

ANZCCART 2020 paper and poster abstract submission guidelines

Paper and poster abstract submission guidelines

Please follow the abstract template below and ensure that the abstract is formatted accordingly, before submission. If selected for a poster or paper, guidelines will be provided; ANZCCART will also confirm the length of the paper presentation (e.g. 20, 15, or 10 minutes) at that time. Please indicate if you would be willing to present a poster, if the abstract submitted is not chosen for a presentation.

Abstract Template Example

PLEASE SEND ALL ABSTRACTS & POSTER SUMMARY AS ONE DOCUMENT ONLY TO:

anzccart@royalsociety.org.nz

ALL TEXT FONT: CALIBRI

One abstract per page (max 250 words), all text justified alignment, single line spacing.

Title – Bold, font size 14

Legal Perspectives on Social Licence

Authors – font size 12, with presenting author underlined.

Rodriguez Ferrere, M. B.¹

¹ Faculty of Law, University of Otago

Main text – font size 12, justified, single line spacing

Research, testing and teaching (RTT) involving non-human animals in New Zealand is almost completely regulated by Part 6 of the Animal Welfare Act 1999. That regime's devolved and decentralised nature gives a great deal of flexibility to those actors and institutions involved in RTT, whilst its recognition of the 3 R's makes it one of the most progressive in the world. Nevertheless, several ad hoc legislative exclusions to the scope of Part 6 might assist a narrative that legislation largely obstructs – rather than assists – research involving animals.¹

Using three examples of legislative reform that affected the scope of RTT in New Zealand – the presumptive ban on RTT involving non-human hominids; the use of animals to test psychoactive substances; and the ban on RTT in making cosmetics – this paper will argue that researchers ought to view such reform as beneficial, in that it assists in securing social licence for the RTT regime left unaffected.² This paper will contrast those reforms with recent controversies involving RTT in New Zealand, ultimately arguing that without the public engagement that such reform promotes, the potential legislative regime for RTT in New Zealand risks being left unfulfilled.

Optional references – font size 10, Calibri. Title in Italics

1. E.g., Suran, M. and Wolinsky, H. (2009) "The end of monkey research? New legislation and public pressure could jeopardize research with primates in both Europe and the USA" *EMBO Rep* 10: 1080-1082
2. Dixon-Woods, M. and Ashcroft, R. P. (2008) "Regulation and the social licence for medical research" *Med Health Care Philos* 11: 381-391; Olsson, I. A. S., (2010) "Legislation, social licence and primate research" *EMBO Rep* 11: 9.