Proposed Action	Responses	Implemented	Not Implemented	For Those Not Implemented* Planning to Implement	For Those Not Implemented* Not Planning to Implement
Eliminate annual protocol renewals for non-USDA species and non-DOD protocols.	94	44 (47%)	50 (53%)	11 (12%)	39 (41%)
Discontinue the USDA pain and distress classifications for non-Animal Welfare Act regulated species	93	14 (15%)	79 (85%)	10 (11%)	69 (74%)
As the default, implement Designated Member Review rather than Full Committee Review	94	62 (66%)	32 (34%)	3 (3%)	29 (31%)
Reduce IACUC requirements for experimental details that are unrelated to the health and safety of animals	93	65 (70%)	28 (30%)	7(8%)	19 (20%)
Adopt NIH OLAW's allowance for "expediting" protocol amendments via a new Veterinary Verification and Consultation (VVC) process, thereby reducing/eliminating full IACUC involvement	94	72 (77%)	22 (23%)	10 (11%)	12 (13%)
Expand the scope of administrative approval authority by allowing small changes to protocols to be handled administratively (by IACUC staff or via Veterinary Verification and Consultation process)	94	87 (93%)	7 (7%)	5 (5%)	2 (2%)
Simplify the IACUC protocol form with standardized language and content requirements. Examples include 1) A standard rodent, pre-approved, pre-operative preparation plan and post-operative recovery plan template 2) A built in commonly used drug formulary that will provide the pre-approved dosage, route and frequency of administration 3) Convert formatted text boxes to simple drop down lists for fast data selection/entry and enhanced reporting capabilities 4) Drop down list of euthanasia methods/dosages that are pre-approved for a given species				45 (48%)	12 (13%)
Does your institution provide template language?	94	50 (53%)	44 (47%)		
Does your institution provide procedural libraries?	86	32 (37%)	54 (63%)		
Replace required documentation on how a proposed protocol was not unnecessarily duplicative with a simple attestation.	94	63 (67%)	31 (33%)	14 (15%)	17 (18%)
Standardize veterinary review procedures and communications to investigators.	92	69 (75%)	23 (25%)	7 (8%)	16 (17%)
Review SOPs on a less frequent basis (e.g. every two to three years) based on potential risk (e.g., skill of investigative team, outcomes of PAM reporting)	93	73 (78%)	20 (22%)	10 (11%)	8 (9%)
Allow investigators to provide an approximate number or range of animals needed over the course of a research project rather than an exact number	94	41 (44%)	53 (56%)	9 (10%)	40 (43%)

Allow investigators to provide a range of time for post op observation rather than an exact time (e.g., 4-6 hours instead of every 4 hours) to allow flexibility and avoid findings on deviations from the language where actions were appropriate	94	88 (94%)	6 (6%)		2 (2%)	2 (2%)
Replace mandatory triennial regulatory refresher seminar with an array of instructional sessions to streamline protocol writing and review. Solicit feedback on how the institution can assist investigators	92	27 (29%)	65 (71%)		14 (15%)	44 (48%)
Adopt standardized models for training and documentation.	90	77 (86%)	13 (14%)		6 (7%)	7 (8%)
Allow use of ad hoc consultants in place of IACUC members (e.g. environmental health and safety or physical plant personnel trained to assess facilities) for semiannual inspections of non USDA species	94	42 (45%)	52 (55%)		5 (1%)	43 (46%)
Eliminate the requirement for a literature search for category D and E procedures for non-USDA species	94	23 (24%)	71 (76%)		9 (10%)	58 (62%)
Eliminate the requirement for a literature search for category C procedures for all species	94	58 (62%)	36 (38%)		7 (7%)	26 (28%)
Allow investigators the flexibility to include more than one species and funding source per protocol	92	84 (91%)	8 (9%)		0	7 (8%)
Eliminate the requirement to describe facilities and husbandry in the protocol if a protocol issuing central facilities and centralized staff support.	93	80 (86%)	13 (14%)		6 (7%)	6 (7%)
Do not require a protocol re-write for PHS triennial review if your process allows modifications to be included in the latest version of the protocol rather than as an attachment.	93	31 (33%)	62 (67%)		12 (13%)	48 (52%)

*Percentage of Total Responses