1 **Executive Summary** – verbally presented to the Committee by the primary reviewer.

2 **Funding** – what is the funding source and has the proposal been peer-reviewed for scientific merit?

3 **Consideration of Alternatives** – have Replacement and Refinement been addressed? (**Reduction is addressed under the Experimental Groups section – Justification of animal numbers.**)

4 **History** – have any issues or complications occurred (during the previous approval period) that the Committee should be made aware of?
   - What level of experience does this lab have with respect to the requested procedures?
   - The outcomes question for Full Resubmissions is found under the Consideration of Alternatives section.
     - Have there been any complications, incidents or issues during the past approval period (lab tours, post approval monitoring, incident reports) that were or should be brought forward?
     - Have or could endpoints be refined?
     - Has the PI addressed the numbers that were used as compared to those approved during the last approval period?

5 **Procedures with Animals** – primary reviewer to give a verbal summary of the procedures as they occur in chronological order.
   - Is the level of invasiveness correct?
   - Veterinary input (anesthetics, analgesics, doses, techniques)
   - Evaluation according to UACC policies and guidelines and University wide SOP’s.

5 **Experimental Groups/Numbers** – have the numbers been outlined in a manner that is easy to follow and that provides adequate justification. Are all 3 areas of the protocol covering numbers consistent (the SSB Use Details table; the authorized amounts question and the justification of animal numbers)?

8 **Occupational Health & Safety** – has adequate information been provide for the use of any hazards involved in this protocol (radioisotopes/biohazards/chemicals/zoonotics)?

9 Discussion and final decision.