CHECKLIST FOR REVIEW OF APPLICATIONS

Page in e-form	Questions	Check
Page 2.1 Investigators	Do the listed researchers have the skills and qualifications to complete the proposed research? *Note this may need to be reviewed in conjunction with page 11.1*	
	Are students listed? If so, is there appropriate support/supervision for junior researchers? *Guidance from the Code:* "Accept responsibilities (see Clauses 1.1 [vi] and 1.31–1.32) (xviii) all people involved in the proposed project understand and accept their roles and responsibilities in the project and the relationship of their roles and responsibilities to those of other people involved in the project (xix) procedures are performed competently, by people competent for the procedures or under the direct supervision of a person competent to perform the procedures, and provisions are made for the education, training and supervision of people nominated on the application, as appropriate."	
Page 2.2 Other Personnel	Is the Facility Manager listed, and correct?	
Page 3.1 Overview	**Title:** Does the title describe the work proposed in lay terms?	
	Lay Summary: Is the lay summary written in plain English and acronyms and abbreviations explained?	
	Timeframe: What is the timeframe requested to do the project, is this reasonable? *Note that a standard 3-year period is approved initially although it is common for teaching applications to request 5 years.* *Guidance from the Code:* 2.3.16 In determining the duration of approval for individual projects, AECs should take into account the number of years for which the project is funded, any milestones or stages outlined in the project, and any formal agreements between the institution and funding bodies.	
Page 3.2 Project Classification	Have the appropriate boxes been ticked?	
Page 4.1 Scientific or Educational Justification	Is the scientific or educational justification clearly defined? (ii) the potential benefits of the outcomes, and the evidence that supports the use of animals. For teaching projects, justification must include an outline of how the attainment of educational outcomes will be assessed, including, as applicable, national educational outcomes, required Vocational Education and Training (VET) package competency achievements, endorsed program outcomes	

Page in e-form	Questions	Check
	and other curriculum-related outcomes (iii) details of why the use of animals is essential to achieve all the stated aims, potential alternatives that are available to replace the use of animals in all or part of the project, and why these alternatives are not suitable (iv) information to support the case for ethical acceptability of the proposed use of animals, based on whether such use demonstrates the principles of the Code, and balancing whether the potential effects on the wellbeing of the animals involved is justified by the potential benefits	
	Is the project scientifically justified?	
	Are the desired outcomes clearly stated?	
	Have the investigators adequately described the benefits /significance of the work?	
Page 4.2 Animal Number Justification	Has satisfactory justification been provided for the use of the nominated species (including strain, sex and age)?	
	If only one sex is used, has this been justified?	
	Has a satisfactory explanation been provided for the number of animals requested?	
	Has a power calculation been performed? If so, have the applicants clearly defined the outcome measures?	
	Do the numbers in this section match the Animals Required page (page 5.1) and the flow chart (page 11.5)? Are animal numbers consistent throughout the application?	
	Have additional animals been requested for potential adverse events or an expected mortality percentage?	
Page 4.3 Replacement	Has it been satisfactorily justified why animals are needed for the proposed project?	
	Has satisfactory consideration been given to the use of alternative forms of research/teaching to avoid or minimise the use of animals?	
Page 4.4 Reduction	Have the applicants adequately addressed if animal numbers could be reduced by obtaining more data or outcomes from each animal (without increasing welfare impact)?	

Page in e-form	Questions	Check
	Has preliminary in vitro work been done to inform the in vivo study or other models? If no, is a justification given?	
Page 4.5 Refinement	Has the level of pain/discomfort and welfare cost to the animal been sufficiently explained and justified?	
	Are methods that alleviate or minimise potential pain and distress, and enhance animal wellbeing discussed (e.g., enrichment in cages)?	
	If enrichment is below the standard, has this been justified?	
Page 5.1 Animals Required	Do the requested animal numbers match the numbers requested on the animal justification page (page 4.2), procedure description (page 6.1) and flowchart (page 11.5)?	
Page 5.2 Animal Housing	Is it clear where the animals will be housed?	
	Are housing conditions fully described (e.g., maximum number of animals to be housed at any one-time, maximum time held, any special requirements)?	
	Is it clear whether any genetically modified animals have phenotypes and if any require special care?	
	Is single animal housing adequately justified, if used?	
Page 5.3 Animal Fate	*When something other than humane killing is selected* - Is it clear what happens to the animals at the end of the project and is this appropriate?	
	Have the applicants addressed if there is possibility of rehoming? *If animals are to be reused (returned to flock/ herd): Consider the following taken from the Code-* "2.3.15 When considering approval for the reuse of animals, the AEC must take into account: (i) the pain and distress, and any potential long-term or cumulative effects, caused by previous activities and conditions (ii) the time allowed for recovery of the animals between activities (iii) whether an animal has fully recovered from the previous activities (iv) the pain and distress likely to be caused by the next and subsequent activities (v) the total time over which an animal will be used."	

Page in e-form	Questions	Check
	When humane killing is selected - Is it clear how the animals will be euthanised and disposed of (if applicable)?	
	Has the chosen method of humane killing been well justified and is it appropriate for the project, the species and age of the animal and the experience of the researchers? *Signs indicative of death should be listed relevant to the species, researchers should refer to a relevant SOP (e.g., Humane Killing of Laboratory animals). Members may need to refer to the substances administered page (page 6.5) to check whether all humane killing agents have been listed.*	
Page 5.4 Genetically Modified Animals	Has this section been adequately addressed? *Guidance from the Code:* "2.4.26 The creation and breeding of a new animal line, including genetically modified and cloned animals, where the impact of the genotype on animal wellbeing is unknown or uncertain is regarded as a scientific purpose. Persons responsible for animals involved in such projects are regarded as investigators. Their responsibilities extend until the impact on animal wellbeing is known and the AEC has approved the final report on the generation of a new animal line. After this AEC approval, the new line can be treated as breeding stock, and responsibility for the animals and for obtaining AEC approval for procedures applicable to their breeding rests with the facility manager or animal carer (see Chapter 2.5). 2.4.27 Investigators must: (i) not generate a new animal line using genetic modification if a similar, suitable animal model is available to the investigator or a relevant in vitro method can be used to achieve the aims of the project."	
Page 6.1 Procedure Description	Has it been clearly explained what will happen to each individual animal or group of animals from the beginning to the end of the project?	
	Are procedures described consistent with the attached flow chart(s) and any relevant SOPs referenced?	
	Have the applicants considered and provided sufficient justification for the cumulative burden on animals? *Many small or moderate interventions can add up to significant cumulative burden over a lifetime.*	
	Have the applicants outlined any anticipated adverse events that could occur (e.g., morbidity or mortality)?	

Page in e-form	Questions	Check
Page 6.2 Procedure Location	Is the location a suitable fit for the animal work? *Guidance from the Code:* "3.2.14 Facilities must be appropriately staffed, designed, constructed, equipped, maintained and managed to achieve a high standard of animal care. Facilities must be suitable for the type of animals kept and the aims of the activities undertaken."	
Page 6.3 Procedure Types, Techniques and Pain	Is the pain category appropriate for the procedure(s) described?	
	Do the procedures listed here match the Procedure Description on page 6.1?	
	Is the extent and duration of pain and distress adequately described and managed?	
Page 6.4 Animal Monitoring	Have the applicants described the monitoring program thoroughly and is the monitoring appropriate for each stage of a study?	
	Is it clear who will do the monitoring (including on weekends and public holidays)?	
	Is the frequency of monitoring post-procedure consistent with planned analgesia administration? Is it clear when analgesia will be administered?	
	Is it clear when intervention will be provided to support an animal's health or humanely kill an animal? *This should also be listed on the CRS if the project has a CRS.* *Guidance from the Code:* 3.3.13 Animals that develop signs of pain and distress must be treated promptly, in accordance with the intervention points and humane endpoints approved by the animal ethics committee (AEC), and institutional and AEC policies and procedures (see Clauses 2.1.5 [v] [d] and 3.1.23–3.1.24).	
Page 6.5 Substances Administered	Have applicants listed doses, pharmaceutical names, route of administration and number of treatments?	
	Do the details in this section match page 6.1, 6.3, flow charts etc?	

Page in e-form	Questions	Check
Page 6.6 Transporting Animals	Are the appropriate SOPs attached? *Guidance from the Code:* "Transport of animals 3.2.5 Methods and arrangements for the transport of animals must support and safeguard the wellbeing of the animals before, during and after their transport, and take into account the health, temperament, age, sex and previous experiences of the animals; the number of animals travelling together and their social relationships; the period without food or water; the duration and mode of transport; environmental conditions (particularly extremes of temperature); and the care given during the journey. 3.2.6 Transport methods and arrangements must: (i) be appropriate for the species and the circumstances (ii) minimise harm, including pain and distress, arising from factors such as containment, movement, noise, disruption of social groups, and changes in the environment and personnel (iii) ensure that animals are: (a) provided with appropriate food and water when necessary (b) provided with the physical and social environment appropriate for the species (c) protected from, and treated for, injury and disease. 3.2.7 Both suppliers and recipients of animals must ensure that satisfactory delivery procedures are in place, including receipt of the animals by a responsible person, accountability for animal numbers, and adherence to other regulatory codes, such as quarantine. 3.2.8 People responsible for monitoring animals during transport must be able to recognise and respond to animal needs during transport."	
Page 7.1 Wildlife Animal(s) and Field Study	*If capture or trapping* – Is the method of capture and welfare implications of capture procedures well described and justified?	
	If tagging – are individual animal tagging and monitoring procedures justified and well described?	
Page 8.1 Teaching/Training	Is there sufficient supervision for students? *Guidance from the Code:* "For teaching projects, justification must include an outline of how the attainment of educational outcomes will be assessed, including, as applicable, national educational outcomes, required Vocational Education and Training (VET) package competency achievements, endorsed program outcomes and other curriculum-related outcomes."	
	Are there sufficient numbers of animals for the procedures and class size?	

Page in e-form	Questions	Check
Page 9.1 Animal Breeding	Is the justification for the breeding colony reasonable? Are there welfare benefits to having a breeding colony over sourcing the animals elsewhere? E.g., transport not required. *Guidance from the Code:* "2.4.27 Investigators must: (i) not generate a new animal line using genetic modification if a similar, suitable animal model is available to the investigator or a relevant in vitro method can be used to achieve the aims of the project."	
	Have the issues of wastage and periods of reduced usage been explained and are the explanations reasonable?	
	Are the numbers outlined and justified on page 4.2? (Age sex/genotype).	
	Has the expertise of persons responsible for the colony been well described and are they suitable to manage a breeding colony?	
	Relationship with LAS – has the division of responsibilities been well described – is this appropriate?	
	Have any issues expected with breeding been described?	
	If the animals are re-used, do they have an adequate rest?	
Page 10.1 Risk Management	Have they adequately addressed any safety issues for humans or other animals?	
Page 10.2 Management of Adverse Events	If there is an animal emergency, are there appropriate measures in place to manage the emergency and minimise any suffering to the animals? *Guidance from the Code:* "3.1.24 Prompt action must be taken in response to unexpected adverse events and emergencies, including alleviation of pain and distress, in accordance with institutional and AEC policies and procedures (see Clause 2.1.5 [v] [d]). Alleviation of pain and distress of a severity that was not anticipated in an approved project or activity must take precedence over an individual animal reaching the planned endpoint of the project or activity, or the continuation or completion of the project or activity. If necessary, animals must be killed humanely without delay. 3.1.25 When an animal dies unexpectedly, or is humanely killed due to unforeseen complications, a necropsy should be performed by a competent person (see Clause 2.1.5 [v] [d])."	

Page in e-form	Questions	Check
Page 11.1 Expertise and Training Required	*The AEC should ensure the person ultimately responsible for the project (CI) is an appropriate choice and can fulfil their responsibilities under the Code. The AEC should take care to give careful consideration of the skills required, and the capacity to handle the number of animals requested.* Have the applicants' experience, and competency been adequately described?	
	If training is required – Is it clear what training is needed, who will provide the training, and how and when the training will be provided?	
	Have all researchers completed the online ComPass Course within the last five years?	
Page 11.2 Related Applications and Committee Approvals	For genetically modified organisms (GMOs), is there an IBC approval recorded?	
	Have the applicants satisfactorily completed this section?	
Page 11.3 Required Permits or Licences	Have the applicants satisfactorily completed this section? *Note – it is the investigators responsibility to ensure all relevant permits are in place.*	
Page 11.4 Publications	Are relevant publications listed?	
Page 11.5 Attached Documents	If attached documents are referred to in the application, are they attached? (Facility Manager Declarations, CRS, Expertise Report, flow charts, SOPs)	
	Does the flowchart/experimental plan show how all the aims/parts of the study interconnect? Does it show a timeline of an individual animal's experience (e.g., when all the procedures are planned for an individual animal)?	
SOP (Standard Operating Procedure)	Are the SOPs up to date? Do they fully describe the procedures and match what is described in the application?	
CRS (Clinical Record Sheet)	Are the intervention criteria listed sufficient to protect the welfare of the animal?	
	Has the CRS been appropriately tailored to the study?	