



Company: CHM Alliance Pty Ltd	Issue date: 21 March 2018
Document: AEC Standard Westbrook Project Proposal 210318.doc	Authorised: Quality Manager
Standard Westbrook Project Proposal to Use Animals for a Scientific Purpose	

Title of Project:

This form is to be used for submission to the CHM Alliance Pty Ltd Animal Ethics Committee (AEC) for Research project proposals for standard Westbrook proposals as defined in Standard Operating Procedures.

Important Notices

The CHM Alliance Animal Ethics Committee (AEC) deems the applicant to be in charge of the project and to be responsible for:

- The conduct of the project in accordance with AEC approval, the *Animal Care and Protection Act 2001*, the *Australian code for the care and use of animals for scientific purposes, 8th Edition 2013* (the Code) and all other relevant Commonwealth and State legislation.
- The submission of all necessary reports, notices and advices as required by the AEC.

Investigators and trainers involved in the scientific use of animals have personal responsibility for all matters related to the wellbeing of the animals they use and must act in accordance with all requirements of the Code. This responsibility begins when an animal is allocated to a project and ends with its fate at the completion of the project. Investigators and trainers involved in the scientific use of animals have an obligation to treat animals with respect and to consider their wellbeing as an essential factor when planning and conducting projects.

Note: Numbering on this proposal mirrors the extended version of the CHM Alliance Animal Ethics Committee Project Proposal. Sections that are addressed in SOPs have been omitted.

AEC USE ONLY			
Proposal Reference Number:		Date Assessed:	
Assessment Category: (cross one box only)			
<input type="checkbox"/> Approved as submitted			
<input type="checkbox"/> Approved subject to modifications			
<input type="checkbox"/> Amend prior to resubmission			
<input type="checkbox"/> Pending			
<input type="checkbox"/> Rejected			
Signature of Chair:			
Initials of Members			
Category A:	Category B:	Category C:	Category D:
Monitoring concerns:			

1.1 Title of Project

The inclusion of Intellibond trace minerals in pig diets to improve performance

1.2 Applicant Details - Applicant's contact person details

Company: CHM Alliance Pty Ltd		
Name: Robert Hewitt		
Address: P.O. Box 5950, Manly Qld 4179		
Relationship to Applicant (eg employee, consultant, vet etc): Research Officer		
Phone: 07 3806 2037	Fax: 07 3806 4993	email: robert.hewitt@sunporkfarms.com.au

1.3 Description of animals used in project: Refer SOP 9.1 Standard Westbrook Pig Research Facility Project Proposal also technology involvement, joint project and another AEC

Put total for project here with detail in 3.3 for individual trials if required, fill out as appropriate for the species to be used (domestic mammals - pig; birds - poultry). If rows are insufficient attach a separate appendix detailing complete animal list.

Animal Type	Scientific name	Class	Sex*	Number
Pigs	Sus scrofa domestica			
Total number of animals to be used for this project (include control and replacement animals)				
*Use either: Prenatal, Newborn, Juvenile / Weaner, Adults, Genetically Modified Organisms, others (describe)				

1.4 Proposed start and end dates of the project:

Start Date: **End date:** *(3 years max duration)*

1.5 Special consideration: Refer SOP 9.1 for technology involvement, joint project and another AEC

Funding: Identify the principle source of funding for this project:

Nature of the funding source ie CHM Alliance company funds, External Agency, External Grant, Commercial, Private, Other:
Name of Funding body/source:
Commercial-in-Confidence Yes/No:
Exact title of funding application:
1 st Named Investigator on funding application:
Administering Organisation/Institution: CHM Alliance Pty Ltd
Date of submission of application:
Period of funding:
Does the animal work described in the funding application correspond exactly to that described in this animal ethics application, including experimental groups and animal numbers?

2. Justification for Animal Use (justification)

2.1 Big Picture Background

It is essential that this section is easily understood by those without technical and scientific knowledge. In plain, clear and concise English (use lay language, avoid jargon and acronyms and use a glossary if necessary) put the project into context (the big picture). In particular, write this section so that AEC members without a veterinary or scientific background can understand what has led to the current situation (including reference to earlier work or this project being part of a larger body of work), the need that exists and how the benefits of the use of the animal/s outweigh the potential costs to the animal/s.

Glossary:

The Big Picture:

2.2 Objectives and purpose of proposed animal use and alternatives (replacement)

2.1.1 Detail the objective and purpose of animal use

2.1.2 If all or some of this project is a *repeat* of work that has been done already, provide justification for this project. Include a literature review and details of reasons for performing this trial

2.1.3 Explain why you need to use live animals to achieve all or some of your aims.

2.1.4 List alternatives to live animals that COULD be used in this project and explain why such alternatives are unsuitable for this project or list those used in conjunction with this project.

This work needs to be conducted on live pigs to achieve the objectives of the experiment

3 Experimental Design of Project (reduction/refinement)

3.1 Justification for number of animals – refer SOP 9.2 Experimental Design of Project

Justify why the proposed number of animals is appropriate to achieve the aims.

Weaner Trials: Power analysis conducted after repopulation indicates that there is only a 44% chance of detecting a difference of 50g/head in average daily gain when there are 6 experimental units per treatment. When increased to 10 experimental units per treatment the chance of detecting a 50 g/day difference increases to 99%, with a 92.0% chance of detecting a 25g/day difference in Av Daily Gain between treatments. An 80% chance of success is the normal standard for adequacy, at this power level a 20g/day difference is detectable.

Grower/Whole of Life Trials: Power analysis conducted after repopulation indicated that 12 experimental units per treatment with an 80% chance of success would allow us to detect a difference between treatments of 28g/day in average daily gain. If 25g/day wanted to be detected 16 replicates would be required and at 50g/day, then 6 pens would be required.

3.2 Where applicable include a table showing treatments and group sizes and outlining trial design in this space.

Weaner Trials:

Design type: Randomised Block	
Number of treatments: <i>(insert)</i>	
What is the experimental unit? Pen	
Number of experimental units (replicates) per treatment:	
Total number of experimental units for the experiment:	
Number of animals per experimental unit (if relevant): 14	
Primary variable: Average daily gain, average daily feed intake, mortality, morbidity	

Standard Grower Westbrook Trials Design:

Design type: Randomised Block	
Number of treatments: <i>(insert)</i>	Treatment Type: Details to be written on proposal
Experimental Unit: Westbrook Research Facility Pen	
Number of experimental (replicates) per treatment: To be included	
Total number of experimental units for the experiment: To be written on proposal	
Number of animals per experimental unit: maximum 11	
Primary variable: Average daily gain, average daily feed intake, mortality, morbidity	

Whole of Life Westbrook:

Design type: Randomised Block	
Number of treatments: <i>(insert)</i>	Treatment Type: Details to be written on proposal
Experimental Unit: Westbrook Research Facility Pen	
Number of experimental (replicates) per treatment: To be included	
Total number of experimental units for the experiment: To be written on proposal	
Number of animals per experimental unit: maximum 11	
Primary variable: Average daily gain, average daily feed intake, mortality, morbidity	

4. Sequence of Procedures and Their Impacts on Animals (refinement via design and monitoring)

4.1 Sequence of procedures and details of procedures- Refer to SOPs 9.1 Standard Westbrook Project Proposal; 9.3 Standard project Sequence & Details of Procedures; 9.4 Weigh Research Pigs; 9.5 Monitor Feed, Water and Health of Research Pigs

Add information for repeated procedures:
Samples required and collection as recommended by AEC

Time Schedule Table: showing staggered commencement and finish times for each batch of pigs. The actual time that any one batch of pigs is in the experiment will be 28 days. But due to the staggered commencement dates, the experiment will run for a total of 49 days. A detailed schedule is attached.

Weaner Trials: consist of X number of batches of pigs, 140/batch, minimum 2 batches (n=280)

Grower/Finisher Trials: consist of maximum of 264 pigs, commencing week 12 to week 20 - 22

Whole of Life Trials: Consist of maximum of 264 pigs, 8 pens / week with 3 weeks of entries commencing at week 1 to week 20 - 25

Commencement Time	Start		
	Highlight trial type: Weaner	Grower	Whole of Life
Week 1			
Week 2			
Week 3			
Week 4			
Week 5			
Week 6			
Week 7			
Week 8			
Week 9			
Week 10			
Week 11			
Week 12			
Week 13			
Week 14			
Week 15			
Week 16			
Week 17			
Week 18			
Week 19			
Week 20			
Week 21			
Week 22			
Week 23			
Week 24			
Week 25			

4.2 Emergency Contact Details SOP 9.8

5. Animal ownership, location, housing & management – SOP 9.6

Trial pig identification details: Pigs to be individually ear tagged.

6. People and procedures involved in the project – SOP 9.7

7. Declarations

Title of Project

Repeat here as this page is sometimes faxed separately with all signatures.

--

Applicant

I, being the applicant or its duly authorised agent, assure the AEC that:

- Adequate resources will be available to undertake the project
- I and all others involved in the project are familiar, and will comply with the requirements of the Animal Care and Protection Act 2001, *Australian code for the care and use of animals for scientific purposes, 8th Edition 2013* and all other relevant Commonwealth and State legislation
- I and all others involved in the project will adhere to all requirements of the AEC including the provision of reports, notices and advices

Name: Robert Hewitt	Position: Principal Investigator
Signature:	Date:

Project Personnel

We the undersigned assure the AEC that:

- I am familiar with, and will comply with the requirements of the Animal Care and Protection Act 2001, the *Australian code for the care and use of animals for scientific purposes, 8th Edition 2013* and all other relevant Commonwealth and State legislation
- I will adhere to all requirements of the AEC

Name: Andres Corso	Position: Facility Manager
Signature:	Date:

Name: Shaunn Jannusch	Position: Research Technician
Signature:	Date:

Name: Steve Peucker	Position: Technical Officer
Signature:	Date:

NB: The signed authority from the host farm company for collaborative projects must be attached.

(Copy page if required)