assessment Director	CCAC
Nicole Fenwick	Coordinator	Three Rs Program, CCAC
Harpreet Kochhar	Scientist	Canadian Food Inspection Agency, Ottawa
Edwin Kroeger	Scientist	University of Manitoba, Winnipeg
Marie-Andrée Laniel	Veterinarian	Université de Montréal
Suzanne MacDonald	Scientist	York University, Toronto
Robert Milling	Community Representative	Ottawa
Tom Moon	Scientist	University of Ottawa
Kresimir Pucaj	Veterinarian	Nucro-Technics, Scarborough
Suzanne Smith	ACC Coordinator	McGill University, Montréal
Rui Wang	Senior Admninistrator	Lakehead University, Thunder Bay

Appendix B – Questionnaire

CCAC Forum 2008 – Building on Strength

Ottawa, October 3, 2008

Background Part A

– Letters to NSERC and CIHR

Background Part B

– CCAC Questionnaire

Part A – Preface

This information is a synthesis of 13 letters (5 French and 8 English) written to the Natural Sciences and Engineering Research Council (NSERC) and the Canadian Institutes of Health Research (CIHR) by academic institutions in Canada. The institutions were invited to submit an open assessment of the CCAC as part of the review of the CCAC 2008-2011 grant submission to the granting Agencies. The granting Agencies removed the names of the authors and institutions, and forwarded anonymous copies of the letters to the CCAC.

The content of the letters has been collated by an external communications consultant into three categories:

- Positive Comments

- Negative Comments

- Suggestions

The number of mentions of a particular comment or suggestion appears in brackets following the item. In addition, comments are sorted in descending order according to number of mentions.

The purpose of this section is to include feedback from the institutions as background material for the CCAC Forum 2008 being held in Ottawa on October 3, 2008. As such, this document makes no effort to interpret the significance or impact of the various comments or suggestions, and is intended solely as a collation of the letters submitted to the granting Agencies.

The CCAC extends thanks to NSERC and the CIHR for having made this information available for the CCAC Forum 2008.

Positive Comments

1. The CCAC provides excellent and comprehensive educational materials and programs – new guidelines are timely and provide needed guidance on emerging or expanding areas.
    [7 mentions]

2. *The CCAC effectively responds to public concerns of the well being of animals used in teaching and research and helps make it more acceptable to use animals in teaching and research. [6 mentions]*

3. The CCAC does an effective job of maintaining national standards with policies, guidelines and oversight for good animal care in research – ensuring that science is not compromised by inadequate care or misuse. **[6 mentions]**

4. Assessment site visits, and the foundation of peer review, are an important mechanism for evaluation and standardization of animal care in university facilities.
    [5 mentions]

5. The CCAC acts as a voice for universities and the animal care programs – e.g. the recent discussions regarding *New Substances Notification Regulations (Organisms)*. **[3 mentions]**

6. The CCAC website is a well developed tool responding to the needs of animal users and the general public wishing to know more. **[3 mentions]**

7. CCAC staff is readily available and provides timely support through telephone or e-mail. **[3 mentions]**

8. The CCAC requirement for community representation on animal care committees provides transparency and protection against animal rights lobbies that seek to ban animal-based medical research. **[2 mentions]**

9. Researchers appreciate that the CCAC has evolved its role from supervisor to collaborator and peer reviewer. **[1 mention]**

10. The CCAC provides a balanced approach (level playing field) by setting standards that apply equally to all universities and researchers. **[1 mention]**

11. The CCAC makes every attempt to ensure that the assessment panels include individuals whose expertise and experience are relevant to the research being assessed. **[1 mention]**

Negative Comments

1. The CCAC should adjust assessments to the size and type of institution and the extent of the use of animals – the administrative structures imposed are excessively heavy for small universities. **[7 mentions]**

2. The delay between an assessment visit and final report is too long. **[2 mentions]**

3. Inevitably CCAC assessments have become more regulatory or inspection oriented, and the reaction has been for the process to become less consultative and open – policing rather than supporting. **[2 mentions]**

4. The CCAC should limit its activities to the quality of the animal care program and not get involved at the managerial level. **[1 mention]**

5. The first CCAC training modules, mandatory for new animal users, are irrelevant in many aspects – e.g. history of the CCAC. **[1 mention]**

6. There is no means to address 'gray' issues or to appeal CCAC assessments when an institution disagrees. **[1 mention]**

Suggestions

1. Additional funding is needed for the CCAC – funding must keep pace with the growth of the assessment program. **[3 mentions]**

2. New CCAC guidelines should include an impact study of the cost to institutions and a reasonable implementation time frame before the new standards are used in assessments.
[2 mentions]

3. A database of current standard operating procedures and new techniques should be provided, as well as a forum for questions and answers. **[2 mentions]**

4. More educational workshops should be offered to assist everyone involved in adhering to the highest standards of animal care. **[1 mention]**

5. The CCAC should act as a unified voice for the university community regarding new regulations or legislation. **[1 mention]**

6. It would be helpful if the CCAC developed documents that provide policy interpretation and/or guidelines for implementation of new policies. **[1 mention]**

7. An on-line animal care software program, that would meet the needs of Canadian academic community, should be created. **[1 mention]**

8. Guidelines and publications could be made more useful if synthesized and published in a lighter format such as brochures, bulletins, etc. **[1 mention]**

9. The CCAC should continue pursuing international harmonization of animal care and use standards to facilitate increasing international collaboration. **[1 mention]**

10. The CCAC should ensure that its core programs remain the first priority over other programs or activities that could dilute capabilities and resources. **[1 mention]**

Part B Preface

This information is based on the tabulation of 184 responses (154 English and 30 French) to the CCAC Strategic Planning (2009-2014) Questionnaire.

In May 2008, Canadian researchers and other relevant personnel of all research institutions participating in the CCAC Program were invited to express their opinions on the most important issues facing institutions and individuals using animals for scientific purposes, and facing the CCAC Program. An external communications consultant was retained to receive and tabulate the responses in a confidential manner.

Comments have been tabulated and sorted in descending order according to number of mentions. The number of mentions appears in brackets, along with the total number of responses to that particular question and the resulting percentage.

This information is presented as part of the background for the CCAC Forum 2008. The material is particularity relevant to the themes and topics of the breakout discussions that will occur during the forum, which will be held in Ottawa on October 3, 2008.

> *The CCAC extends thanks to the many individuals from across Canada that took time from their busy schedules to participate in the questionnaire, and to Chairs of institutional animal care committees, senior administrators of research institutions, and the CIHR and NSERC for their assistance in circulating the questionnaire. Thank you!*

Theme I: Identifying the Needs of Participants in the CCAC Program

1. **Please identify in decreasing order of importance the most serious concerns with your animal care and use program, and provide any comments that might be useful in addressing these concerns in the short, medium and long term:**

   (Tabulation includes 180 comments and 4 no answers)

   - Funding and cost issues, e.g., operating costs, budget cuts, and per diem animal housing **[36/180 = 20.0%]**

   - Administrative and regulatory burden – too long to get approvals and too much time spent on animal protocols **[31/180 = 17.2%]**

   - Aging or inadequate infrastructure/equipment **[28/180 = 15.6%]**

   - Personnel shortages, e.g., shortages of animal care employees, program administrators, personnel for doing peer reviews and veterinarians for lab animal medicine, and high turnover of temporary employees **[24/180 = 13.3%]**

   - Adaptation of guidance and protocols to the institution/type of research, e.g., teaching institutions, smaller institutions, 'near production' level facilities for livestock, wildlife and field-based research, and aquatic research **[18/180 = 10.0%]**

   - Shortage of space and facilities **[17/180 = 9.4%]**

   - Lack of commitment on the part of institution's senior administration (e.g., failure to hire a director of the animal care program) **[5/180 = 2.8%]**

   - Clarity and simplicity of the animal protocol and interpretation of regulatory responsibility; guidance is not provided on regulatory compliance and interpreting CCAC guidelines **[5/180 = 2.8%]**

   - Effective post–approval, real-time monitoring for standards and protocols **[3/180 = 1.7%]**

   - No serious concerns with our animal care and use program **[3/180 = 1.7%]**

   - The need for a detailed 'How to run your local ACC' manual which should be produced and followed **[2/180 = 1.1%]**

   - Lack of access to effective training materials and programs for veterinarians and animal care staff **[2/180 = 1.1%]**

   - Miscellaneous – i.e. single mention of an issue or concern **[6/180 = 3.3%]**

   - No answer **[4/184 = 2.2%]**

2. From your perspective, what are the emerging or dominant trends that will shape the field of animal use for scientific purposes in the next five years?

(Tabulation includes 138 comments and 46 no answers)

- Genetically-engineered models/organisms **[33/138 = 23.9%]**

- Increasing regulation and the trend toward decreasing animal use **[26/138 = 18.8%]**

- New model techniques, systems and materials, including imaging and computer models, which simulate organs or organ systems **[11/138 = 8.0%]**

- Increasing costs and challenges to get adequate funding for animal care and use programs **[10/138 = 7.2%]**

- Increasing concern about bio-security and containment **[9/138 = 6.5%]**

- Increased use of aquatic animals (i.e. fish, squid and octopi) for research and teaching **[7/138 = 5.1%]**

- Increasing momentum of animal rights groups **[6/138 = 4.4%]**

- Continued improvement in the application of the Three Rs **[6/138 = 4.4%]**

- Specialized facilities (e.g., ventilated caging systems) and animal care expertise **[5/138 = 3.6%]**

- Increased movement of animals from one facility to another and inter-institutional collaboration on studies **[4/138 = 2.9%]**

- Reaching a balance between an acceptable level of animal welfare and allowing researchers freedom to pursue their studies **[3/138 = 2.2%]**

- Miscellaneous – i.e. 1 or 2 mentions of a trend **[18/138 = 13.0%]**

- No answer **[46/184 = 25.0%]**

Theme II: Participants' comments on the CCAC Program

The Canadian Council on Animal Care (CCAC) currently operates three programs: guidelines, assessment, and education/training/communications (ETC).

1. **Are you satisfied with the quality of content and delivery of the following CCAC programs?**

   Graded from -2 (very dissatisfied) to +2 (very satisfied)

	-2	-1	0	+1	+2	No Answer
Guidelines Program	3/164 = 1.8 %	13/164 = 7.9 %	28/164 = 17.1 %	88/164 = 53.7 %	32/164 = 19.5 %	20/184 = 10.8 %
Assessment Program	6/164 = 3.7 %	17/164 = 10.4 %	37/164 = 22.5 %	74/164 = 45.1 %	30/164 = 18.3 %	20/184 = 10.8 %
ETC Program	9/158 = 5.7 %	28/158 = 17.7 %	43/158 = 27.2 %	61/158 = 38.6 %	17/158 = 10.8 %	26/184 = 14.0 %

2. **Please suggest ways in which content or delivery of these programs could be improved by the CCAC?**

   Guidelines Program:
   (Tabulation includes 112 comments and 72 no answers)

   - Guidelines are thorough; the program is good as is. **[17/112 = 15.2%]**

   - More specific and less restrictive guidelines are needed for different classes of experimentation as well as types of institutions. **[14/112 = 12.5%]**

   - Input from research institutions and researchers should be sought as new guidelines proceed through the drafting process. **[10/112 = 8.9%]**

   - The amount of guidelines material should be standardized and reduced – it is too laborious. **[9/112 = 8.0%]**

   - Guidelines should be made more accessible/available, e.g., through a web-based searchable library, and electronic updates should be sent out when guidelines are released or updated. **[7/112 = 6.2%]**

   - Information on best practices and interpretation of guidelines (providing more clarity and precision) would be helpful. **[6/112 = 5.3%]**

   - Guidelines should stay as 'guidelines', emphasizing performance standards and allowing for deviation when scientifically justified. **[5/112 = 4.5%]**

- Obsolete information should be removed from guidelines and updates should be provided that keep up with current trends and developments. **[5/112 = 4.5%]**

- Guidelines need to be developed on defining and managing pain and discomfort. **[3/112 = 2.7%]**

- ACCs should be more proactive in contributing to draft guidelines and facilitating input from researchers. **[3/112 = 2.7%]**

- There should be more CCAC guidelines staff and appropriate funding to keep guidelines current as well as generate new ones. **[2/112 = 1.8%]**

- Guidelines are excellent resources; there should be greater variety and additional guidelines to deal with post-approval monitoring, for example. **[2/112 = 1.8%]**

- More guidelines are needed on aquatic animal species and wildlife. **[2/112 = 1.8%]**

- Occasional workshops/teleconferences should be held on guidelines, trends and problems. **[2/112 = 1.8%]**

- Guidelines should be more environmentally friendly – i.e. move from paper to electronic means, and provide an e-newsletter with links to the guidelines in question. **[2/112 = 1.8%]**

- Guidelines should involve more interaction and input from practicing researchers (especially with respect to wildlife) as opposed to just those serving on ACCs. **[2/112 = 1.8%]**

- Miscellaneous – i.e. single mention of an issue or concern **[21/112 = 18.7%]**

- No answer **[72/184 = 39.1 %]**

Assessment Program:
(Tabulation includes 100 comments and 84 no answers)

- The Assessment Program is satisfactory as it is. **[16/100 = 16%]**

- Consistency in application of CCAC standards from one assessment panel to the next should be ensured. **[13/100 = 13%]**

- Documentation and administrative burden should be reduced. **[11/100 = 11%]**

- CCAC evaluation teams should have more direct interaction with individual research scientists when making site visits. **[9/100 = 9%]**

- Assessments should be proportionate and suited to type of institution/research. **[9/100 = 9%]**

- Assessment should show greater flexibility; demands are made in an authoritarian fashion with little 2-way discussion. **[4/100 = 4%]**

- Responses to post-assessment follow-up reports are slow. **[4/100 = 4%]**

- Unannounced assessment visits should be instituted. **[3/100 = 3%]**

- All violations should be shared with all institutions. **[2/100 = 2%]**

- Assessments should avoid being prescriptive – i.e. tell the institution what is wrong and avoid prescribing the resolution. **[2/100 = 2%]**

- There is a trend to continually raise the animal care bar, regardless of the quality of care currently provided. **[2/100 = 2%]**

- Assessments should focus objectively on animal care issues that have been verified by multiple inputs. **[2/100 = 2%]**

- Examples or direction should be provided on how to fill out forms for assessment visit, and the scope of assessment should be made very clear prior to the visit. **[2/100 = 2%]**

- Criteria should be restricted to those directly relevant to the well-being of animals (e.g., crack in ceiling, or chipped paint were cited). **[2/100 = 2%]**

- Miscellaneous – i.e. single mention of an issue or concern **[19/100 = 19%]**

- No answer **[84/184 = 45.6%]**

Education, Training and Communications Program:
(Tabulation includes 96 comments and 88 no answers)

- The CCAC and ACCs need to increase visibility and accessibility of ETC to researchers. **[14/96 = 14.6%]**

- The present ETC program is working well. **[11/96 = 11.5%]**

- More online materials and courses are needed. **[11/96 = 11.5%]**

- Training is needed for non-traditional species, wildlife, amphibians, reptiles, birds and livestock; training should not be restricted to laboratory animals. **[10/96 = 10.4%]**

- More courses and workshops/seminars should be delivered at institutions. **[8/96 = 8.3%]**

- Website and web-based training modules need to be updated and improved for user friendliness, ability to search, links, etc. **[6/96 = 6.2%]**

- More courses (compliance and administration) and certification programs are needed for staff and members of ACCs. **[6/96 = 6.2 %]**

- The CCAC should play a stronger role in education of the public to counter animal rights activists. **[3/96 = 3.1%]**

- An up-to-date schedule of courses and training sessions available across the country should be posted and maintained **[3/96 = 3.1%]**

- Online tests should be redesigned and shortened to focus on handling and use issues, and less on administration structure. **[2/96 = 2.1%]**

- Training should be standardized so that people can move between institutions and not have to retrain. **[2/96 = 2.1%]**

- Annual CCAC workshops could be expanded and allotted an adequate amount of time; these could also include more lectures on industry issues. **[2/96 = 2.1%]**

- Certification requirements for students and temporary assistants should be made easier. **[2/96 = 2.1%]**

- A program should be developed (in association with CALAS) for animal care staff. **[2/96 = 2.1%]**

- Miscellaneous – i.e. single mention of an issue or concern **[14/96 = 14.6%]**

- No answer **[88/184 = 47.8%]**

3. **Are you satisfied with the opportunities made available to you (e.g., Council/committee representation, assessment visits, guidelines subcommittees, expert/widespread reviews of guidelines and policies, workshops; and contacts with Secretariat members) to provide input to the CCAC on the programs listed below?**

    Graded from -2 (very dissatisfied) to +2 (very satisfied)

	-2	-1	0	+1	+2	No Answer
Guidelines Program	6/159 = 3.8 %	9/159 = 5.7 %	40/159 = 25.1 %	72/159 = 45.3 %	32/159 = 20.1 %	25/184 = 13.6 %
Assessment Program	7/158 = 4.4 %	11/158 = 7.0 %	41/158 = 25.9 %	69/158 = 43.7 %	30/158 = 19.0 %	26/184 = 14.1 %
ETC Program	6/155 = 3.9 %	20/155 = 12.9 %	47/155 = 30.3 %	61/155 = 39.4 %	21/155 = 13.5 %	29/184 = 15.8 %

4. **If you have any concerns, please suggest ways in which your input could be: a) better solicited; and b) better used by the CCAC.**

    Guidelines Program:
    (Tabulation includes 45 comments and 139 no answers)

- There are no concerns; the present Guidelines Program is working well. **[11/45 = 24.4%]**

- Input of the research community should be solicited and shared at the guidelines planning stages. **[10/45 = 22.2%]**

- An interactive website, password protected, should be generated for soliciting annual input, perhaps with specific questions and a brief questionnaire. **[4/45 = 8.9%]**

- There is a lack of awareness of how input is delivered to the CCAC. **[3/45 = 6.7%]**

- The selection process for the guidelines subcommittees could be more transparent to allow for input from expert researchers who may not be familiar to the CCAC. **[3/45 = 6.7%]**

- Miscellaneous – i.e. single mention of an issue or concern **[14/45 = 31.1%]**

- No answer **[139/184 = 75.5%]**

Assessment Program:
(Tabulation includes 39 comments and 145 no answers)

- There are no concerns; the present Assessment Program is working well. **[7/39 = 18.0%]**

- There should be appropriate representation of users on CCAC assessment panels (e.g., for assessment of teaching institutions, employees of teaching institutions should be on the assessment panel). **[5/39 = 12.8%]**

- More time for discussion and justification of assessment panel recommendations should be provided during assessment visits. **[3/39 = 7.7%]**

- Communication and interaction should be increased throughout the year, and assessments should be conducted in a less aggressive style. **[3/39 = 7.7%]**

- A suggestion box should be put on the website, electronic submission and data entry in the Program Review Form should be improved (i.e. improve user friendliness), and there should be more frequent surveys like this one. **[3/39 = 7.7%]**

- There should be exit interviews/follow-up reports from the institution and ACC detailing their experience and concerns mentioned during the visit. **[2/39 = 5.1%]**

- More and quicker feedback should be provided at the end of each evaluation. **[2/39 = 5.1%]**

- Miscellaneous – i.e. single mention of an issue or concern **[14/39 = 35.9 %]**

- No answer **[145/184 = 78.8 %]**

ETC Program:
(Tabulation includes 32 comments and 152 no answers)

- The availability of training programs and workshops across the country should be increased. **[6/32 = 18.8%]**

- There are no concerns; the present ETC Program is working well. **[5/32 = 15.6%]**

- More online course material for updating scientists, technicians and animal care staff should be created. **[4/32 = 12.5%]**

- More affordable workshops and seminars should be provided (e.g., perhaps use local facilities in exchange for reduced rates of attendance). **[4/32 = 12.5%]**

- Opportunities should be provided for those working closely with the animals to play a role in education, training and communication. **[3/32 = 9.4%]**

- Miscellaneous – i.e. single mention of an issue or concern **[10/32 = 31.2%]**

- No answer **[152/184 = 82.6%]**

5. **The CCAC is responsible for setting appropriate standards for, and oversight of, the care and use of animals in science. While ensuring the confidentiality of information received from institutions, the CCAC is also accountable to the Canadian public in three main ways:**

   - **assuring community representation at all levels of the CCAC's work;**
   - **publishing annual statistics on animal use in Canada;**
   - **publishing the names of holders of the CCAC Certificate of Good Animal Practice – GAP® on its website, along with extensive other information including CCAC annual reports.**

   Please suggest any other ways in which you think: a) the CCAC; and b) participants in the CCAC Program could be more accountable to the Canadian public with respect to animal care and use in science.

   (Tabulation includes 119 comments and 65 no answers)

   - The CCAC should champion the value of animal-based research to the media, the public, and the school systems; it should educate Canadians with regard to the oversight programs that are in place to ensure the ethical use of animals in research. **[46/119 = 38.6%]**

   - The scope of responsibilities and accountabilities that is in place now is good. **[33/119 = 27.7%]**

   - Help should be provided for institutions in recruiting and training independent public members to sit on animal care committees. **[5/119 = 4.2%]**

   - There should be prompt annual reporting, including data on numbers of animals used (and species) for non-invasive purposes (i.e. teaching/training) where animals go back into production purposes, as opposed to research that uses animals in terminal procedures. **[3/119 = 2.5%]**

   - The CCAC could set up a network of knowledgeable speakers to make presentations to appropriate organizations about the CCAC programs, hold regional meetings and workshops, develop more educational modules, etc. **[2/119 = 1.7%]**

   - The CCAC needs a "Fast Reaction Committee" to provide concise information on CCAC guidelines to institutional committees when they are facing a media crisis. **[2/119 = 1.7%]**

   - Bureaucratic load for investigators has grown tremendously over the past decade – the role of CCAC is increasingly hindering research. **[2/119 = 1.7%]**

   - To gain a better understanding of field research, the CCAC or ACC should actually visit the sites where the research is being conducted. **[2/119 = 1.7%]**

   - Miscellaneous – i.e. single mention of an issue or concern **[24/119 = 20.2 %]**

   - No answer **[65/184 = 35.3 %]**

Theme III: Working Together To Achieve Good Animal Practice in Science throughout Canada

Please suggest the ways in which you feel progress can be made in effectively protecting animals used for scientific purposes, both in your institution and more generally throughout Canada, dividing these into:

Programs or elements that the CCAC can develop and implement:

(Tabulation includes 101 comments and 83 no answers)

- Standard training programs (including training on non-traditional species) should be developed and made available across Canada for animal handlers and research assistants. **[15/101 = 14.9%]**

- There should be more communication about success stories and best practices to create public awareness that research is conducted by responsible, caring people to improve many aspects of life. **[11/101 = 10.9%]**

- A very good job is being done now. (e.g., animals used in research receive far more care and consideration than most pets or agricultural animals). **[10/101 = 9.9%]**

- A post-approval monitoring program should be developed and implemented, including what to do regarding non-compliant research. **[8/101 = 7.9%]**

- There should be a greater level of engagement with researchers, and more hands-on meetings and dialogue with technicians, as opposed to simply increasing online training. **[5/101 = 5.0%]**

- There should be workshops and training opportunities in veterinarian university programs to increase student awareness and interest in laboratory animals. **[4/101 = 4.0%]**

- A database of expert contacts (especially veterinarians) that can be contacted when problems arise with lab animals should be created. **[3/101 = 2.9%]**

- The CCAC should be the liaison with funding agencies to ensure appropriate representation and animal research funding. **[3/101 = 2.9%]**

- Unannounced random assessments/evaluations should be instituted. **[3/101 = 2.9%]**

- More communication and guidelines is needed around non-traditional species, i.e. wildlife issues. **[3/101 = 2.9%]**

- There should be a decentralised CCAC centre in each region to offer more cost effective training, as well as a hotline for veterinary questions, protocol clarifications, etc. **[3/101 = 2.9%]**

- Information sessions should be held at Canadian scientific conferences to inform and increase awareness among students and researchers. **[2/101 = 2.0%]**

- The regulatory/administrative burden should be reduced and any further regulation should be well thought out in terms of effects on universities and R&D. **[2/101 = 2.0%]**

- Quick reference fact sheets, executive summaries or short versions (less wordy) should be provided for each guidelines document. **[2/101 = 2.0%]**

- There should be a crisis management plan and emergency/disaster guidelines for infectious diseases and pandemic preparedness. **[2/101 = 2.0%]**

- Animal use guidelines should be adapted for institutions other than post secondary, such as for government agencies and labs, pharmaceutical companies, SPCAs, zoos, and aquariums. **[2/101 = 2.0%]**

- An animal care training 'road show' to the various institutions should be organized. **[2/101 = 2.0%]**

- AUPs (Animal Use Protocols) should be standardized across institutions. **[2/101 = 2.0%]**

- Miscellaneous – i.e. single mention of an issue or concern **[19/101 = 18.9%]**

- No answer **[83/184 = 45.1%]**

Programs or elements that institutions can develop and implement:

(Tabulation includes 90 comments and 94 no answers)

- There should be better education and training programs that will result in veterinary and technical personnel with skills in science, medicine and animal care. **[11/90 = 12.2%]**

- There should be better post-approval monitoring and follow up (e.g., a dedicated team). **[11/90 = 12.2 %]**

- Institutions need to allocate appropriate resources to develop and maintain animal care and use programs, including facilities as well as veterinary and technical care. **[10/90 = 11.1%]**

- There should be more communication about success stories and best practices to create public awareness that research is conducted by responsible, caring people to improve many aspects of life. **[8/90 = 8.9%]**

- Consultation/communication between an institution's ACC and the animal research community should be fostered so that CCAC recommendations trickle down. **[7/90 = 7.8%]**

- There should be assurance that only trained individuals are working with animals and that ongoing training is available for staff and students. **[5/90 = 5.6%]**

- Institutions should work towards best practices, implementation of the Three Rs and welfare standards that will meet public expectations. **[4/90 = 4.4%]**

- Administrative burden should be decreased and time for processing shortened. **[4/90 = 4.4%]**

- There should be annual medical testing of all staff working with animals. **[2/90 = 2.2%]**

- 'Boiler plate' sections that protocol writers can copy and paste into their protocols should be developed. **[2/90 = 2.2%]**

- There should be closer collaboration with other committees, such as biosafety and toxicology committees. **[2/90 = 2.2%]**

- Miscellaneous – i.e. single mention of an issue or concern **[24/90 = 26.8%]**

- No answer **[94/184 = 51.1%]**

Programs or elements that the granting Agencies and other funders of direct and indirect costs of animal-based research can develop and implement:

(Tabulation includes 93 comments and 91 no answers)

- They should help fund the real costs of animal care, including assistance for annual and indirect costs, improvement and expansion of animal care facilities and infrastructure (perhaps some sort of matching program). **[27/93 = 29.0%]**

- Part of the funding criteria should include the training and credentials of the individuals working with the animals, and the CCAC accreditation status. **[7/93 = 7.5%]**

- An on-going public education outreach program should be developed to respond to negative press and counter animal rights misinformation. **[7/93 = 7.5%]**

- Granting Agencies should ask questions about whether the proposed animal species is the best for the job, and what alternatives to using the animals could be suggested. **[5/93 = 5.3%]**

- The system that is in place (to abide by CCAC standards) is working well. **[4/93 = 4.3%]**

- Granting Agencies should ensure that any project using animals for research is thoroughly peer reviewed for scientific merit. **[4/93 = 4.3%]**

- Granting Agencies should communicate more with researchers concerning animal care and what they specifically need as a program for animal care for the research they support. **[3/93 = 3.2%]**

- Online resources for training of staff and students in animal-based research should be provided. **[2/93 = 2.2%]**

- There should be means to ensure that funds granted are really used for what they were intended. **[2/93 = 2.2%]**

- Granting Agencies should not be involved in animal care and use issues. **[2/93 = 2.2%]**

- There should be financial support for veterinarian and technician training programs. **[2/93 = 2.2%]**

- By having to provide an animal use protocol number, funding agencies can make sure that funded activities conform to the guidelines. **[2/93 = 2.2%]**

- Solutions for providing affordable research animals and ensuring high quality animals for research purposes need to be developed. **[2/93 = 2.2%]**

- Miscellaneous – i.e. single mention of an issue or concern **[24/93 = 25.7%]**

- No answer **[91/184 = 49.5%]**