

**Sixth Annual Report
to the
Minister of Health**

**National Ethics
Advisory Committee
Kāhui Matatika o te Motu**

2007

Citation: National Ethics Advisory Committee. 2008. *Sixth Annual Report to the Minister of Health: National Ethics Advisory Committee* – *Kāhui Matatika o te Motu*. Wellington: Ministry of Health.

Published in December 2008 by the
Ministry of Health
PO Box 5013, Wellington, New Zealand

ISBN: 978-0-478-31884-5 (print)
ISBN: 978-0-478-31885-2 (online)
HP 4737

This document is available on the NEAC website:
<http://www.neac.health.govt.nz>

neac
National Ethics Advisory Committee
Kāhui Matatika o te Motu

Foreword

On behalf of the Committee, I am pleased to present the sixth Annual Report of the National Ethics Advisory Committee – Kāhui Matatika o te Motu (NEAC). The Report outlines the Committee's activities for 2007 and summarises advice it has given this year on matters referred to it under section 16 of the New Zealand Public Health and Disability Act 2000.

NEAC's statutory functions are broad and strategic. They include providing advice to the Minister of Health on ethical issues of national significance in respect of health and disability matters and determining nationally consistent ethical standards across the health sector.

In 2007 the Committee completed a major project, *Getting Through Together: Ethical values for a pandemic*. The World Health Organization officially recognised this document, as did the Ministry of Health, which included NEAC's summary statement of ethical values in its *New Zealand Influenza Pandemic Action Plan*.

In the context of its policy work on research ethics, NEAC views research and the evidence it produces as vital to the achievement of health sector goals: better health; reduced inequalities; increased participation and independence; and trust and security for New Zealanders. To be credible and to sustain firm public support, such research must meet high ethical standards.

NEAC's focus on the benefits of research has also led the Committee to highlight and seek to foster the contribution of the health and disability sector to cross-agency policy work on research and innovation. During 2007 the Committee

made significant progress on its development of ethical guidelines for intervention studies, as well as continuing its work in the areas of research ethics governance and Māori research ethics.

NEAC also made contributions in the areas of health system design and workforce issues in 2007, including developing a 'pathway' approach to the provision of elective services and providing draft advice on the relationship between the professional ethical principle of 'do no harm' and the practice of withdrawing labour as a method of industrial action in the health sector.

NEAC strives to produce work that is both principled and practical. Several things matter to this: an expert and credible membership, collaborative working relationships with key individuals and organisations, inclusive and thorough project processes and a professional secretariat.

On behalf of NEAC, I am pleased to present this annual report for 2007.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Andrew Moore', with a stylized flourish at the end.

Andrew Moore
Chair
National Ethics Advisory Committee
Kāhui Matatika o te Motu

Contents

Foreword	iii
Introduction	1
NEAC's 2007 Work Programme	2
Committee membership	20
Secretariat 2007	32
Contact details	33
Appendix A: Goals, Objectives and Desired Outcomes of an Ethical Review System	34
Appendix B: Terms of Reference	38

Introduction

National Ethics Advisory Committee – Kāhui Matatika o te Motu

The National Ethics Advisory Committee – Kāhui Matatika o te Motu (NEAC) is an independent advisor to the Minister of Health. Its statutory functions, under section 16 of the New Zealand Public Health and Disability Act 2000, are to:

- advise the Minister of Health on ethical issues of national significance in respect of health and disability matters
- determine nationally consistent ethical standards across the health sector
- provide scrutiny for national health research and health services.

NEAC works within the context of the New Zealand Public Health and Disability Act 2000 and key health and disability policy statements. Section 16(6) of the Act 2000 requires that NEAC:

at least once a year, deliver to the Minister a report setting out its activities and summarising its advice on the matters referred to it under this section.

The members of NEAC, appointed by the Minister of Health, have expertise in the fields of ethics, health and disability research, health service provision and leadership, public health, epidemiology, law, Māori health and consumer advocacy.

NEAC's 2007 Work Programme

Introduction

Ethics involves identifying what matters and how best to act on this finding. NEAC uses this understanding of ethics to produce work that is both principled and practical.

NEAC agrees its work programme with the Minister of Health. NEAC's work on ethics related to health and disability support services and research is varied and far-reaching. There are important ethical issues to consider across the health and disability system, including: public health, workforce, health system design, and quality and safety.

NEAC's 2007 work programme included projects in the following areas:

Public health priorities

- Pandemic planning

Workforce

- 'Do no harm' and 'life preserving services'

Health system design

- Elective services

Quality and safety

- Observational studies
- Intervention studies
- Innovative practice
- Research ethics governance
- Māori research ethics

Public health priorities

Pandemic planning

Summary	
What matters	Minimising harm from any pandemic. Minimising inequalities in the impact of any pandemic. Getting through any pandemic together.
NEAC contributions	Identifying shared values to assist difficult decision-making. Providing practical guidance on certain key 'hard issues'. Working with the Ministry of Health, the lead cross-government agency.
Output	Publishing an accessible document, developed through inclusive public consultation processes. <i>Getting Through Together: Ethical values for a pandemic</i> was made publicly available in July 2007. It is available at http://www.neac.health.govt.nz

Ethical values for a pandemic

An influenza pandemic would be likely to involve high levels of illness and death. Pandemic planning aims to prevent a pandemic when possible, and to minimise negative impacts where prevention is not possible. Considering ethical issues as part of pandemic planning will better equip us to react to a pandemic by acting on shared values using common sense and imagination, even when we have little time.

NEAC advice on ethical values for a pandemic

NEAC's contribution to pandemic planning, *Getting Through Together: Ethical values for a pandemic* (July 2007), was written to reflect the New Zealand context. It aims to:

- highlight, for the public and all who are involved in pandemic planning, the fact that ordinary people can do extraordinary things, and that forming high expectations for ourselves and one another will help more of us to act in this way
- emphasise that, when we are pulled in more than one direction by things that matter, we should get through as far as we can with an imaginative approach that maintains each of the things that matter (eg, thought and action that achieve *both* self-protection *and* help for our neighbours).

As consultation feedback confirmed, *Getting Through Together* identifies shared values and offers broad guidance in the areas of restrictive measures, the responsibilities of health professionals, prioritising health services and neighbourliness/whānaungatanga. NEAC considers that community action expressing neighbourliness and whānaungatanga, in particular, will be vital to managing a future pandemic.

Getting Through Together includes a summary statement of ethical values relevant to the management of a pandemic, expressed in a common-sense style. Identifying the values that matter most gives us a shared basis for decision-making. The summary statement identifies values recognised in Māori tikanga alongside other values, and acknowledges that values can be conflicting. The values identified in the statement apply in many settings and at all pandemic phases. The document makes use of two hypothetical cases to examine some of the challenges we may face in a pandemic.

NEAC hopes that a wide range of people, including health professionals, planners, policy makers and members of the public and business community, can use *Getting Through Together* as they plan for, and think about, their potential response to a pandemic. NEAC emphasises shared values that assist people to care for themselves, their whānau and their neighbours, and to make decisions in situations of overwhelming demand.

The summary statement of ethical values is included in the Ministry of Health's *New Zealand Influenza Pandemic Action Plan*. The World Health Organization has recognised this document.

Further information

For further information about the development of NEAC's pandemic work see NEAC's 2006 Annual Report, available at <http://www.neac.health.govt.nz>

Workforce

‘Do no harm’ and ‘life preserving services’

Summary	
What matters	Minimising the potential for harm to patients during industrial action.
NEAC contributions	Analysing ethical issues to inform discussion of interpretation and application of the Code of Good Faith, including ‘life preserving services’ provisions. Challenging and assisting key parties to consider ethical issues related to industrial action.
Output	Producing a draft advisory paper to the Minister (May 2007).

Impetus for NEAC’s work on ‘do no harm’ and the provision of ‘life preserving services’

In May 2007 NEAC provided advice requested by the Minister of Health on the relationship between the professional ethical principle of ‘do no harm’ and the practice of withdrawing labour as a method of industrial action in the health and disability sector.

NEAC carried out this work in the context of strike action by health care workers (most prominently radiographers in November 2006) and a change in New Zealand law governing the provision of ‘life preserving services’. In December 2006, the Code of Good Faith for Public Health Sector in Schedule 1B of the Employment Relations Act 2000 was amended to include the prevention of permanent disability in the definition of ‘life preserving services’. The Minister of Health invited NEAC to consider and address

issues arising from their interpretation of the Code of Good Faith, including the 'life preserving services' provisions.

'Life preserving services'

The Code of Good Faith defines 'life preserving services' as:

- crisis intervention for the preservation of life or for the prevention of permanent disability
- care required for therapeutic services without which life would be jeopardised or permanent disability would occur
- urgent diagnostic procedures required to obtain information on potentially life-threatening conditions or conditions that could potentially lead to permanent disability.

'Do no harm'

NEAC examined the 'do no harm' principle in relation to the 'life preserving services' provisions. The 'do no harm' principle implies that healthcare and disability workers should not provide, withdraw or withhold services where the risk of harm from doing so outweighs the benefits expected to the patient or disabled person in question.

NEAC advice on 'do no harm' and 'life preserving services'

NEAC's draft advisory paper on 'do no harm' and 'life preserving services' was prepared as a contribution to the New Zealand Council of Trade Unions (CTU)'s and District Health Boards (DHBs)' 2007 stocktake of the Code of Good Faith. The stocktake process considers and addresses issues arising in the interpretation and application of the Code of Good Faith for Public Health Sector. NEAC's paper aims to assist key parties to consider ethical issues relating to industrial action and the provision of 'life preserving services'.

As a starting point for this work, NEAC assumes that there is a right to strike, and that this right extends to health care and disability workers. The Committee's draft advisory paper examines whether, when key parties are applying the Code of Good Faith, their interpretation and application of 'life preserving services' is consistent with the ethical principle of 'do no harm'. It posits a distinction between harm and hurt, and considers situations where withdrawing services may not breach the 'do no harm' principle.

NEAC's preliminary analysis is that:

- it is appropriate for healthcare and disability workers to apply the 'do no harm' principle to any act of theirs to provide, withhold or withdraw any health or disability service
- in general, withholding or withdrawing a health or disability service (for example, by strike action) has the potential to cause serious harm, in addition to any potential it has to cause loss of life or permanent disability
- it is appropriate for the CTU/DHB stocktake to include consideration of whether the current interpretations and applications of 'life preserving services' ensure that any withholding or withdrawal of service through industrial action also adheres to the 'do no harm' principle.

Process

In May 2007 NEAC forwarded its 'first thoughts' to the Minister of Health in the form of a draft advisory paper. The paper outlines the core issues concerning the relation of 'do no harm' to the current definition and interpretations of 'life preserving services'. The Minister sent this paper to the CTU and the Chair of the national DHB chief executive officers' group in order for them to actively consider the issues as part of the 2007 stocktake of the Code of Good Faith.

Health system design

Elective services

Summary	
What matters	Developing elective services that work better for New Zealanders.
NEAC contributions	Proposing a strategic direction for elective services that is patient-centred, encompasses all steps on the electives pathway for patients, and addresses key sector contexts.
Output	Providing advice to the Minister to inform further policy development and examination of the booking system approach (September 2006). This advice became publicly available in February 2007. See <i>Ethical Issues in Elective Services: NEAC Report to the Minister of Health</i> at http://www.neac.health.govt.nz

Ethical issues in elective services

Since the mid-1990s New Zealand has been implementing an internationally distinctive 'booking system' approach to elective services. Key principles underlying the booking system are clarity, timeliness and fairness. Ongoing review of the system will help to deliver elective services that work better for New Zealanders.

In September 2006 NEAC provided advice to the Minister of Health on ethical issues in elective services. NEAC took a whole-of-system approach, addressing issues in the overall design of the electives pathway and its interaction with other parts of the New Zealand health system. This work

continues to be used by the Ministry of Health to inform the development of policy and practice.

Public availability of NEAC's advice

NEAC's advice and the 'Electives pathway' diagram can be downloaded from the 'Publications' page on NEAC's website. NEAC's summary statement, published on its website alongside its *Report to the Minister*, states:

In NEAC's view, there are potential ethical advantages in New Zealand's 'booking system' approach to elective services. To help secure these advantages, however, NEAC considers that the ongoing development of elective services should be more explicitly built around the patient-centred idea of the 'electives pathway'. This would highlight the full set of steps at which things must work well for patients.

In particular, NEAC wishes to see development of a measure of progress towards the ideal that every patient who has a primary care referral is offered a timely and appropriate specialised service. This is likely also to require ongoing innovation in how, where, and by whom such specialised services are offered.

NEAC considers that there are some issues about the overall design of the electives pathway, and its interaction with other parts of the New Zealand health system, that merit further examination. These issues are:

- *the 'first specialist assessment' step*
- *relations between elective services and acute services*
- *relations between public and private sectors.*

For further background information on NEAC's advice on ethical issues in elective services see NEAC's 2006 Annual Report, available at <http://www.neac.health.govt.nz>

Quality and safety

Observational studies

Summary	
What matters	Providing safe and high-quality health and disability services. Ensuring safe environments at home, work and leisure.
NEAC contributions	Building observational studies further into the culture and routines of the health and disability sector. Minimising any risk or harm related to such studies. Building public confidence in observational studies and their contribution to health and disability services. Promoting <i>Ethical Guidelines for Observational Studies: Observational research, audits and related activities</i> (December 2006).
Output	Publishing NEAC's <i>Ethical Guidelines for Observational Studies</i> , available in hard copy and electronically at http://www.neac.health.govt.nz

Ethical issues in observational studies

Observational studies inform New Zealanders on the safety and effectiveness of services, providing vital evidence about our health and how best to protect and improve it. Such studies use personal information for public good, and to be effective they must meet high ethical standards.

In an observational study the investigator observes and analyses information about health or disability but does not control the care or services that people receive. This method differs from that of an intervention study, in which the investigator intentionally alters people's treatment or other care to study the safety and benefit of doing so. This difference means observational studies have relatively low risk.

NEAC has developed guidelines on conducting observational studies in an ethical manner that are intended to facilitate high-quality studies, protect the interests of participants and underpin public assurance of good study conduct. The guidelines are available in combination with a two-page summary guidance sheet for easy reference.

Promoting the uptake of NEAC's *Ethical Guidelines for Observational Studies*

In 2007 NEAC presented its *Ethical Guidelines for Observational Studies* to a range of audiences to raise awareness of them, encourage their uptake and foster discussion on issues arising from their use.

Further information

For further background and information about the aims and features of NEAC's *Ethical Guidelines for Observational Studies*, see NEAC's 2006 Annual Report, available at <http://www.neac.health.govt.nz>

Intervention studies

Ethical issues in intervention studies

Health professionals use 'interventions' to prevent, diagnose or treat illness or disease. They need to know which interventions are safe and effective. Intervention studies are their main source of reliable information.

In an intervention study, the investigator intentionally alters one or more treatments or other health-related factors to study the effects of doing so. The effects to be studied typically concern treatment safety or benefit for participants. A clinical trial of an influenza vaccine is an example.

Ethical guidance for intervention studies is an important area of NEAC's work. This is a dynamic area of research, with great potential for benefit; however, in general, intervention studies also involve a higher risk to participants than other kinds of studies.

NEAC's aims

NEAC aims to contribute to better health outcomes and reduced health inequalities for New Zealanders by assisting researchers to perform sound intervention studies. NEAC's work pursues these aims by:

- identifying ethical issues for intervention studies in New Zealand
- considering how these issues are currently addressed
- identifying which issues need to be addressed more effectively
- proposing options for addressing these issues more effectively.

Process

The Minister of Health has agreed to NEAC carrying out a project on the ethics of intervention studies. NEAC intends to produce a guidance document parallel to its established *Ethical Guidelines for Observational Studies*. The Committee will also make recommendations to the Minister to attend to any matters the proposed guidelines cannot address.

Innovative practice

What is innovative practice?

Innovative practice can overlap with intervention studies. Innovative practice has been defined as:

... a planned deviation from the currently accepted practice of a New Zealand body of health professionals involving an untested or unproven clinical intervention intended to be used on an ongoing basis. Innovative practice includes the application of known procedures in new or novel circumstances in which they have not previously been tested. It may involve new delivery practices by health practitioners, new devices, new investigative procedures, or clinical management options (Ministry of Health, Operational Standard for Ethics Committees: Updated edition, 2006, paragraph 121).

Ethical issues in innovative practice

The ethical issues involved in innovative practice are similar to those for an intervention study. The term 'innovative practice' covers a range of activities. Again, there is great potential benefit and also some vulnerability of participants to potential harm.

Process

The Committee has carried out a literature scan on ethical issues in innovative practice, a stocktake of New Zealand and international policy and guidance on innovative practice, and interviews with relevant people. In 2007 NEAC focussed on its work on intervention studies, which shares similarities with NEAC's current and future work on innovative practice.

Health and disability research ethics governance

Ethical responsibilities in research

Governance arrangements for health and disability research ethics concern responsibility for the ethical design, review and conduct of such research. They also concern the standards, processes and structures to support and facilitate these responsibilities. It matters that good studies are facilitated and conducted to high ethical standards, and that any ethical issues are well addressed.

The responsibility for the ethical design, review and conduct of research is exercised at many levels, including by researchers, ethics committees, bodies that establish ethical review processes, funding organisations, agencies that set standards and government.

NEAC's 2003 review of the ethics committee system in New Zealand identified areas where responsibilities may be unclear or inconsistent.

NEAC's aims

NEAC's Research Ethics Governance project aims to:

- examine the current governance arrangements for health and disability research ethics in New Zealand
- advise the Minister of Health on issues in relation to the current governance arrangements that need to be addressed as a matter of public policy.

Process

NEAC has analysed existing sector guidance, including identifying gaps, overlaps and broad options for future development and linking of guidance. The Committee has also identified further potential areas of responsibility to address, held preliminary discussions with some key people in the health and disability research community and undertaken research on international approaches to health and disability research ethics governance.

Māori health and disability research ethics

There has been much progress in the area of Māori research in recent years, drawing on tikanga Māori and matauranga Māori as an ethical base. Although new opportunities and challenges abound, as yet there are few formal protocols or ethical guidelines to inform Māori research. There are also important linkages between Māori research ethics and wider frameworks and approaches.

NEAC's aims

The purpose of NEAC's work on Māori health and disability research ethics is to facilitate understanding of Māori research ethics, improve the quality of research and assist Māori communities to contribute to Māori health development.

Process

NEAC is working in collaboration with Ngā Pae o te Māramatanga (Māori Centre of Research Excellence, based at the University of Auckland) and the Health Research Council of New Zealand. The partners' approach has been to encourage discussion and dialogue on ethical issues amongst Māori communities, researchers, and other people and organisations involved in research ethics, to clarify issues, needs, and options for policy and practice.

In 2007 NEAC consulted its project partners on a draft Māori research ethics issues paper. This draft was also made available to Māori members of health and disability ethics committees. Outlining existing elements of Māori research ethics and potential areas for further development, this issues paper is intended as a resource for the project partners to support future work.

Committee membership

Andrew Moore – chair

Andrew Moore is an associate professor in the Department of Philosophy at the University of Otago. His teaching, research and community service activities focus on ethics, political philosophy and bioethics.



Andrew's practical experience in clinical ethics and health research ethics includes previous health and disability ethics committee memberships at the Otago regional level and with the National Ethics Committee on Assisted Human Reproduction. He was also previously a member of the human subjects ethics committee at the University of Otago. In addition, he is a member of the Health Research Council of New Zealand's Data and Safety Monitoring Board for New Zealand-led clinical trials.

Andrew's policy experience includes previous membership of the National Health Committee and Public Health Advisory Committee.

Allison Kirkman – deputy chair

Allison Kirkman is a senior lecturer in sociology in the School of Social and Cultural Studies and deputy dean in the Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences at Victoria University of Wellington.



Allison's areas of expertise are in the sociology of gender, sexuality and health. She is the convenor of the Victoria University of Wellington Human Ethics Committee and is also currently convenor of the Standing Committee on the Code of Ethics for the Sociological Association of Aotearoa New Zealand.

Michael Ardagh

Michael Ardagh is professor of emergency medicine at the Christchurch School of Medicine, specialist emergency physician at the Christchurch Hospital Emergency Department and chair of the Emergency Care Foundation (a charitable trust dedicated to innovation, education and research into emergency care). His duties involve a mix of patient care in the emergency department, supervision of junior medical staff, education and research.



Michael attained a doctorate in bioethics from the University of Otago in 2001, exploring ethical issues related to resuscitation.

Barbara Beckford

Barbara Beckford is the co-convenor of the Federation of Women's Health Councils Aotearoa, which provides advocacy for generic health consumer interests, particularly at the policy level.



Barbara has extensive hands-on knowledge of health care in the community. She has been a patient advocate and chair of a regional health and disability ethics committee.

Barbara is a lay member of the Medical Radiation Technologists Board, the co-chair of the National Screening Unit Consumer Reference Group, a consumer representative on the BreastScreen Aotearoa Advisory Group, and a community representative on the West Coast DHB Hospital Advisory Committee and Community and Public Health Advisory Committee.

Dale Bramley

Dale Bramley is a medical graduate of the University of Auckland.



Dale is a public health physician and general manager of Planning and Funding for the Waitemata DHB. He has an honorary academic appointment as a senior lecturer in public health in the section of epidemiology and biostatistics at the University of Auckland.

Dale has a keen interest in Māori health, epidemiology, cardiovascular disease and public health. From July 2003 to July 2004 he completed a Harkness Fellowship in health policy at the Mount Sinai Medical Center in New York. The focus of his work was an international comparison of indigenous health disparities. Dale is also a member of the National Health Committee and Public Health Advisory Committee.

Dale has tribal affiliations to Ngāti Hine and Ngā Puhi.

Michael Findlay

Michael is professor of oncology, head of the discipline of oncology, director of Cancer Trials New Zealand and honorary professor at the Auckland Cancer Society Research Centre at the University of Auckland. He is also a practising medical oncologist in the Auckland Regional Cancer and Blood Service.



Michael has published in the area of cancer research, particularly in the area of clinical trials in cancer of the gastro-intestinal tract. He is deputy-chair of the Australasian Gastro-Intestinal Trials Group, having been an active investigator for over a decade.

More recently Michael's major focus has been in developing Cancer Trials New Zealand – an academic research organisation established to facilitate and support cancer research and the research environment with the purpose of improving cancer outcomes in New Zealand.

Elisabeth Harding

Elisabeth Harding is the legal advisor and privacy officer at Counties Manukau DHB. Elisabeth trained and worked as a nurse for 17 years. She spent four years working for the Privacy Commissioner before moving to private practice. Her DHB role combines her nursing and legal skills.



Elisabeth has an ongoing interest in privacy issues related to the safe management of health information, and led the privacy work stream in the Ministry of Health's Working to Add Value through E-information (WAVE) project. She is a member of the Health Research Council's Ethics Committee.

John Hinchcliff

John Hinchcliff retired as vice-chancellor of the Auckland University of Technology and has served on the Auckland City Council. He has published articles and books on ethics, lectured on ethics at universities in the United States and New Zealand, and helped introduce and teach medical ethics at the University of Auckland Medical School during the 1970s.



John has been head of the Department of Humanities at the Royal Melbourne Institute of Technology, chaplain at the University of Auckland and assistant professor of philosophy at Hampden Sydney University in Virginia.

John has also lectured on the ethics of business, technology, sport, politics and futures studies.

Te Kani Kingi

Te Kani Kingi is director of Te Mata o te Tau, the Academy for Māori Research and Scholarship, at Massey University, Wellington. Te Kani has extensive experience in Māori health research and has lectured in Māori health, health policy, Māori mental health and the Treaty of Waitangi. He has served on a number of health-related committees and continues to publish in the broad area of Māori health and Māori development. He has a particular interest in mental health, health outcome measurement and the development of culturally aligned outcome indicators.



Te Kani was born and raised in Poroporo (near Whakatane) and was educated at St Stephen's School in South Auckland. He studied at Waikato and Massey Universities and has tribal affiliations to both Ngāti Awa and Ngāti Pūkeko.

Joanna Manning

Joanna Manning is an associate professor in the Faculty of Law at the University of Auckland.



Joanna is an academic lawyer, teaching and researching principally in the fields of medical law and ethics, and torts and accident compensation. She has published widely, particularly on issues relating to informed consent to medical treatment and the Code of Patients' Rights.

Joanna has a practical background in prosecution and civil litigation. She was the consumer representative on the Medical Practitioners' Disciplinary Committee for 10 years.

Charlotte Paul

Charlotte Paul is professor of preventive and social medicine at the University of Otago Medical School in Dunedin.



Charlotte is an epidemiologist with a background in medicine and public health. She has extensive experience in conducting epidemiological research nationally, particularly in the areas of women's cancers and contraceptive safety. She is associate director of the AIDS Epidemiology Group, which is responsible for monitoring the HIV/AIDS epidemic in New Zealand. In addition, she is a principal investigator in the Dunedin Multidisciplinary Health and Development Study in the area of sexual and reproductive behaviour, and is a member of its Scientific Advisory Group.

In 1987/88 Charlotte was a medical advisor to Judge Cartwright for the cervical cancer inquiry, and has published articles on the ethical implications of that inquiry. She has been a member of the Otago Area Health Board Ethics Committee and the Health Research Council Ethics Committee. She chaired a working party for the Health Research Council of New Zealand on privacy and health research, which produced guidance notes for health researchers and ethics committees.

Martin Sullivan

Martin Sullivan is a senior lecturer in social policy and disability studies at the School of Sociology, Social Policy and Social Work at Massey University. He was awarded his doctorate on the sociology of paraplegia in 1997 and was made a Winston Churchill Fellow in 2000 for his work on the development of disability studies and the disability movement in the United Kingdom.



As an academic, Martin teaches, researches and has published widely on disability. As a disabled person, Martin has been actively involved in the disability movement for many years and is chair of Advocacy Manawatu (a citizen advocacy group for people with disabilities).

Secretariat 2007

NEAC's secretariat is located in the Ministry of Health and provides dedicated analytical policy support and administrative support to the Committee.

Barbara Burt – senior analyst

Vanessa Roberts – analyst

Gabrielle McDonald – public health medicine registrar (fixed term)

Contact details

NEAC's contacts are as follows:

Telephone 64 4 496 2000

Email neac@moh.govt.nz

Postal address PO Box 5013, Wellington

Website <http://www.neac.health.govt.nz>

Appendix A: Goals, Objectives and Desired Outcomes of an Ethical Review System

The National Ethics Advisory Committee – Kāhui Matatika o te Motu (NEAC) has issued a statement entitled *Goals, Objectives and Desired Outcomes of an Ethical Review System* (GODO) in accordance with its statutory function to ‘determine nationally consistent ethical standards across the health sector’ (New Zealand Public Health and Disability Act 2000, s.16).

The ethical review system includes ethical aspects of self-review, peer review, ethics committee review, and specialist review of health and disability research and related activity. It applies established ethical standards to research and related activity. GODO states established goals, objectives and desired outcomes that are to be applied to the ethical review system itself.

For details of the inclusive public process that generated the GODO statement, see National Ethics Advisory Committee, *Review of the Current Processes for Ethical Review of Health and Disability Research in New Zealand* (December 2003), available at: <http://www.neac.health.govt.nz>

Goals, objectives, and desired outcomes of an ethical review system

Overall goals
<p>Facilitate research and innovative practice that contributes to knowledge and improved health outcomes</p> <p>Protect participants in health and disability research and innovative treatment</p> <p>Find a balance that minimises risks and maximises benefits arising from health and disability research</p> <p>Recognise and respect the principles of the Treaty of Waitangi by enabling Māori to contribute to the ethical review system for health and disability research</p>

Objectives	Desired outcomes
Accountable	<p>Public accountability requirements are defined.</p> <p>Ethical reviews meet internationally recognised standards.</p> <p>Ethical reviews take into account relevant legislation.</p>
Enabling	<p>Research participants/subjects are protected.</p> <p>Quality research is facilitated.</p> <p>Review processes are clear about jurisdiction and coverage.</p> <p>Awareness of ethical practice among all stakeholders is developed.</p> <p>Good communication with affected communities is demonstrated.</p> <p>Local input is achieved.</p> <p>Positive relationships with all stakeholders are developed.</p> <p>System review mechanisms are in place.</p>

Objectives	Desired outcomes
Informed	<p>Researchers consider ethical implications from the outset; eg, there is clarification of who will benefit from the research (participants, the public, etc).</p> <p>The perspectives of affected communities are included.</p> <p>Review processes are proactive and attend to emergent issues, and are responsive to change over time.</p> <p>Review processes apply appropriate expertise.</p> <p>Scientific and ethical standards are considered alongside each other where appropriate.</p> <p>Decision-making is consistent.</p> <p>Review capacity and relevant expertise are maintained and developed.</p>
Enabling of Māori participation	<p>A Māori ethical framework is developed and implemented.</p> <p>Consultation with Māori is collaborative, genuine, inclusive, and appropriate.</p> <p>Māori participation in the decision-making component of the system is facilitated.</p> <p>The potential for diversity of opinion across iwi and regions is recognised and respected.</p> <p>Māori research capability is facilitated.</p>
Fair	<p>Review processes are independent.</p> <p>Stakeholders have access to due process.</p> <p>Outcomes of processes are equitable.</p> <p>Applicants to review processes have the right of reply.</p> <p>Conflicts of interest are acknowledged and addressed.</p>

Objectives	Desired outcomes
Efficient	Time and resources are used productively. Reviews are timely. Sector guidance is updated regularly, with opportunity for all stakeholders to participate.

Appendix B: Terms of Reference

The Role of the Committee

The National Advisory Committee on Health and Disability Support Services Ethics ('the National Ethics Advisory Committee') is a ministerial advisory committee established under section 16 of the New Zealand Public Health and Disability Act 2000 ('the Act'). The National Ethics Advisory Committee is established by and accountable to the Minister of Health.

The National Ethics Advisory Committee's statutory functions are to:

- provide advice to the Minister of Health on ethical issues of national significance in respect of any health and disability matters (including research and health services)
- determine nationally consistent ethical standards across the health and disability sector and provide scrutiny for national health research and health services.

As part of its functions the National Ethics Advisory Committee is also required to:

- consult with any members of the public, persons involved in the funding or provision of services and other persons that the committee considers appropriate before providing advice on an issue (section 16(4) refers)

- at least annually, deliver to the Minister of Health a report setting out its activities and summarising its advice on the matters referred to it under section 16 of the Act by the Minister of Health
- provide timely and sound advice to the Minister of Health on the membership and operation of its Sub-Committee on Appeals, including advice on those member categories that cannot be filled from the National Ethics Advisory Committee's membership, and will therefore require a wider nominations process. The National Ethics Advisory Committee may make nominations as part of this wider process.

In undertaking its functions, the National Ethics Advisory Committee is expected to:

- provide advice on priority issues of national significance as requested by the Minister of Health
- provide advice to the Minister of Health regarding ethical issues concerning emerging areas of health research and innovative practice. The advice is to include the National Ethics Advisory Committee's rationale for its advice and any relevant evidence and/or documentation
- provide advice to the Minister of Health regarding aspects of ethical review in New Zealand, including the setting of principles and guidelines in relation to each of the different types of health research and innovative practice. The advice is to include the National Ethics Advisory Committee's rationale for its advice and any relevant evidence and/or documentation
- develop and promote national ethical guidelines for health research and health and disability support services (the guidelines should address how to conduct different types of health research [including ethical issues relating to Māori health research] and innovative practice in an ethical manner and should establish

parameters for, and provide guidance on, the ethical review of such types of health research and health and disability support services)

- monitor and review the operation of the health and disability ethics committees for the purposes of providing direction, guidance and leadership to ensure the ongoing quality and consistency of ethical review in the health and disability sector
- undertake its tasks in a manner consistent with the principles of the Treaty of Waitangi
- develop guidelines on conducting observational studies in an ethical manner and establish parameters for the ethical review of observational studies (including guidance regarding weighing up the harms and benefits of this type of research).

Composition of the Committee

The National Ethics Advisory Committee shall consist of not more than 12 members appointed by the Minister of Health ('the Minister'). The National Ethics Advisory Committee's membership shall include:

- two health professionals (one of whom must be a registered medical practitioner)
- two health researchers (one of whom should have knowledge and expertise of qualitative research and one of whom should have knowledge and expertise of quantitative research)
- one epidemiologist
- three other members (must not be a health professional or health researcher. One of whom must be a lawyer and one who must be an ethicist. Includes persons with a knowledge and understanding of the ethics of health

research and the provision of health care, and academic staff)

- three community/consumer representatives (must not be health professionals, health researchers or professional members)
- one member nominated by the Health Research Council of New Zealand.

At any time, the National Ethics Advisory Committee shall have at least two Māori members, one of whom shall be a person with Māori research/ethics background.

The Director-General of Health will appoint an advisor to the National Ethics Advisory Committee who will be responsible for providing advice regarding government policy and the mechanics of government.

Terms and conditions of appointment

Members of the National Ethics Advisory Committee are appointed by the Minister of Health for a term of office of up to three years. The terms of office of members of the National Ethics Advisory Committee will be staggered to ensure continuity of membership. No member may hold office for more than six consecutive years unless an additional period of up to 12 months is confirmed to allow for continuity of projects. Unless a person sooner vacates their office, every appointed member of the National Ethics Advisory Committee shall continue in office until their successor comes into office. Any member of the National Ethics Advisory Committee may at any time resign as a member by advising the Minister of Health in writing.

Any member of the National Ethics Advisory Committee may at any time be removed from office by the Minister of Health for inability to perform the functions of office, bankruptcy,

neglect of duty or misconduct, proved to the satisfaction of the Minister.

The Minister may from time to time alter or reconstitute the National Ethics Advisory Committee, or discharge any member of the National Ethics Advisory Committee or appoint new members to the National Ethics Advisory Committee for the purpose of decreasing or increasing the membership or filling any vacancies.

Chairperson

The Minister will from time to time appoint a member of the National Ethics Advisory Committee to be its Chairperson. The Chairperson will preside at every meeting of the National Ethics Advisory Committee at which they are present. The Chairperson may from time to time appoint a new member as Deputy-Chairperson.

Duties and responsibilities of a member

This section sets out the Minister of Health's expectations regarding the duties and responsibilities of a person appointed as a member of the National Ethics Advisory Committee. This is intended to aid members of the National Ethics Advisory Committee by providing them with a common set of principles for appropriate conduct and behaviour and serves to protect the National Ethics Advisory Committee and its members.

As an independent statutory body, the National Ethics Advisory Committee has an obligation to conduct its activities in an open and ethical manner. The National Ethics Advisory Committee has a duty to operate in an effective manner within the parameters of its functions as set out in its Terms of Reference.

General

1. National Ethics Advisory Committee members should have a commitment to work for the greater good of the committee.
2. There is an expectation that members will make every effort to attend all the National Ethics Advisory Committee meetings and devote sufficient time to become familiar with the affairs of the committee and the wider environment within which it operates.
3. Members have a duty to act responsibly with regard to the effective and efficient administration of the National Ethics Advisory Committee and the use of committee funds.
4. Members of the National Ethics Advisory Committee are not obliged to accept nomination to the Sub-Committee on Appeals.

Conflicts of interest

1. Members must perform their functions in good faith, honestly and impartially and avoid situations that might compromise their integrity or otherwise lead to conflicts of interest. Proper observation of these principles will protect the National Ethics Advisory Committee and its members and will ensure it retains public confidence.
2. Members attend meetings and undertake committee activities as independent persons responsible to the committee as a whole. Members are not appointed as representatives of professional organisations and groups. The National Ethics Advisory Committee should not, therefore, assume that a particular group's interests have been taken into account because a member is associated with a particular group.

3. When members believe they have a conflict of interest on a subject that will prevent them from reaching an impartial decision or undertaking an activity consistent with the committee's functions, they must declare that conflict of interest and withdraw themselves from the discussion and/or activity.
4. A member of the National Ethics Advisory Committee who has a proposal before the committee, or who has an involvement in a proposal, such as a supervisory role, shall not take part in the National Ethics Advisory Committee's assessment of that proposal. The member may be present to answer questions about a proposal but should be asked to leave the meeting while the remaining members consider the proposal. This will allow proposals to be considered in a free and frank manner.

Confidentiality

1. The public has a right to be informed about the issues being considered by the National Ethics Advisory Committee. The National Ethics Advisory Committee should have procedures in place regarding the release of information and processing requests for information.
2. Individual members must observe the following duties in relation to committee information. These provisions ensure that the National Ethics Advisory Committee as a whole maintains control over the appropriate release of information concerning applications or issues before it.
 - Meetings of the National Ethics Advisory Committee, including agenda material and draft minutes, are confidential. Members must ensure that the confidentiality of committee business is maintained.

- Members are free to express their own views within the context of committee meetings, or the general business of the National Ethics Advisory Committee.
- Members must publicly support a course of action decided by the National Ethics Advisory Committee. If unable to do so, members must not publicly comment on decisions.
- At no time should members individually divulge details of committee matters or decisions of the National Ethics Advisory Committee to persons who are not committee members. Disclosure of committee business to anyone outside the committee must be on the decision of the committee, or, between meetings, at the discretion of the Chairperson of the National Ethics Advisory Committee. In choosing to release or withhold information, the committee must comply with the provisions of the Official Information Act 1982 and the Privacy Act 1993.
- Committee members must ensure that committee documents are kept secure to ensure that the confidentiality of committee work is maintained. Release of committee correspondence or papers can only be made with the approval of the committee.

Working arrangements

The National Ethics Advisory Committee will agree a work programme with the Minister of Health. The National Ethics Advisory Committee will be serviced by permanent staff, sufficient to meet the Committee's statutory requirements, that will be based in the Ministry of Health.

In carrying out its terms of reference, the National Ethics Advisory Committee must:

- provide the Minister of Health with advance notice of any media statements or reports to be published
- ensure its advice is published and widely available
- ensure that, in developing any advice, guidelines or its views in relation to an appeal, an appropriate balance exists between protecting the rights and well-being of patients and research participants and facilitating health research and innovative practice
- ensure that, where appropriate, any advice or guidelines contain clear guidance regarding the application of ethical principles that is appropriate to the type of health research or innovative practice being considered (due regard should be given to the different nature of qualitative and quantitative approaches to research)
- ensure that any advice, guidelines and views in relation to an appeal, comply with the laws of New Zealand
- ensure appropriate consultation has occurred in accordance with the requirements set out below.

Consultation

Where appropriate, the National Ethics Advisory Committee must make reasonable attempts to consult with:

- health and disability ethics committees
- the National Ethics Advisory Committee on Assisted Human Reproduction
- the Health Research Council Ethics Committee
- any other ethics committee established by the Minister of Health

- organisations known to the committee to represent affected patients or other groups of the community
- relevant whānau, hapū and iwi
- a reasonably representative sample of affected patients or members of the public or (if the National Ethics Advisory Committee thinks it more appropriate) a reasonably representative sample of people who would be entitled to consent on behalf of the affected patients or members of the public
- a reasonably representative sample of affected health researchers and/or affected health professionals
- relevant government bodies.

Performance measures

The National Ethics Advisory Committee will be effectively meeting its tasks when it provides relevant and timely advice to the Minister of Health based in research, analysis and consultation with appropriate groups and organisations.

The National Ethics Advisory Committee must:

- agree in advance to a work programme with the Minister of Health
- achieve its agreed work programme
- stay within its allocated budget.

Meetings of the National Ethics Advisory Committee

Meetings shall be held at such times and places as the National Ethics Advisory Committee or the Chairperson of the National Ethics Advisory Committee decides.

At any meeting, a quorum shall consist of six members. A quorum must include either the Chairperson or Deputy-Chairperson. An endeavour will be made to ensure reasonable representation of community/consumer members and members with specialist knowledge and experience.

Every question before any meeting shall generally be determined by consensus decision-making. Where a consensus cannot be reached a majority vote will apply. Where a decision cannot be reached through consensus and a majority vote is made, the Chairperson shall have the casting vote.

Subject to the provisions set out above, the National Ethics Advisory Committee may regulate its own procedures.

Reporting requirements

The National Ethics Advisory Committee is required to:

- keep minutes of all committee meetings which outline the issues discussed and include a clear record of any decisions or recommendations made
- prepare an annual report to the Minister of Health setting out its activities and comparing its performance to its agreed work programme and summarising any advice that it has given to the Minister of Health. This report must also include details of the appeals heard by the Sub-Committee on Appeals. The report is to include the National Ethics Advisory Committee's rationale for its advice and any relevant evidence and/or documentation. This report will be tabled by the Minister of Health in the House of Representatives pursuant to section 16(7) of the Act.

Servicing of the National Ethics Advisory Committee

The Ministry of Health will employ staff to service the National Ethics Advisory Committee out of the Committee's allocated budget allocated and consistent with the Memorandum of Understanding between the National Ethics Advisory Committee and the Ministry of Health.

Fees and allowances

Members of the National Ethics Advisory Committee are entitled to be paid fees for attendance at meetings. The level of attendance fees are set in accordance with the State Services Commission's framework for fees for members of statutory bodies. The Chairperson will receive \$430 per day (plus half a day's preparation fee) and an allowance of two extra days per month to cover additional work undertaken by the Chairperson. The attendance fee for members is set at \$320 per day (plus half a day's preparation fee). The Ministry of Health pays for actual and reasonable travel and accommodation expenses of the National Ethics Advisory Committee members.

Sub-Committee on Appeals

The National Ethics Advisory Committee will convene a Sub-Committee on Appeals (the SCA).

Whereas the main statutory function of the National Ethics Advisory Committee is to advise the Minister of Health on ethical issues of national significance regarding health and disability, the function of its SCA is to review particular proposals at appeal.

The SCA will be responsible for hearing appeals from decisions of the following health and disability ethics committees:

- Regional Ethics Committees (RECs) established under section 11 of the New Zealand Public Health and Disability Act 2000
- the Multi-region Ethics Committee (MEC) established under section 11 of the New Zealand Public Health and Disability Act 2000.

Authority of the SCA

An appeal may only be lodged with the SCA by the principal researcher identified in the application in question. The SCA may not hear any appeal that is lodged by any third party.

The SCA may only hear appeals in cases where a second opinion from the Health Research Council Ethics Committee has been sought (by either the original ethics committee or the researcher) and received, and the matter reconsidered by the original ethics committee. All appeals will be from the decision made by the original committee following the second opinion.

All appeals heard by the SCA will be by way of re-hearing, focusing on specific alleged errors of judgement or reasoning in the original decision.

In hearing an appeal, the SCA will have discretionary power to re-hear any part of the evidence that is relevant to these specific alleged errors of judgement or reasoning. The SCA will also have the power to receive further evidence and to call individuals involved in the reconsidered decision to give evidence in person.

In hearing an appeal, the SCA will be bound by the presumption that the original decision was correct. The SCA will affirm the decision being appealed against where:

- i. the SCA is not satisfied that errors exist in the original decision
- ii. the SCA is satisfied of the existence of such errors but considers the errors to be of insufficient importance to warrant reversing the original decision.

The SCA will reverse the original decision only where it is satisfied that the original decision contained errors of judgement of a sufficiently serious nature to warrant the reversal.

The SCA will in all cases either affirm or reverse the original decision.

Consequential amendments to the *Operational Standard for Health and Disability Ethics Committees*

These Terms of Reference have precedence over the Operational Standard for Health and Disability Ethics Committees on any point of conflict. Otherwise, the Operational Standard applies to the SCA.

Approvals

The SCA must be approved for all purposes required for the application in question.

Role of the SCA

The primary role of the SCA will be to hear appeals from the decisions of the health and disability ethics committees named above.

The SCA will act so as to safeguard the rights, health and wellbeing of consumers and research participants and, in particular, those persons with diminished autonomy. In order to do this, the SCA shall:

- i. foster an awareness of ethical principles and practices in the health and disability sector and research community
- ii. facilitate excellence in health research and innovative practice for the well-being of society
- iii. collaborate with researchers to ensure the interests, rights, dignity, welfare, health and well-being of participants and consumers are protected
- iv. give due consideration to community views
- v. consistent with section 4 of the New Zealand Public Health and Disability Act 2000 and He Korowai Oranga, recognise and respect the principles of the Treaty of Waitangi
- vi. operate in accordance with the *Operational Standard for Health and Disability Ethics Committees*
- vii. operate in accordance with any guidelines issued or approved by the Director-General of Health.

Composition and membership

Guiding principle

The primary guiding principle for appointing members to the SCA is to ensure the most appropriate expertise, skills, knowledge and perspectives to hear appeals from the decisions of the MEC and the RECs.

Minister to appoint members

Members of the SCA will be appointed by the Minister of Health.

Member numbers

The number of members of the SCA shall be at least twelve, including a lay chairperson.

Lay/non-lay membership

At least one half of the total membership shall be lay members. A lay member is a person who is not:

- currently, nor has recently been, a registered health practitioner (for example, a doctor, nurse, midwife, dentist or pharmacist)
- involved in conducting health or disability research or who is employed by a health research agency and who is in a sector of that agency which undertakes health research; or
- construed by virtue of employment, profession or relationship to have a potential conflict or professional bias in a majority of protocols reviewed.

At any time, the SCA shall have one member who is a lawyer and one member with expertise in ethics (for example, a teacher of ethics, philosopher, theologian, or community-recognised person such as a Māori elder). In addition, it is important that the SCA's composition also includes individuals possessing a knowledge and understanding of consumer and community issues and perspectives.

The SCA's non-lay membership shall include two health researchers, two health practitioners, one biostatistician and one pharmacist or pharmacologist.

NEAC/non-NEAC membership

Members will in the first instance be drawn from the membership of NEAC. All members of the National Ethics Advisory Committee, with the exception of the Chair and any NEAC member who is also a member of a Regional Ethics Committee, the Multi-region Ethics Committee or the Health Research Council Ethics Committee, shall be eligible for appointment to the SCA.

Where further members are required to meet the requirements for approval under these terms of reference and the relevant legislation, these further members will be drawn from outside of NEAC.

Whole committee requirements

At any time, consistent with the requirements of the New Zealand Public Health and Disability Act's requirements for District Health Boards and with the requirements of the Operational Standard, the SCA shall have at least two Māori members, who should have an awareness of te reo Māori and an understanding of tikanga Māori. All members of the SCA are expected to have knowledge of the principles of partnership, participation and protection and their application to ethical review.

The SCA's membership should include expertise in the main kinds of health and disability research (eg, interventional, observational, kaupapa Māori and social research), and in both quantitative and qualitative research methods.

Members should possess an attitude that is accepting of the values of other professions and community perspectives, and it is important that the SCA be comprised of people from a range of backgrounds and ethnicities.

Terms and conditions of appointment

Members of the SCA who are also members of NEAC will be appointed to both committees by the Minister of Health for a term of office of up to three years. Other members will also be appointed to the SCA for a term of office of up to three years. The terms of office of members of the SCA will be staggered to ensure continuity of membership. No member may hold office for more than six consecutive years.

Unless a person sooner vacates their office, every appointed member of the SCA shall continue in office until their successor comes into office. Any member of the SCA may at any time resign as a member by advising the Minister of Health in writing.

A member of both NEAC and the SCA may resign from the SCA and remain on NEAC. A member of both NEAC and the SCA who resigns from NEAC shall require specific Ministerial approval to continue serving on the SCA.

Any member of the SCA may at any time be removed from office by the Minister of Health for inability to perform the functions of office, neglect of duty, bankruptcy or misconduct, proved to the satisfaction of the Minister.

Chairperson

The Chairperson of the SCA shall also be a member of the National Ethics Advisory Committee.

The Chairperson of the SCA shall be chosen by the Minister of Health. The Chairperson will preside at every meeting of the SCA at which they are present. The Chairperson may from time to time appoint a member as Deputy Chairperson to act in the place of the Chair when required.

Duties and responsibilities of a member

This section sets out the duties and responsibilities generally expected of a person appointed as a member of the SCA. This is intended to aid SCA members by providing them with a common set of principles for appropriate conduct and behaviour.

General

SCA members should have a commitment to protecting the interests of human participants while promoting and facilitating excellence in research and innovative practice.

There is an expectation that SCA members will make every effort to attend all SCA meetings and devote sufficient time to become familiar with the affairs of the SCA and the wider environment within which it operates.

Members have a duty to act responsibly with regard to the effective and efficient administration of the SCA and the use of SCA funds.

Conflicts of interest

SCA members should perform their functions in good faith, honestly and impartially and avoid situations that might compromise their integrity or otherwise lead to conflicts of interest. Proper observation of these principles will protect the SCA and its members and will ensure it retains public confidence.

SCA members attend meetings and undertake SCA activities as independent persons responsible to the SCA as a whole. Members are not appointed as representatives of professional organisations or particular community bodies. The SCA should not, therefore, assume that a particular

group's interests have been taken into account because a SCA member is associated with this group.

When SCA members believe they have a conflict of interest on a subject that will prevent them from reaching an impartial decision or from undertaking an activity consistent with the SCA's functions, they should declare that conflict of interest and withdraw themselves from the discussion and/or activity.

A member of the SCA who has any involvement in any proposal under appeal shall not take part in the SCA's assessment of that proposal. The member may be present to answer questions about a proposal but should take no part in the discussion surrounding the consideration of the proposal or any decision relating to the proposal. This will allow proposals to be considered in a free and frank manner. The SCA must exhibit transparency in avoiding or managing any real or perceived conflict of interest.

Confidentiality and information sharing

The SCA should assure all appellants that, subject to the Official Information Act 1982, the details of their appeals will be kept confidential.

It is desirable for the members of the SCA to have an opportunity to discuss issues arising from appeal with key contacts and support people prior to the consideration of proposals. This process should be encouraged. However, due to the need to protect any personal information and the commercial sensitivity of some applications, names, identifying details and written material should not be circulated or made known outside the SCA. The SCA will need to consider the Privacy Act 1993 and the Health Information Privacy Code 1994 in developing processes around information sharing.

Within the SCA, members with particular community expertise should be consulted and provide advice on the appropriate consultative process for all ethical issues concerning particular communities of interest.

Agendas and minutes, except for 'in committee' items, should be available to the public. Subject to the Official Information Act 1982, copies of proposals under appeal will not be available to individuals outside the SCA without the prior approval of the researcher.

Committee meetings

Meetings of the SCA shall be held whenever an appeal or other related business is before the committee. Meetings shall be called by the Chairperson of the SCA.

Meetings of the SCA shall be open to the public. However, the SCA may exclude non-members from being present while it considers a decision.

The minutes of all meetings shall be publicly available.

Appellants may attend meetings, in person or by teleconference, to be available to talk to their proposal and answer any questions the SCA may have. The SCA should advise appellants that they may be asked to leave the meeting while the SCA considers its decision on the appeal.

Subject to the provisions set out in this document, the SCA may regulate its own procedures.

Quorum

At any meeting, a quorum shall consist of at least six members or the minimum number constituting a majority. The quorum must include a reasonable representation of members with health professional, research, ethical and community/consumer expertise, knowledge and perspectives.

Decision-making process

Decisions

Where possible, decisions of the SCA shall be made by consensus. If consensus cannot be reached within a reasonable period of time, as defined by the Chair, a decision may be made by simple majority vote. In such cases, the Chair of the SCA shall hold a casting vote.

Members of the SCA should be free to participate fully in discussion and debate. In particular, the Chairperson should have skills in consensus decision-making and conflict resolution.

Issues of ethical review are often complex and can involve ethical dilemmas on which there is no consistent community view. Members of the SCA have a responsibility to identify underlying ethical principles.

In relation to appeals involving issues for Māori, it is important that Māori expertise be available to ensure that all issues are appropriately considered. Where it is not possible for Māori members to attend an SCA meeting or for those members' views to be sought and represented at the meeting, the matter should be deferred.

On occasion, individual members may wish to abstain from some or all of the decision-making process because of strong personal moral or religious reasons. Such abstentions shall not affect the appeal process.

Communication of decisions

All decisions of the SCA will be communicated to:

- i. the principal investigator of the application in question
- ii. the committee which made the original decision
- iii. other RECs/MEC
- iv. the National Ethics Advisory Committee
- v. the Health Research Council Ethics Committee
- vi. the Director-General of Health.

The reasoning behind the decision must be explained as clearly as possible.

Members will be expected to publicly support the decisions of the SCA.

Once the SCA has made and communicated its decision on the matter at appeal, the ethics committee that made the original decision will resume its full responsibilities in relation to the ethics committee application in question. The original committee will be bound by the decision of the SCA.

Expert advice and consultation

Where the Chairperson or a quorum of SCA members believes there is insufficient expertise on the SCA to assess an application or an issue, the committee should seek additional expert advice.

Training for members

Training should be provided for new members and chairpersons within six months of appointment to the SCA.

Records

Information held by the SCA is subject to the Privacy Act 1993, the Official Information Act 1982, and the Archives Act 1957.

Records may only be accessed with the permission of the Chairperson or the Director-General of Health. The secretariat of the SCA is responsible for maintaining and controlling access to the SCA's records.

Fees and allowances

Members of the SCA are entitled to be paid fees for attendance at meetings. The Chairperson's attendance fee is set at \$430 per day (plus half a day's preparation fee). The attendance fee for members is set at \$320 per day (plus half a day's preparation fee). The level of attendance fees are set in accordance with the State Services Commission's framework for fees for members of statutory bodies. The Ministry of Health pays actual and reasonable travel and accommodation expenses of the SCA members.

Servicing and administration of the SCA

The SCA will use the administrative resources of the National Ethics Advisory Committee.

The contact address for the SCA will be:

Sub-Committee on Appeals
National Ethics Advisory Committee
PO Box 5013
WELLINGTON

Email: appeals_neac@moh.govt.nz

