July 7, 2011

Ad Hoc Committee to Review Principles
International Council on Laboratory Animal Science
Council for International Organizations of Medical Sciences

RE: Comments on International Guiding Principles for Biomedical Research Involving Animals

VIA EMAIL TO: CIOMS@msu.edu

Dear Committee Co-Chairs,

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments on the “2011 International Guiding Principles for Biomedical Research Involving Animals” drafted jointly by the International Council on Laboratory Animal Science and the Council for International Organizations of Medical Sciences. The Federation of American Societies for Experimental Biology (FASEB), which is the largest coalition of biomedical research associations in the United States, commends the authors of these updated principles for developing achievable and culturally sensitive guidelines that provide a solid foundation upon which countries can develop their animal research programs.

FASEB endorses the use of “should” in lieu of “must” in describing the actions the scientific community should take to ensure that research with vertebrate animals is conducted responsibly. The word “should” provides flexibility in an animal care and use program and defers to the professional judgment of animal care staff in developing standards. Flexibility is important for providing optimal care to laboratory animals and ensuring the integrity of scientific research as it allows researchers, veterinarians, and animal care staff to take into consideration information on the species, local environment, individual animal, and research goals that may impact animal care and use.

However, we feel that some wording in principle number ten may be too prescriptive. The sentence, “It should promote a risk-benefit analysis for animal use, balancing the benefits derived from the research and/or educational activity with the potential for pain and/or distress experienced by the animal,” may cause unintentional burden in animal use programs. We agree that the risks to animals associated with a particular line of research should be reasonable in relation to the anticipated benefits. However, this is a judgment that often depends on prevailing...
community standards and somewhat subjective determinations of a risk and benefit. The use of the word “analysis” is too technical and suggests that there is a single objective method for making these determinations. This implication may make it difficult for animal care and use committees to make a determination as to whether the anticipated benefits of a research project outweigh the risk, potentially slowing down or preventing the approval of important, humanely-crafted studies. We, therefore, recommend that the sentence state, “It should consider the goals of the research and/or education activity against potential animal welfare concerns, including pain and/or distress.”

Finally, we are pleased that the committee has identified vertebrate animals as the main focus of these principles. Consensus has not been reached within the animal care and use communities as to the appropriate standard of care for invertebrate species, and many countries do not currently regulate the use of invertebrates in research. Under these circumstances, developing internationally recognized guiding principles would be premature and impractical. Therefore, we believe the decision as to if and how to regulate invertebrates should be left to individual countries, which can make these determinations based on the standards set within their own communities.

FASEB strongly affirms the essential contribution of animals in improving the health of both humans and animals, and we take seriously the responsibility to provide for their proper care and humane treatment. We praise the authors for developing workable guidelines that facilitate the advancement of science while ensuring the utmost in animal welfare. If you have questions or need additional information, please do not hesitate to contact us.

Sincerely,

Joseph C. LaManna, PhD
FASEB President