



Norwegian School of Veterinary Science



*The Norwegian Reference Centre for Laboratory Animal Science & Alternatives*

# **Platforms and Funds for Alternatives to Animal Experimentation**

**Live Kleveland**

**A report from  
The Norwegian Reference Centre for  
Laboratory Animal Science & Alternatives,  
Norwegian School of Veterinary Science,  
Oslo, Norway  
2005**

**ISBN 82-7725-120-3**

**This is a revised version of the report, after circulation to  
representatives of all *ecopa* platforms for approval.**

## CONTENTS

<b>INTRODUCTION</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>ECOPA AND EUROPEAN CONSENSUS-PLATFORMS FOR ALTERNATIVES TO ANIMAL EXPERIMENTATION</b>	<b>5</b>
<i>Austria</i>	<b>5</b>
<i>Belgium</i>	<b>6</b>
<i>The Czech Republic</i>	<b>6</b>
<i>Finland</i>	<b>7</b>
<i>Germany</i>	<b>8</b>
<i>Italy</i>	<b>8</b>
<i>The Netherlands</i>	<b>9</b>
<i>Spain</i>	<b>10</b>
<i>Sweden</i>	<b>11</b>
<i>Switzerland</i>	<b>12</b>
<i>The UK</i>	<b>13</b>
<b>SUMMARY OF CONSENSUS-PLATFORMS FOR ALTERNATIVES TO ANIMAL EXPERIMENTATION</b>	<b>15</b>
<b>FUNDING OF ALTERNATIVES TO ANIMAL EXPERIMENTATION</b>	<b>17</b>
<i>Austria</i>	<b>17</b>
<i>Belgium</i>	<b>17</b>
<i>The Czech republic</i>	<b>17</b>
<i>Finland</i>	<b>18</b>
<i>Germany</i>	<b>18</b>
<i>Italy</i>	<b>19</b>
<i>The Netherlands</i>	<b>19</b>
<i>Spain</i>	<b>20</b>
<i>Sweden</i>	<b>20</b>
<i>Switzerland</i>	<b>21</b>
<i>The UK</i>	<b>21</b>
<b>SUMMARY OF FUNDS AND AWARDS FOR ALTERNATIVES TO ANIMAL EXPERIMENTATION</b>	<b>22</b>
<b>LINKS</b>	<b>23</b>
<b>REFERENCES</b>	<b>25</b>
<b>APPENDIX</b>	

## INTRODUCTION

In recent years an increasing number of countries and institutions have started to work for the implementation of the "3 Rs" Replacement, Reduction and Refinement as overruling principles for the use of animals in experimentation.

In Europe, several countries have established national "consensus platforms for alternatives". A "consensus platform for alternatives" is a national group or organisation with representatives from different stakeholders and authorities, dedicated to promote dialogue and promote the use of the 3 Rs. Some platforms even dispose of funds for research or other projects in the field of alternatives. On an international level the platforms collaborate through membership in the pan-European organisation *ecopa*.

The Norwegian Food Safety Authority (Mattilsynet, <http://www.mattilsynet.no>) requested the Norwegian School of Veterinary Science to gather information about existing platforms for alternatives and how they work. The Norwegian School of Veterinary Science specified this to include an overview of existing platforms and funds, with particular emphasise on the state fund in Sweden.

Platforms under construction (Denmark, Hungary and Poland) are not included in the overview. Only funds based in countries with member platforms in *ecopa* are listed.

To find information about the consensus-platforms, a questionnaire was e-mailed to all contact persons listed at *ecopa*'s website on 6th April, and then again on 18th May.

The questionnaires were answered by representatives for the platforms without being formally approved by the boards. Therefore, the responses must be regarded as indications rather than official answers.

Additional information was gathered from speeches and by direct contact with delegates at *ecopa*'s meeting in Ljubljana, Slovenia, 10th - 12th June 2005, and by e-mail contact with the delegates later on. Several platforms have websites that also provided valuable information.

The information about funds outside *ecopa* is based on internet searches. Altweb (<http://altweb.jhsph.edu/databases/funding/funding.htm>) was used as a starting point. Persons involved in work for alternatives in different countries were contacted by e-mail, and asked for information about funds in their countries. The scope of the search was limited by the set of resources and time constraints for the report.

In the following "alternatives" is used as a general term describing all the 3 Rs.

This report was circulated to representatives of all the European platforms in November 2005 for approval.

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

To date the existing information about platforms and funds for alternatives has been scattered. The help of individuals familiar with the situation in their country, or being able to provide detailed information about their platform or fund, has been invaluable. I am grateful for the help of the following:

**Helmut Appl**, ZET (Zentrum für Ersatz- und Ergänzungsmethoden zu Tierversuchen), **Jp. Beaufays**, Director of BPAM, La Plate-forme Belge des Méthodes Alternatives à l'expérimentation animale (Belgium), **Dagmar Jírová**, chair of Czecopa (the Czech Republic), **Eila Kaliste**, secretary general, and **Hanna Tähti**, chair of Fincopa (Finland), **Marianna Norring**, chair of Juliana von Wendt's Foundation (Finland), **Roman Kolar**, deputy council member of SET, Stiftung für Forderung der Erforschung von Ersatz- und Ergänzungsmethoden zur Einschränkung von Tierversuchen (Germany), **Annalaura Stamatii**, president, and **Roberta Bartocci**, IPAM, Italian Platform on Alternative Methods (Italy), **Iris Arendzen**, chair, and **Janne Kuil**, Platform alternativen voor dierproeven (The Netherlands), **Argelia Castano**, chair of REMA, Red Española para el desarrollo de Métodos Alternativos a la Experimentación Animal (Spain), **Karin Gabrielson**, chair of Swecopa (Sweden), **Peter Maier**, scientific adviser, 3 R Research Foundation Switzerland (Switzerland), **Laura Playle**, programme manager, and **Ashely Scott**, NC3Rs, The National Centre for the Replacement, Refinement and Reduction of Animals in Research (the UK), **Jane Smith**, The Boyd Group (the UK) and **Gill Langley**, Dr. Hadwen Trust (the UK).

Live Kleveland Karlsrud

Oslo, 1st August, 2005.

# **ECOPA AND EUROPEAN CONSENSUS-PLATFORMS FOR ALTERNATIVES TO ANIMAL EXPERIMENTATION**

The concept of national consensus platforms for alternatives is to gather four concerned parties, namely animal welfare, industry, academia and governmental institutions, in order to improve dialogue and obtain consensus about issues concerning animal experimentation. A consensus platform for alternatives aims at increasing the acceptance of the 3 Rs, for example by information or through funding of relevant research.

National consensus-platforms for alternatives may apply for membership in the European umbrella organisation *ecopa*. The aim of *ecopa* is to act as a link between the national platforms, to minimize conflicts among stakeholder groups, and to promote the 3 R strategy on a European basis.

Conditions for membership are listed on *ecopa*'s website. The conditions are flexible in order to suit the situation in different countries.

At present, national consensus platforms with membership in *ecopa* have been established in eleven European countries: Austria, Belgium, the Czech Republic, Finland, Germany, Italy, the Netherlands, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, and the UK.

## **AUSTRIA**

### **Constitution**

The Austrian Platform, Zentrum für Ersatz- und Ergänzungsmethoden zu Tierversuchen (ZET), was founded in 1995 as a "scientific animal welfare organisation". [1]

The board consists of representatives for the four parties (academia, animal welfare, industry and government), in addition to representatives for one labour organisation, several NGOs, private persons and members of the Parliament. [2]

New board members are selected by the previous board. The aim is to ensure the Platform a broad range of competence and an extensive contact net in fields relevant to animal experimentation. [2]

### **Management**

ZET is a legal entity. It has a permanent office and approx. five employees, out of which some work part time. Occasionally, personnel is hired for short-term tasks. [2]

### **Funding of the Platform's work**

The annual income of ZET varies between approx. €90.000 – 130.000. [2]

ZET does not receive regular state funding, but the government has supported several concrete projects. ZET's work generally depends on the support of the industry, local municipalities, funds, and private donations. It has recently established a fundraising programme and information centre in order to increase the support from private sponsors. [1] Some years the Platform arranges conferences, and the participation fees contribute to the funding. [2]

### **Funds disposed or managed by the Platform for grants**

ZET does not dispose of funds for granting. [2]

### **Priorities**

ZET has written and published several reports, for example about the welfare of transgenic animals, and organized conferences. It has made an extensive list of animal free sera which is updated twice a year. [1]

A short-term objective at the moment is to organize an international congress about the 3 Rs. [1]

## **BELGIUM**

### **Constitution**

The Belgian Platform, La Plate-Forme Belge des Méthodes Alternatives à l'expérimentation animale (BPAM), was founded in Belgium in 1999, and reassessed in 2002. [3]

The Platform is a scientific department of the Prince Laurent Fondation, which is an animal protection charity with a wide range of activities. The Prince Laurent Fondation is a legal entity with statutes. [3]

The board consists of representatives from academia, animal welfare, industry and government. It has not been possible to get confirmed how the board members are selected.

### **Management**

The board usually meets three times a year. The board members undertake work for the Platform on a regular basis, namely in management, public relations, scientific development, and scientific research. [3]

The Platform has a permanent office and permanent employees, but does not hire personnel for short-term tasks. [3]

It has not been possible to obtain information about the annual budget and funding of the Platform.

### **Funds disposed or managed by the Platform for grants**

BPAM funds scientific projects aimed at replacing animal experiments, but it has not been possible to find out by which amounts and how often. For example, the Platform has funded a project aiming at finding an alternative to animal tests for eye irritancy. [4]

### **Priorities**

BPAM's long-term objective is to promote the 3 Rs. The main short-term objective is to gather and distribute relevant information.

The Platform has given lectures/talks, lobbied for 3 R issues, organized discussion forums/seminars, and taken part in relevant seminars organized by others, for example the European Parliament. [3]

It has also funded research relevant to 3 R issues, and published reports and other information relevant to 3 R issues. BPAM issues a free of charge quarterly magazine. Lately the Platform has worked together with other stakeholders to promote the implementation of alternatives to animal experimentation in REACH [5].

## **THE CZECH REPUBLIC**

### **Constitution**

The Czech Platform, Czcopa, was founded in 2001. It has been registered as a legal entity with statutes since 2003. [6]

The board consists of representatives from academia, animal welfare, industry and government. The board members are elected by the General Assembly after proposals from the four parties. [6]

New members are only accepted following recommendation from one existing member and approval of the General Assembly. [7]

### **Management**

The board normally meets once a year. The board members do not undertake work for the Platform on a regular basis. [6]

Czcopa does not have permanent employees, nor does it hire personnel for short-term tasks. The Platform does not have a permanent office. [6]

### **Funding of the Platform's work**

The annual income of the Platform was approx. CZK 7.300 (€200) in 2004. Approx. 40% of the income was contributions from the industry, 30% private donations, 15% contributions from animal welfare or animal rights organisations, and 15% contributions from academia. [6]

### **Funds disposed or managed by the Platform for grants**

The Platform does not dispose of granting funds. [6]

### **Priorities**

The Platform's long-term objectives are to promote scientific development and implementation of alternatives, to inform about ethics in relation to animal experimentation, to promote information and education about the 3 Rs, and to advise the government, for example when new legislation is being implemented. [6]

The short-term objectives are to provide the public information about Czacopa's mission, to establish a means of regular communication between the four parties involved, to implement and validate alternative methods, and to introduce alternatives in routine practice in testing laboratories and education. [6]

So far Czacopa has given lectures/talks, organized discussion forums/seminars, lobbied for 3 R issues, published information relevant to 3 R issues and demonstrated alternatives on TV. [6]

## **FINLAND**

### **Constitution**

The Finnish Platform, Fincopa, was founded in 2003. It is a legal entity with statutes.

The board consists of representatives from academia, animal welfare, industry and government. The current board is the first in Fincopa's history, and was set down at a workshop which representatives from all the four parties had been informed about. In the future, the board will be elected by the members of Fincopa. [8]

Only physical persons are accepted as members. Organisations and companies are welcomed as observers. A member must represent one of the four parties (academia, industry, animal welfare, government). Every member has to be approved by the board. At the moment Fincopa has approx. twenty members. [9]

### **Management**

The board normally meets two to four times a year, depending on the workload. The board members undertake work for the Platform on a regular basis. The chairperson and the secretary are involved in the planning of Fincopa's activities and communication strategy. [8]

Fincopa have no permanent employees, and does not hire personnel for short-term tasks. Fincopa does not have a permanent office. [8]

### **Funding of the Platform's work**

The total income of Fincopa in 2004 was approx. €150. The income was entirely based on member fees. [8]

### **Funds disposed or managed by the Platform for grants**

The Platform does not dispose of a fund for grants.[8]

### **Priorities**

Fincopa's long-term objective is to promote discussion between the four parties and stakeholders. In order to reach this goal, another objective is to improve the Platform's financial situation, for example by gathering members and organizing seminars. [8]

Fincopa's current short-term objective is to initiate discussion between academia, industry, animal welfare organisations and government in the debate about REACH (Registration, Evaluation and Authorisation of Chemicals). A seminar is planned. [8]

So far, the Platform has given lectures/talks, organized discussion forums/seminars, lobbied for 3 R issues, and gathered information relevant to 3 R issues. [8]

## **GERMANY**

### **Constitution**

The German Platform for alternatives, Stiftung für Forderung der Erforschung von Ersatz- und Ergänzungsmethoden zur Einschränkung von Tierversuchen (SET), was founded in 1986 on initiative from the government and by the help of animal welfare organisations and industry. SET is a legal entity with statutes. [10]

The active, governing organ of SET is the council (board). The council consists of four members representing animal welfare and four members representing the industry. The council members are nominated by the organisations represented.

The council receives advice from a scientific advisory committee and from external scientists. The members of the scientific advisory committee cannot be members of other SET committees. They are expected to be independent, but are still nominated by stakeholder groups like industry and animal welfare organisations. [11]

In addition to the council, SET has a board of trustees where the government, industry, academia and animal welfare organisations are represented, including representatives for public institutions, trade unions and the church. [11]

The Platform is not open for individual membership.

### **Management**

The council usually meets twice a year. The members do not undertake work for the Platform on a regular basis. SET has permanent employees, equivalent to approx. 0,5 man-years annually, and a permanent office. It does not hire personnel for short-term tasks, except for projects to be funded by the Platform. [10]

### **Funding of the Platform's work**

The annual income of SET (2004) was approx. €189.000. The income was mainly obtained by regular contributions from the industry, in addition to interests. Private donations contribute to the income some years, but not on a regular basis. [10]

### **Funds disposed or managed by the Platform for grants**

SET disposes of a fund of approx. €511.000. It awards approx. €200.000 to research every year. [11]

Detailed conditions for grants are published on SET's homepage. [12]

### **Priorities**

SET's aim is to fund 3 R related research projects, mainly concerning Replacement and Reduction. Academically unconventional studies, which are unlikely to be accepted by other funding bodies despite a high scientific level, is SET's priority. To obtain funding from SET, a research project should also lead to applicable results in the short term. From 1986 to 2005 SET has received 170 applications and funded 55 projects. [11]

SET also aims at promoting dialogue and transparency, and gives financial support to relevant courses, communication of scientific results, and projects analysing the legal demand for animal experiments. [11]

So far SET has organized discussion forums/seminars, lobbied for 3 R issues, gathered and published information relevant to 3 R issues, and funded research and other relevant activities. [10]

## **ITALY**

### **Constitution**

The Italian Platform on Alternative Methods (IPAM), was founded in 2003, and is a legal entity with statutes. [13]

The board consists of one president and eight members, of which two members represent each of the four parties: academia, animal welfare, industry and government. Every year the board members are elected by IPAM's members at the General Assembly, based on proposals from each of the four parties (academia, industry, animal welfare and government). [13] The board chooses its own president. [14]

IPAM is open for membership to everybody, including physical persons, organisations and companies. At present the Platform has approx. seventy members. Most of them represent either industry, animal welfare organisations or academia. IPAM reports difficulties in recruiting members from the governmental sector. [14]

### **Management**

The board normally meets two or three times a year. The board has not yet decided how the work will be organized permanently, and so far the board members do not undertake work for the Platform on a regular basis. [13]

The Platform neither has permanent employees, nor hires personnel for short-term tasks. It has no permanent office. [13]

### **Funding of the Platform's work**

The total income of IPAM in 2004 was approx. €9.900, which was entirely obtained by membership fees. [15]

### **Funds disposed or managed by the Platform for grants**

IPAM does not dispose of funds for granting. [13]

### **Priorities**

IPAM's long-term objective is to replace animal experiments. To achieve this IPAM plans to engage in joint projects and establish itself as a credible source for political advice. [15]

The short-term objective is to distribute information about alternatives to animal experimentation in education, mainly to students and researchers, and to push forward for improved legislation and implementation of alternatives. [15]

So far, the Platform has concentrated on giving lectures/talks and organizing discussion forums/seminars. [13]

## **THE NETHERLANDS**

### **Constitution**

The Platform for alternatives in the Netherlands, Platform alternatieven voor dierproeven, was founded in 1986 by the Ministry of Public Health. [16]

The board consists of representatives from the industry, animal welfare organisations, academia and the government. The governmental participation is considerable, with representatives from institutions responsible of public health, agriculture, environment, traffic & water and defence. The aim is to include all stakeholders, but in equal terms. Because there are too few animal welfare organisations compared to industrial companies, the industry memberships rotate among the companies every year. [17] The members from governmental bodies participate as part of the duties belonging to their positions. Members from the other parties are proposed by their own organisations, institutions or companies. [16]

The Platform has statutes, but it has not been possible to get confirmed whether or not the Platform is a legal entity. [18, 19]

## **Management**

The Platform receives secretary help from the chair's department. Apart from this, the Platform does not have permanent employees, nor does it hire personnel for short-term tasks. [18]

The main task of the Platform is to give advice on four-year research programmes developed and proposed by a state organisation for health research and development, ZonMw. [20]

ZonMw was established in 1999 mainly to distribute state subsidies. ZonMw's board members are appointed as private persons, but are recruited from different stakeholder groups like industry and animal welfare organisations. [18] The Platform does not evaluate concrete research projects, but the four-year research programme as a whole. [18]

The board normally meets two or three times annually, and does not have a permanent office. [18]

It should be noted that in addition to the Platform, the Netherlands has a National Centre for Alternatives (NCA) located to the University of Utrecht, which works to stimulate the development and use of alternatives. NCA monitors the progress of research projects granted by the Platform and the state organisation ZonMw. [20] NCA also gathers and distributes information about the 3 Rs through a newsletter, an extensive homepage, a database for alternatives, and by organizing seminars and workshops. [21]

## **Funding of the Platform's work**

The Platform receives approx. €500.000 – 900.000 from the state every year, which is distributed by ZonMW and primarily used to support 3 R research. [17, 18, 22] Apart from this, it has not been possible to obtain information about the income of the Platform.

## **Funds disposed or managed by the Platform for grants**

The Platform indirectly funds 3 R research through ZonMW, which is the granting body.

## **Priorities**

The priorities are to develop policies on 3 R issues, to advise the Minister of Public Health, to stimulate the development and validation of alternatives to animal experimentation and to fund 3 R related research projects. [17, 19]

So far the Platform has lobbied for 3 R issues, and funded approx. 100 projects. One of its success stories is the development of an artificial rat for surgical training, which is now used all over the world. [16]

# **SPAIN**

## **Constitution**

The Spanish Platform was founded in 1999 and is a legal entity with statutes. [23]

The board consists of representatives from academia, animal welfare, industry and government, but the governmental representatives only participate as observers.

New board members are, according to the statutes, proposed by the board itself, but elected by the General Assembly. [23, 24]

REMA is open for membership. [23]

## **Management**

The board normally meets two or three times a year. The board members undertake work for the Platform on a regular basis, for example by updating REMA's homepage, by undertaking tasks as a secretary and a treasurer, and by representing REMA. [25]

The Platform does not have permanent employees, but occasionally hires personnel for short-term tasks. REMA has a permanent office. [25]

### **Funding of the Platform's work**

The income of the Platform in 2004 was approx. €3.700. The industry contributed with approx. 50%, animal welfare organisations with 5%, and academic institutions with 16%. In addition private donations counted for approx. 28% of the income. [25]

### **Funds disposed or managed by the Platform for grants**

The Platform manages a fund which, every year, grants one or two prizes to young scientists working to promote the 3 Rs. The funding money has been mainly been raised by REMA itself and amounts to approx. €300 a year. [23]

### **Priorities**

The Platform's long-term objectives are to promote, co-ordinate and inform about the 3 Rs and on-going activities in the field. [25]

The short-term objective is to be recognized by the government, academia, industry and scientific societies as a reference for the promotion of the 3 Rs in Spain. [25]

So far REMA has given lectures/talks, organized discussion forums, seminars etc., lobbied for 3 R issues, gathered information relevant to 3 R issues, and published information about 3 R issues, in addition to the funding. [25]

## **SWEDEN**

### **Constitution**

The Swedish Platform, Swecopa, was founded in February 2003. It is a legal entity with statutes. A revision of the statutes is planned in 2006. [26]

The board consists of representatives from academia, animal welfare, industry and government. [27] The board members are elected by the General Assembly every year, after having been nominated by the members of the Platform.

Swecopa accepts both physical persons and legal entities as members. According to the statutes, all members must endorse the principles of the Platform, and be willing to work constructively to promote its aims. [27]

In 2004, eighteen members were registered, out of which ten were individual persons and eight were organisations. In addition, two state authorities were represented as observers. [28]

### **Management**

The board usually meets one to three times a year, but most of the communication is done by e-mail. [26]

The board members are expected to be actively involved in the work of the Platform, and undertake tasks such as treasurer and secretary. The board members are also involved in working groups and participate in Swecopa's work to compile and distribute information.

Swecopa is currently without permanent employees, but used to have one person employed secretary a few hours a week. The intention is to employ a new secretary as soon as possible.

So far, the Platform has never hired personnel for short-term tasks. The Platform does not have an office. [26]

### **Funding of the Platform's work**

The annual income of the Platform in (2004) was approx. SEK 2.000 (€200) which was all obtained by member fees. [29]

### **Funds disposed or managed by the Platform for grants**

The Platform does not have a fund to give grants. [26]

### **Priorities**

The Platform's long-term objectives are to be a forum for discussion and collaboration about 3 R related issues, to inform the general public, politicians and other interested parties about the 3 Rs, and to elaborate strategies for how to reduce the number of animals in experimentation, and to reduce suffering for experimental animals.

The Platform's short-term objectives are to gather information about education in alternatives to animal experimentation, to comment on the development of REACH, and to participate in *ecopa's* work on an international level. [28]

So far the Platform has given lectures/talks and distributed information about 3 R issues. [26] Representatives from Swecopa have also participated in EU projects related to 3 R issues, and gathered information about prioritised areas.

## **SWITZERLAND**

### **Constitution**

The Swiss Platform, Fondation Recherches 3 R/Stiftung Forschung 3 R was founded in 1987. It is a legal entity with statutes. [30]

The board consists of nine members, of which two represent animal welfare organisations, two represent the industry, two represent the government and three board members represent the Parliamentary Group for Animal Experimentation Questions. Academia is not represented as such, but board members from other parties are involved in the academic field. [31]

The election of the board members varies for each party, and is very informal. The existing board elects new board members, but elections do not take place on a regular basis. [31]

The government is represented by the Federal Veterinary Office, which usually suggests two candidates out of which the board chooses one. The two representatives from the industry are both suggested by their own companies and approved by the board. The political members are suggested by the board members themselves and then approved. The representatives from the animal welfare movement were chosen by the board several years ago and re-election has never taken place. [32]

### **Management**

The board normally meets twice a year. The board members do not undertake work for the Platform on a regular basis. [30]

The board has appointed a scientific evaluation committee to review proposed research projects and applications for grants twice a year. At the moment, the evaluation committee consists of eight representatives: 4 from academia, 1 from government, 1 from animal welfare and 2 from industry, among them three board members representing government, industry and animal welfare. The number of committee members is not fixed and can be extended by additional experts in order to cover the different research areas. The suggestions for funding made by the scientific committee are as a rule confirmed by the board.

The board has appointed a scientific evaluation committee to review proposed research projects and applications for grants. At the moment, the evaluation committee consists of nine representatives from the academic and industrial sectors.

The Platform has two permanent employees; a scientific adviser with approx. 50% position, and a secretary taking care of financial and legal affairs with approx. 30% position. [31] The scientific adviser acts as a link between the board and the scientific evaluation committee. He takes care of all the daily work of the platform. For example, he communicates with scientists and other relevant parties, writes information and represents the Platform when necessary. The scientific advisor is also responsible of keeping contact with the leaders of funded projects, and of the scientific outcome of the projects. [33] and the content of the website ( see <http://www.forschung3r.ch/> ). The website provides not only all the information about the 98 funded projects (end of 2005) and financial affairs but also information for grant applications, annual and final project reports.

The Platform does not hire personnel for short-term tasks. It has a permanent office, located in combination with a lawyer's office. [30]

#### **Funding of the Platform's work**

The income of the Platform in 2003 was approx. SFR 812.000 (€519.000). [34]

The income (2004) was obtained by contributions from the state (approx. 50%) and industry (approx. 50%). [30]

#### **Funds disposed or managed by the Platform for grants**

The principal aim of the 3 R Foundation is to financially promote alternative research methods to animal experimentation. Therefore, the management of a fund giving regular grants to relevant projects has been an integrated part of the Platform's work since the founding.

The Platform was set up jointly by the Parliamentary Group for Animal Experimentation Questions (public sector), Interpharma (Novartis Pharma Ltd, F. Hoffman-La Roche Ltd, Serono Ltd) and the Foundation for Animal-Free Research (animal protection). [34]

The funding is provided in equal parts by the government and the industry. An amount of approx. SFR 700.000 (€448.000) is available for grants every year. To be able to fund research projects lasting over several years, the amounts of the donations are planned for periods of four years at a time. [34]

The Platform mainly supports projects aimed at developing new methods or refining accepted methods. Research projects are selected for support according to periodically defined principal areas. [34]

#### **Priorities**

The Platform's long-term objective is to promote alternative research methods which replace animals.

The short-term objectives are funding of projects, mainly in the following areas:

Arthritis models, convulsion models, infection models and shock models. Further areas include procedures for testing toxicity in the development of pharmaceutical products, as well as registering products and chemicals such as sensitisation tests, models for testing of chronic toxicity, and characteristics for humane endpoints. [34]

To encourage research, potential applicants are invited to present a two-page summary of their planned project to the scientific adviser for pre-validation and advice. Applications are accepted all year round. [31]

The scientific adviser gives lectures/talks and gathers information relevant to 3 R issues. On behalf of the Platform he also publishes information about 3 R issues, particularly through a free newsletter informing about the research projects currently being funded. The Platform does not engage in lobbying activities. [30] but is also engaged in education by means of an electronic 3R training programme accepted by the authorities as Continuing Education ( see <http://3r-training.tierversuch.ch/>).

## **THE UK**

#### **Constitution**

The British Platform, the Boyd Group, was founded in 1992 as a forum for dialogue on contentious issues related to the use of animals in science, with the aims of encouraging productive debate about animal experimentation and alternatives, clarifying key issues of concern, working towards consensus where possible, and informing a wider public. [35] It is not a legal entity. [36]

The Group aims to involve as wide a diversity of perspectives and interests as possible in its work. It does not have a formal Board, but there are Officers (chairman, secretary, treasurer) who, with others, comprise a small steering group. All four parties are represented in the steering group and in the Boyd Group as a whole. [36]

In 2004, a new National Centre for the 3Rs, NC3Rs was established by the government. [37] It is not a legal entity. [38] The board of sixteen comprises representatives from academia, animal welfare, industry and government, public bodies and an organisation working to ensure the best use of animal models. The NC3Rs is represented, and actively participates, in the Boyd Group, and thereby receives all information coming from and going to *ecopa*. At present, the NC3Rs is content that the Boyd Group should remain the UK National Platform for *ecopa* purposes, but that position will be kept under review. [39]

### **Management**

The Boyd Group currently has more than 40 participants, representing a wide range of stakeholders, including veterinarians, scientists using animals (from industry and academia), members of animal welfare organisations, anti-vivisectionists, members of government and charitable bodies funding or directly engaged in research, philosophers and others. Any matter related to the use of animals in science may be raised by any participant for consideration by the Group and this may lead to the appointment of a sub-group to pursue the issue and prepare a report or other communication. [35] All members therefore participate directly in the work of the Platform. The steering group maintains oversight, communicating by e mail and meeting face-to-face when necessary. To date the Group has not hired personnel for short-term tasks, although it is currently applying for funding to do so, for a specific project. [36]

The Boyd Group employs one member of staff on a part-time consultancy basis, working from her own office, which forms the main contact point for the Platform.

The NC3Rs board normally meets four times a year. The board members undertake work for the organisation on a case-by-case basis. The NC3Rs currently has six employees, and is in the process of employing another three. It has a permanent office. To date it has not hired personnel for short-term tasks. [38]

### **Funding of the Platform's work**

The Boyd Group is funded by subscriptions and facilities from members of all four parties, and had an income of approx. GBP 12.000 pounds in 2004 (€16.500). [35]

The NC3Rs is funded by the government Home Office (the authority that, among other things, controls the use of animals in research in the UK), the Association of the British Pharmaceutical Industry, The Wellcome Trust, the Biotechnology and Biological Sciences Research Council and the Medical Research Council. [37] For the financial year 2004/2005, the total income was approx. GBP 700.000 (€965.000). The budget for 2005/2006 is of approx. GBP 1 million (€1.380.000), and the budget for 2006/2007 is of approx. GBP 1,8 million (€2.500.000). [40]

### **Funds disposed or managed by the Platform for grants**

The Boyd Group does not award grants, whereas funding of 3Rs research is a major aim of the NC3Rs. Contributions from the state have enabled NC3Rs to set up a 3Rs research funding scheme [41], and from 2005 a small awards scheme is available too, granting projects up to GBP 2.000 (€2.800). The latter scheme is a joint project by the NC3Rs and LASA (Laboratory Animal Science Association). [42]

### **Priorities**

The Boyd Group's objectives are to promote dialogue between its diverse participants; clarify key issues of concern identified by participants; understand where differences lie; and where possible, identify points of consensus and make practical recommendations towards achieving common goals. A number of consensus reports documenting and investigating specific topics related to animal experimentation and contributions to public consultations are available at the Group's web-site. [35]

Current work by the Platform includes an examination of practice in the assessment of animal suffering and, in particular the role and value of schemes for classifying the severity of animal procedures; a review of current provision of training and other support for the development of new biomedical researchers' understanding of laboratory animal welfare science and ethics; and dialogue on the possibility of setting 'targets' for the elimination of certain animal tests and better application of the Three Rs.

The ultimate aim for the NC3Rs is to replace animal experiments. In the short term, the NC3Rs plans to fund 3 Rs research, develop relevant information resources and guidelines for best practice in UK laboratories, and to organise workshops and symposia. [37]

## **SUMMARY OF CONSENSUS-PLATFORMS FOR ALTERNATIVES TO ANIMAL EXPERIMENTATION**

*Ecopa* purposely accepts a wide range of solutions for the establishment of national consensus-platforms for alternatives. The overview indicates clear differences among the eleven national platforms, particularly in resources and priorities. Most consensus-platforms still have similar structures in constitution and management, and common aims in the sense of promoting the 3 Rs and contributing to exchange of views and information among relevant parties.

### **Constitution**

Eight platforms are legal entities, two are not, and in one case it has not been possible to obtain a definitive answer. Nine platforms have their own statutes, one has statutes as part of another organisation, and in one case no definitive answer has been obtained.

All the platforms have a board or similar body.

The four parties (government, academia, animal welfare and industry) are represented on all the boards, even if one platform reports that academia is represented only indirectly.

In five platforms the board members are elected by members/the General Assembly. In two platforms new board members are selected by the previous board, and in two other platforms, the board members are proposed by the organisations, institutions or companies that they represent. In two cases it has not been possible to obtain definitive answers.

Four platforms have included board members from other parties than the government, academia, animal welfare and industry. Seven platforms report that only the four parties (government, academia, animal welfare and industry) are represented on the board.

### **Management**

Nine platforms report that the board meets once, twice or up to four times a year. In two cases answers have not been obtained.

In five cases the board members undertake work for the platforms on a regular basis, and in another five platforms they do not. In one case no answer was obtained.

Six platforms have permanent employees. While some platforms only employ one person part-time, others employ up to nine persons. Four platforms do not have employees. One platform has no employees of its own, but receives secretary help from the government.

Eight platforms have never hired personnel for short-term tasks, while another two have done so. In one case no answer was obtained.

Four platforms have a permanent office, while seven do not.

### **Funding of the Platforms' work**

Information obtained from ten platforms indicate that the annual income of the platforms vary a lot, from approx. €150 a year to almost €1,4 million.

On the basis of information from 2003 - 2005, two platforms receive financial support from the government or other state authorities (a third receives support from government indirectly, via government agencies that fund research and testing). This result should be seen in connection with the list of funds granting money to 3 R related research, which indicates that another three countries contribute financially to the development or implementation of alternatives. In one country the government contributes financially both to the platform and by other funding.

Six platforms receive contributions from industry, three from animal welfare organisations and three from academia. Three platforms receive private individual donations, and one receives support from legacies or awards. Four platforms have an income from member fees. One platform has an income from capital interests, and one earns money by arranging conferences.

#### **Funds disposed or managed by the Platforms for grants**

Five platforms dispose of funds for granting, while another six do not.. The amount of funding varies from a few hundred euros a year and up to several hundred thousand euros.

#### **Priorities**

The priorities of the platforms indicate a wide range of activities, and most platforms have several aims both currently and in the long term. However, eight platforms mention information activities as a long-term priority. Six platforms answer that advising the government and other relevant parties is an important aim. Two platforms mention funding as a priority both now and in the long term.

#### **Opinions of the respondents**

On the question "*In your opinion, what have been the positive effects of the platform in your country?*" the respondents from seven platforms stressed that their platforms had contributed to generally increased information about the 3 Rs.

Answers from four platforms indicated that the communication among relevant parties had been improved because of the platform.

In addition, several answers mentioned concrete results of the platforms' work, like important funding leading to improvements in alternatives.

On the question "*In your opinion, what could be done to maximize the positive effects of the platform in your country? (e.g. increased resources, changes in organisation, etc.)*" Eight respondents mentioned increased resources. The fact that many respondents mentioned this might of course be due to the fact that it was mentioned as an example in the question. However, the other example in the question (changes in organisation) was only mentioned by one respondent.

Others mentioned the need for more active involvement by relevant parties, better communication with the scientific community, and political recognition by *ecopa* on an EU level.

## **FUNDING OF ALTERNATIVES TO ANIMAL EXPERIMENTATION**

A number of funds provide grants for research on alternatives to animal experimentation. In some countries the government contributes to such research.

The aim of the list below is to present an overview of the major sources of funding for 3 R related projects in countries with membership platforms in *ecopa*, namely Austria, Belgium, the Republic, Finland, Germany, Italy, the Netherlands, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland and the UK.

Consequently, funds and awards based in other countries, and international funds which are not based in a particular country, are not mentioned. For example, ECVAM as a research institution within the EU system, is not listed, neither the “Procter and Gamble European Animal Welfare and Alternatives Awards”. Funds not aiming particularly at promoting the 3 Rs are also left out, even if they occasionally may consider relevant projects. Governmental funding is included, even if it is in the form of annual contributions subject to political decisions every year.

In 2003, the Norwegian Parliament expressed a particular interest in the funding of alternatives in Sweden. [43] As a result, the Norwegian School of Veterinary Science has emphasized the need for an overview of the history, scope and amounts allocated to research in 3 R related projects by the Swedish government.

The funds and awards listed below vary a lot in aims and conditions. Some fully accept animal experimentation and aim at improving the methods, while others envision an end to all animal experimentation and focus on developing alternatives to replace them.

It should be noted that nationally based funds seldom consider applicants from foreign countries. Still a few have an international scope, or may accept foreign applicants occasionally.

### **AUSTRIA**

The Austrian state supports the development of alternatives to animal experimentation by €11.000 every year.

See: [http://www.bmbwk.gv.at/forschung/staatspreis\\_ersatzmethoden.xml](http://www.bmbwk.gv.at/forschung/staatspreis_ersatzmethoden.xml)

### **BELGIUM**

#### **Prince Laurent Foundation**

Fondation Prince Laurent allocates several awards and grants to animal welfare, including 3 R projects. The Prince Laurent Prize of approx. €12.500 is awarded every second year to a researcher or research team for fundamental work to improve or evaluate animal welfare.

See: <http://www.fondation-prince-laurent.be>

### **THE CZECH REPUBLIC**

The Czech state does not contribute to the development and promotion of alternatives directly. On some occasions, however, it funds relevant projects. For example, money has been granted for a research project aiming at implementing alternative methods for skin penetration. [7]

There are no private funds for alternatives. [7]

## FINLAND

In Finland the greatest support (34000 €) for alternatives comes from the Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry not from the government, [44]

### **Juliana von Wendt's Fund for Science without Animal Experimentation**

The fund was established in 1971 (<http://www.jvws.org/>). It aims at supporting Finnish researchers, with a yearly support of several thousand euros (about 5000 €). developing and applying non-animal methodology in a wide range of fields including toxicity testing, cancer research, surgery, antibody production, computer assisted drug modelling, tissue culture techniques, higher education etc. Methods replacing exceptionally harmful use of animals are prioritised

In addition, there is a **joint Nordic prize** of 60 000 SEK which is awarded every third year to a scientist in Finland promoting research on alternatives.

In addition to the funding and some educational work, Juliana von Wendt's Fund awards The Scandinavian Research Prize for Alternatives to Animal Experiments together with The Swedish Fund for Research without Animal Experiments and Alternativfondet in Denmark. [45]

The Cell Research Center (CRC) at the University of Tampere promotes research on alternatives by its research programmes and education courses, but it does not share any funding of alternative research.

## GERMANY

### **The Federal Ministry for Education and Research**

Germany supports the development of alternatives to animal experimentation by approx. €4-5 million every year. [46]

Bundesministerium für Bildung und Forschung, BMF, (the Federal Ministry for Education and Research) has, in the course of twenty years, spent approx. €70 million, giving grants to approx. 230 projects related to the 3 Rs. According to the Ministry's homepage, these efforts have significantly reduced the number of animals used for research in Germany.

See: <http://www.bmbf.de/de/1040.php> & <http://www.fz-juelich.de/ptj/index.php?index=526>

### **The Federal Ministry of Consumer Protection, Food and Agriculture**

Bundesministerium für Verbraucherschutz, Ernährung und Landwirtschaft, BMVEL, awards €15.000 for research on alternatives every year. The prize may be obtained in the field of toxicology or human medicine.

See: <http://www.verbraucherministerium.de/index-0000099A56CB100E94B06521C0A8D816.html>

### **ZEBET- Centre for Documentation and Evaluation of Alternatives to Animal Experiments**

Zentralstelle zur Erfassung und Bewertung von Ersatz- und Ergänzungsmethoden zum Tierversuch (ZEBET) was established in 1989. The institute is a state body and a part of the German Federal Institute for Risk Assessment (Bundesinstitut für Riskbewertung).

ZEBET is active in a wide range of fields. It scientifically develops and evaluates alternative methods to animal experimentation, financially promotes development of alternatives by other institutions, arranges seminars about 3 R issues, and advises the government in relation to legislation about animal experimentation.

ZEBET also runs a database on alternatives to animal experiments, which has been on the net free of charge since 2000.

See: <http://www.bgvv.de/cd/1433> & <http://www.bgvv.de/cd/1591> (English version)

### **Ursula M. Händel-Tierschutzpreis**

The Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft (DFG) awards €25.000 yearly to 3 R related projects.

See: [http://www.dfg.de/forschungsfoerderung/preise/ursula\\_haendel\\_preis.html](http://www.dfg.de/forschungsfoerderung/preise/ursula_haendel_preis.html)

#### **The Erna Graff Foundation for Animal Welfare**

The Erna Graff Stiftung für Tierschutz was founded in 1983. The foundation awards, among other things, 3 R research and educational projects.

The foundation also awards a prize of €2.500 for animal welfare projects every year.

See: <http://www.erna-graff-stiftung.de/>

#### **Federation of Animal Protection Societies of Lower Saxony - The Ilse Richter Research Award for Animal Welfare**

The Ilse Richter Tierschutz Forschungspreis has been awarded since 1989. The prize is of €15.000. Projects for alternative methods in toxicology are among the prioritised areas.

See: <http://www.tierschutz-in-niedersachsen.de/>

#### **The Felix Wankel Foundation**

The Felix Wankel Tierschutz Forschungspreis is usually awarded every year for research in the fields of the 3 Rs. The award is of maximum €30.000, but may be divided among three winners.

See: <http://www.uni-kiel.de/fak/med/preise/wankel.htm> & <http://www.lrz-muenchen.de/~lmhyg.vetmed/taef-aktuell.htm>

#### **Grants from regional or local governments/municipalities**

Several regional or local authorities award grants which occasionally may go to 3 R issues. For example, the Ministerium für Umwelt und Forsten (Rheinland-Pfalz) can grant 3 R projects.

See: <http://www.muf.rlp.de/index2.asp?bereich=104>

## **ITALY**

There are no Italian funds for alternatives to animal experimentation. [47]

## **THE NETHERLANDS**

The Netherlands allocates money to 3 R research projects through various ministries or their research institutes. One state fund is of special importance. It grants approx. €100.000 to research in human health projects every year. Research in 3 R related issues may receive money from the fund if they benefit human health. [18]

The Netherlands has a National Centre for Alternatives (NCA) in addition to the Platform for alternatives. NCA was established in 1994 at the University of Utrecht and provides the Ministry of Public Health with advice on questions concerning animal experimentation. The state contributes to the funding of NCA through an organisation called ZonMw. [18]

#### **Hugo van Poelgeest award**

A prize of €10.000 is awarded every fourth year for contribution to alternatives in animal experimentation.

See: <http://www.nca-nl.org/English/Newsletters/Nb13/nl13txt.html>

#### **The Dieter Lütcken award**

The Dieter Lütcken award, funded by Intervet/Akzo Nobel, was established in 2004. The prize is of €20.000 is awarded to an institution or individual for contributions to the 3 Rs in the development or production of veterinary medicinal products.

See: [www.intervet.com](http://www.intervet.com)

## SPAIN

It has not been possible to obtain information about funds for alternatives in Spain, apart from the consensus-platform (REMA).

## SWEDEN

### **The Swedish Fund for Experiments without Animal Research**

Stiftelsen Forskning utan djurforskning was founded in 1964 to promote alternatives to animal experimentation. The aim of the fund is to end the use of all animal experiments.

The funding of research and other projects replacing animal research at the moment amounts to approx. SEK 1,5 million (€159.000) every year.

The Scandinavian Research Prize for Alternatives to Animal Experiments is awarded every year by the fund, together with Juliana von Wendt's Fund in Finland and Alternativfondet in Denmark. The prize is of approx. SEK 60.000 (€6.000).

Apart from research, the fund also supports the development of information about replacement of animal experiments. For example, the fund supports the Norwegian database for alternatives in education, NORINA, and the scientific journal ATLA (Alternatives to Laboratory Animals).

See: <http://www.stifud.se/startside.php>

### **The Swedish Animal Welfare Agency**

Djurskyddsmyndigheten is a state agency, subordinate to the Ministry of Agriculture. One of the tasks of the Animal Welfare Agency is to limit the number of animals in experimentation, mainly by supporting research for alternatives. All the 3 Rs are equally prioritised.

The Animal Welfare Agency has been granting money for research in alternatives to animal experimentation since it was founded in 2004. Even before that, Sweden funded research for alternatives through the previous Swedish National Board for Animal Experimentation (Centrala Forsöksdjursnämnden, CFN).

CFN was established in 1979 as a national co-ordinating authority for animal experimentation. An important task for the CFN was to promote the development of alternatives to animal experiments. Already in 1980 the CFN started to fund research for alternatives. [48] In the early 1980's, the medical industry started to contribute annually to the funding. [49]

From 1997 to 2001 the industry contributed with approx. SEK 1 million (€100.500) every year, while the government granted between approx. SEK 2.620.000 and 3.700.000 (€260.000 – 370.000). In the same period, between 33 and 37 projects received funding every year. Approx. 50% of the applications obtained funding. [48, 49]

Today applications are processed every year by the Animal Welfare Agency's scientific council for alternatives to animal experimentation, which proposes a priority list of the applicants. The council consists of members representing various biomedical research areas, state agencies and animal welfare. The evaluation of the applicants is based on relevance to the 3 Rs and scientific quality.

In 2005 the following areas were prioritised: Toxicology, development of new stem cell techniques, data based prediction models and development of *in vitro* diagnostics, pharmacology, testing of vaccines and evaluation and validation of such alternative methods as mentioned above, and improvement of housing conditions for animals in experimentation.

Even other projects in biology or medicine may receive support, on the condition that the results may contribute to the development of alternatives to animal experimentation.

Detailed conditions for applicants are published on the Animal Welfare Agency's homepage.

In 2004 approx. SEK 16 million (€1.693.000) was made available for research, including approx. SEK 1 million from the medical industry (AstraZeneca AB and Biovitrum AB).

See: <http://www.djurskyddsmyndigheten.se/jahia/Jahia/pid/108>

## SWITZERLAND

### **Fonds für versuchstierfreie Forschung**

Fonds für versuchstierfreie Forschung, FFVFF, was founded in 1976 to promote the development of alternatives to animal experimentation. It supports research and other projects relevant to the 3 Rs. Projects involving the use of animals are not accepted.

See: <http://www.ffvff.ch> & [http://www.ffvff.ch/forschung\\_e.htm](http://www.ffvff.ch/forschung_e.htm)

### **Egon-Naef-Forschungspreis**

Fondation Egon Naef pour la Recherche in Vitro was founded in 1998. The primary aim is to contribute to the development of *in vitro* testing as an alternative to animal experiments. The fund has a capital of approx. €12.000.

<http://www.fondation-naef.com/french/Description.htm>

The Doerenkamp Zbinden Foundation.

<http://www.doerenkamp.ch/en/index.html?id=10>

## THE UK

### **Universities Federation for Animal Welfare (UFAW)**

UFAW was founded in 1926 to provide scientific evidence for animal welfare. UFAW funds research, holds symposia and gives advice to government and others. It also produces publications on animal welfare, including the leading scientific journal "Animal Welfare".

UFAW supports research and other projects in animal welfare through a broad scheme of grants, scholarships and awards. 3 R projects may receive support if they comply with the conditions. The number and amounts of the grants and scholarships varies from year to year due to unpredictable income. In the year 2002/2003 UFAW's total income was almost GBP 1.000 000 (€1.386.000), more than the double of the previous year. [50]

See: <http://www.ufaw.org.uk/>

### **The British Veterinary Association's Animal Welfare Foundation**

The BVA is the national representative body for the British veterinary profession. It makes occasional awards for projects aimed at improving the welfare of laboratory and agricultural animals.

See: <http://www.bva.co.uk/> & <http://www.bva-awf.org.uk/about/grants/>

### **The Dr. Hadwen Trust For Humane Research**

The Dr. Hadwen Trust funds non-animal research into major health problems such as cancer, heart disease, meningitis and Alzheimer's disease.

See: [www.drhadwentrust.org.uk](http://www.drhadwentrust.org.uk)

### **Fund for the Replacement of Animals in Medical Experiments (FRAME)**

FRAME was founded in 1969 to encourage legislative and regulatory reform and scientific research in laboratory animal science. FRAME's ultimate aim is to end the use of animal experimentation, all though it advocates the 3 Rs. FRAME funds laboratory-based research at the University of Nottingham, primarily within the FRAME Alternatives Laboratory and the Molecular Toxicology Group. FRAME also publishes the scientific journal ATLA (Alternatives to Laboratory Animals). The total income of FRAME in 2004 was almost GBP 800.000 (€1.109.000). [51]

See: <http://www.frame.org.uk/>

#### **The Humane Research Trust**

The Humane Research Trust was established in the late 1950's under the name of The Lawson Tait Trust.

It funds and promotes medical research into human disease without the use of animals or animal tissue. Pioneering projects which cannot obtain support from other sources are prioritised.

See: <http://www.humaneresearch.org.uk/>

#### **The Lord Dowding Fund**

The Lord Dowding Fund was founded in 1973 to financially support non-animal research and education. It has funded research in working a wide range of fields including microsurgery, product safety testing, cell culture, computer-aided drug design, biotechnology, brain damage, and computer teaching packages.

To date, the fund has awarded grants approaching GBP 2 million (€2.758.000) to research.

See: <http://www.navs.org.uk/research/>

#### **Marchig Animal Welfare Trust**

The Marchig Animal Welfare Trust was established in 1989. Grants are given to various animal welfare projects, including development for alternatives to animal experimentation. Development or implementation of alternative methods may also be awarded.

See: <http://www.marchigawt.org/>

#### **The GlaxoSmithKline Laboratory Animal Welfare Prize**

The research Defence Society (RDS) represents medical researchers in the public debate about animal experimentation. Sponsored by GlaxoSmithKline, it awards an annual prize of €3.000 for contributions to the 3 Rs.

Individuals or organisations in a country member of the Council of Europe are considered.

See: [http://www.rds-online.org.uk/pages/page.asp?i\\_ToolbarID=4&i\\_PageID=163](http://www.rds-online.org.uk/pages/page.asp?i_ToolbarID=4&i_PageID=163)

## **SUMMARY OF FUNDS AND AWARDS FOR ALTERNATIVES TO ANIMAL EXPERIMENTATION**

Because there may be funds that have not been found, the results summarized should only be seen as indications.

Funds for alternatives were found in eight of the eleven countries examined. Three countries were found to have one fund each, another three countries had two funds each, one country had seven funds and one was found to have eight funds with a national scope.

In four of the eleven countries the government funds research for alternatives (not included governmental funding of the consensus-platforms).

## LINKS

### Consensus-platforms for alternatives

European consensus-platform on alternatives (*ecopa*), <http://ecopa.vub.ac.be/>

#### *Austria*

Zentrum für Ersatz- und Ergänzungsmethoden zu Tierversuchen (ZET), <http://www.zet.or.at/>

#### *Belgium*

La Plate-forme Belge des Méthodes Alternatives à l'expérimentation animale (BPAM), [www.fondation-prince-laurent.be](http://www.fondation-prince-laurent.be)

#### *The Czech Republic*

CZECOPA, [www.czecopa.cz](http://www.czecopa.cz)

#### *Germany*

Stiftung zur Förderung von Ersatz- und Ergänzungsmethoden zur Einschränkung von Tierversuchen (SET), <http://www.stiftung-set.de/>

#### *Italy*

Italian Platform on Alternative Methods (IPAM), <http://www.ipamitalia.it>

#### *Spain*

Red Española para el desarrollo de Métodos Alternativos a la Experimentación Animal (REMA), <http://tox.umh.es/rema/>

#### *Switzerland*

3 R Research Foundation Switzerland, <http://www.forschung3 R.ch/en/information/intro.html>

#### *The UK*

The Boyd Group, <http://www.boyd-group.demon.co.uk/>

### Funds and awards for alternatives to animal experimentation

#### *Austria*

Staatspreis ersatzmethoden: [http://www.bmbwk.gv.at/forschung/staatspreis\\_ersatzmethoden.xml](http://www.bmbwk.gv.at/forschung/staatspreis_ersatzmethoden.xml)

#### *Belgium*

Prince Laurent Foundation: <http://www.fondation-prince-laurent.be>

#### *Finland*

Juliana von Wendt's Fund for Science without Animal Experimentation: <http://www.jvws.org/>

#### *Germany*

The Federal Ministry for Education and Research: <http://www.bmbf.de/de/1040.php> & <http://www.fz-juelich.de/ptj/index.php?index=526>

Federal Ministry of Consumer Protection, Food and Agriculture:

<http://www.verbraucherministerium.de/index-0000099A56CB100E94B06521C0A8D816.html>

ZEBET- Centre for Documentation and Evaluation of Alternatives to Animal Experiments:

<http://www.bgvv.de/cd/1433> & <http://www.bgvv.de/cd/1591> (English version)

Ursula M. Händel-Tierschutzpreis:

[http://www.dfg.de/forschungsfoerderung/preise/ursula\\_haendel\\_preis.html](http://www.dfg.de/forschungsfoerderung/preise/ursula_haendel_preis.html)

The Erna Graff Foundation for Animal Welfare: <http://www.erna-graff-stiftung.de/>

Federation of Animal Protection Societies of Lower Saxony - The Ilse Richter Research Award for Animal Welfare: <http://www.tierschutz-in-niedersachsen.de/>

The Felix Wankel Foundation: <http://www.uni-kiel.de/fak/med/preise/wankel.htm> & <http://www.lrz-muenchen.de/~lmhyg.vetmed/taef-aktuell.htm>

Grants from regional or local governments/municipalities:  
<http://www.muf.rlp.de/index2.asp?bereich=104>

#### *The Netherlands*

Hugo van Poelgeest award: <http://www.nca-nl.org/English/Newsletters/Nb13/nl13txt.html>

The Dieter Lütcken award: [www.intervet.com](http://www.intervet.com)

#### *Sweden*

The Swedish Fund for Experiments without Animal Research: <http://www.stifud.se/startside.php>

The Swedish Animal Welfare Agency: <http://www.djurskyddsmyndigheten.se/jahia/Jahia/pid/108>

#### *Switzerland*

Fonds für versuchstierfreie Forschung: <http://www.ffvff.ch> & [http://www.ffvff.ch/forschung\\_e.htm](http://www.ffvff.ch/forschung_e.htm)

Egon-Naef-Forschungspreis: <http://www.fondation-naef.com/french/Description.htm>

The Doerenkamp Zbinden Foundation: <http://www.doerenkamp.ch/en/index.html?id=10>

#### *The UK*

Universities Federation for Animal Welfare (UFAW): <http://www.ufaw.org.uk/>

The British Veterinary Association Animal Welfare Foundation: <http://www.bva.co.uk/> & <http://www.bva-awf.org.uk/about/grants/>

The Dr. Hadwen Trust For Humane Research: [www.drhadwentrust.org.uk](http://www.drhadwentrust.org.uk)

Fund for the Replacement of Animals in Medical Experiments (FRAME): <http://www.frame.org.uk/>

The Humane Research Trust: <http://www.humaneresearch.org.uk/>

The Lord Dowding Fund: <http://www.navs.org.uk/research/>

Marchig Animal Welfare Trust: <http://www.marchigawt.org/>

UK: National Centre for the Replacement, Refinement and Reduction of Animals in Research (NC3Rs), <http://www.nc3Rs.org.uk/>

The Research Defense Society (RDS): [http://www.rds-online.org.uk/pages/page.asp?i\\_ToolbarID=4&i\\_PageID=163](http://www.rds-online.org.uk/pages/page.asp?i_ToolbarID=4&i_PageID=163)

#### **Other links**

Spain: In Vitro testing Industrial Platform, <http://www.ivtip.org/>

The Netherlands: National Centre for Alternatives (NCA), <http://www.nca-nl.org/>

UK: The Boyd group, <http://www.boyd-group.demon.co.uk/>

## REFERENCES

1. Helmut Appl, *Presentation on state of the art per country: Experiences from ZET. Ecopa consensus meeting in Ljubljana, Slovenia, 10th-12th June 2005.*
2. Helmut Appl, ZET, *personal communication*, 2005.
3. Jp. Beaufays, *Responses to questionnaire on the constitution and work of existing European Consensus Platforms for 3R Alternatives to Animal Experimentation.* BPAM, 2005.
4. BPAM, <http://www.fondation-prince-laurent.be/indexfr.html>. "Des réalisations concrètes: La Plate-forme soutient des projets de recherche scientifiques de haute valeur dans le domaine du remplacement des animaux de laboratoire..."
5. BPAM, <http://www.fondation-prince-laurent.be/indexfr.html>.
6. Dagmar Jírová, *Responses to questionnaire on the constitution and work of existing European Consensus Platforms for 3R Alternatives to Animal Experimentation.* Czecopa, 2005.
7. Kristina Kejlová, CZECOPA, *by e-mail*, 27th June 2005.
8. Eila Kaliste and Hanna Tähti, *Responses to questionnaire on the constitution and work of existing European Consensus Platforms for 3R Alternatives to Animal Experimentation.* Fincopa, 2005.
9. Marianna Norring, *Presentation on state of the art per country: Experiences from Fincopa. Ecopa consensus meeting in Ljubljana, Slovenia, 10th-12th June 2005.*
10. Roman Kolar, *Responses to questionnaire on the constitution and work of existing European Consensus Platforms for 3R Alternatives to Animal Experimentation.* SET, 2005.
11. Roman Kolar, *Presentation on state of the art per country: Experiences from SET. Ecopa consensus meeting in Ljubljana, Slovenia, 10th-12th June 2005.*
12. SET, <http://www.tierversuche-ersatz.de/index.php?cXBfYWN0aXZlPWdsb2JhbCZxcF9sbnI9MTAmaWRfY2F0ZWdvcnk9MjA=>.
13. Annalaura Stammati, *Responses to questionnaire on the constitution and work of existing European Consensus Platforms for 3R Alternatives to Animal Experimentation.* IPAM, 2005.
14. Annalaura Stammati, IPAM, *personal communication*, 2005.
15. Annalaura Stammati, IPAM, *by e-mail*, 23rd June 2005.
16. Janne Kuil, *Presentation on state of the art per country: Experiences from Platform alternatien voor dierproeven. Ecopa consensus meeting in Ljubljana, Slovenia, 10th-12th June 2005.*
17. Janne Kuil, Platform alternatien voor dierproeven, *Personal communication*, 2005.
18. Iris Arendzen, Platform alternatien voor dierproeven, *personal communication*, 2005.
19. Janne Kuil, *Responses to questionnaire on the constitution and work of existing European Consensus Platforms for 3R Alternatives to Animal Experimentation.* Platform alternatien voor dierproeven, 2005.
20. ZonMw, <http://www.zonmw.nl/index.asp?s=3787>.
21. NCA, <http://www.nca-nl.org/>.
22. ZonMw, [www.zonmw.nl](http://www.zonmw.nl).
23. Argelia Castano, REMA, *by e-mail*, 5th July 2005.
24. REMA, *Statutes of the REMA Association.*
25. Argelia Castano, *Responses to questionnaire on the constitution and work of existing European Consensus Platforms for 3R Alternatives to Animal Experimentation.* REMA, 2005.
26. Karin Gabriellsson, *Responses to questionnaire on the constitution and work of existing European Consensus Platforms for 3R Alternatives to Animal Experimentation.* Swecopa, 2005.
27. Swecopa, *Stadgar för en svensk plattform för alternativ till djurförsök.* 10th February 2003.
28. Swecopa, *Verksamhetsberättelse 2004.* 2005.
29. Swecopa, *Ekonomisk årsredovisning 2004.* 2005.
30. Peter Maier, *Responses to questionnaire on the constitution and work of existing European Consensus Platforms for 3R Alternatives to Animal Experimentation.* Fondation Recherches 3R/Stiftung Forschung 3R, 2005.
31. Peter Maier, Fondation Recherches 3R/Stiftung Forschung 3R, *personal communication*, 2005.
32. Peter Maier, Fondation Recherches 3R/Stiftung Forschung 3R, *by e-mail*, 17th July 2005.
33. Maier, P., Fondation Recherches 3R/Stiftung Forschung 3R, *by e-mail*, 1st August 2005.
34. Fondation Recherches 3R/Stiftung Forschung 3R, <http://www.forschung3r.ch/fr/information/intro.html>.
35. The Boyd Group, <http://www.boyd-group.demon.co.uk>
36. Jane Smith, *Responses to questionnaire on the constitution and work of existing European Consensus Platforms for 3R Alternatives to Animal Experimentation.* The Boyd Group, 2005.

37. NC3Rs, <http://www.nc3rs.org.uk/>.
38. Laura Playle, NC3Rs, *personal communication*, 2005.
39. Kenneth Boyd, *Presentation on state of the art per country: Experiences from The Boyd Group. Ecopa consensus meeting in Ljubljana, Slovenia, 10th-12th June 2005.*
40. Ashley Scott, NC3Rs, *by e-mail*, 25th July 2005.
41. NC3Rs, *3Rs Research Funding Scheme*. <http://www.nc3rs.org.uk/funding.htm>.
42. NC3Rs, *NC3Rs/LASA Small Awards Scheme*. <http://www.nc3rs.org.uk/small.htm>.
43. Stortinget, *Innst. S. nr. 226 (2002-2003) Innstilling fra næringskomiteen om dyrehold og dyrevelferd*.
44. Marianna Norring, Juliana von Wendt's Fund for Science without Animal Experimentation, *by e-mail*, 1st July 2005.
45. Stiftelsen Forskning utan Djurforsök, *Nordiska Forskningspriset*. [http://www.stifud.se/forskarrummet/nordiska\\_forsk\\_priset.php](http://www.stifud.se/forskarrummet/nordiska_forsk_priset.php).
- . Aldabert Schlitt, SET, *personal communication*, 2005.47. Roberta Bartocci, LAV, *by e-mail*, 27th July 2005.
48. Centrala Forsöksdjursnämnden, *Projectkatalog - CFN:s forskningsprojekt 2002*. 47, 2002.
49. Centrala Forsöksdjursnämnden, *Projectkatalog - CFN:s forskningsprojekt 2000*. 43, 2000.
50. UFAW, *Annual report 2002-2003*. <http://www.ufaw.org.uk/>, 2004.
51. FRAME, *Annual report and review 2003-2004*. <http://www.frame.org.uk/index.htm>, 2005.

## APPENDIX

### QUESTIONNAIRE on the constitution and work of existing European Consensus Platforms for 3R Alternatives to Animal Experimentation

#### I INFORMATION ABOUT THE RESPONDENT

1. Country and date:
2. Name of respondent:
3. Respondent's role in national platform:

#### II CONSTITUTION

1. When was the platform founded in your country?
2. Is your national platform a legal entity?
3. Does your national platform have statutes or by-laws? (If yes, please enclose copies or links to websites with more information).
4. Does the platform have a board?
5. If yes, are all the four parties (academia, animal welfare, industry and government) represented on the board?
6. How are the representatives for the four parties (academia, animal welfare, industry and government) selected? Please describe:
7. Are others than the four parties (academia, animal welfare, industry and government) represented on the board? If yes, please specify:

#### III MANAGEMENT

1. How often does the board normally meet in the course of a year?
2. Do the board members undertake work for the platform on a regular basis?
3. If yes, please specify what types of work the various board members are responsible for:
4. Does the platform have permanent employees?
5. If yes, approx. how many man-years annually?
6. Does the platform hire personnel for short-term tasks?
7. If yes, approx. how many man-years annually?
8. Does the platform have a permanent office?

#### IV GENERAL FUNDING OF THE PLATFORM'S WORK

1. What was the annual income of the platform in 2004?
2. Please indicate how the income was obtained in 2004 (estimate):

Income	Percentage of total income
Contributions from the state	
Contributions from industry	
Contributions from animal welfare or animal rights organizations	
Contributions from academia	
Private individual donations	
Grants, awards or legacies	
Other, please specify:	

#### **V FUNDS DISPOSED OR MANAGED BY THE PLATFORM FOR GRANTS**

1. Does the platform manage a fund giving regular grants to work on the three Rs?
2. If yes, when was the fund established?
3. Who established the fund?
4. What approx. is the fund's capital, and what approx. is the annual yield of this fund?
5. What conditions, if any, apply to grants given by the fund?

#### **VI PRIORITIES**

1. What, if any, are the Platform's long-term objectives?
2. What, if any, are the Platform's short-term objectives?
3. Which of the following activities has the platform been engaged in so far (please indicate all relevant activities):

Activity undertaken	Yes/No
Giving lectures/talks	
Organizing discussion forums, seminars etc.	
Lobbying for 3R issues	
Gathering information relevant to 3R issues	
Publishing information about 3R issues	
Funding research or other activities relevant to 3R issues	
Other, please specify:	

#### **VII OPINIONS (optional)**

1. In your opinion, what have been the positive effects of the platform in your country?
2. In your opinion, what could be done to maximize the positive effects of the platform in your country? (e.g. increased resources, changes in organisation, etc.)