

SessionID	Datetime submitted	Name	Affiliation (if applicable)	SessionID
				Any public feedback and input provided will be considered for discussion during the workshop. No personally identifiable, proprietary, classified, confidential, or sensitive information should be included in your response.
RESPONSEID_73617803_a 4e5d8492bccd195- 14BA89AD-5056-9439- 7E7AE81D3C6E6657	32:04.2	Denise Hudson	(Submitter left answer blank)	Please discontinue the use of any primates for research. There are now perfectly sound cruelty free alternatives that do not use animals at all. Your continued pursuit of this practice puts you soundly and shamefully in the 20th century. If you must use animals use humans who are willing and often begin for experimental trials. Thank you.
RESPONSEID_73794489_1 708dbafb4e754ac- 5A09E8F2-5056-9439- 7E045F87375C347C	55:06.9	jim macke	(Submitter left answer blank)	
RESPONSEID_73776552_7 065c21bda796490- 541604BA-5056-9439- 7EE5B4DD1EE0A89C	08:41.8	Andrea Giolli	(Submitter left answer blank)	Please ensure the continued responsible oversight of research with non-human primates!!!
RESPONSEID_73770948_e 76dba49a6ce22d1- 51694007-5056-9439- 7ED0D8DAF8838DA4	54:19.7	tamara mcready	(Submitter left answer blank)	Please stop any and all research on non-human primates and stop any and all research on any and all animals period.
RESPONSEID_73765323_3 55063d56ea359f9- 4DD94B31-5056-9439- 7ED771A3CCA3D081	14:25.7	Lynn Barnes	(Submitter left answer blank)	(Submitter left answer blank)
RESPONSEID_73755781_8 8f952b37c8c50b7- 48BD5A43-5056-9439- 7E86B9BD7024B828	52:17.9	Noel MacLeod	(Submitter left answer blank)	When will this world come together for the greater good for our creatures!

RESPONSEID_73749939_f 36fbbc395574028- 45062CAD-5056-9439- 7E6947957116F498	09:08.3	Lauren coale	(Submitter left answer blank)	Please end the use of primates for science. They are our closest relatives with true emotions and feel pain. Please let all of these animals live out their life free of pain and emotional strife. They deserve to be in a sanctuary to live out their remaining years.
RESPONSEID_73749075_b d1dacd226dd3701- 4487B998-5056-9439- 7E948820EE5BE3DD	54:03.6	Lisa Kamins	(Submitter left answer blank)	Please halt the usage of primates in experimentation.
RESPONSEID_73741710_c 058fe91cd4b5f6e- 40EEFF89-5056-9439- 7E6605A9A37BDCBF	12:50.1	Jon Krueger	(Submitter left answer blank)	Please stop using primates.
RESPONSEID_73740763_5 cafbcfdbf0db6ca- 40894FA2-5056-9439- 7E8536C732575368	02:28.2	Evina konstantinova	(Submitter left answer blank)	251
RESPONSEID_73740014_9 f7098b56379962- 403B99B1-5056-9439- 7EDB7924B62284A1	57:18.5	Charles Alexander	(Submitter left answer blank)	I worked with large animals for almost 10 years after college and from my personal observation, reflection and discussions with others (vets, farmers, ect.) I am convinced animals have a higher degree of feeling and understanding than most credit them with.
RESPONSEID_73739061_d d62a16f20694d50- 3FE984D6-5056-9439- 7E2C5C590BF1AE91	45:12.3	Megan Rhoads	(Submitter left answer blank)	Thank you for presenting a clear case as to why we desparately need NHP focused research today. The NIH should support more public advocacy efforts about this topic and fund more NHP translational research.

RESPONSEID_73736792_5 f00afe6669231bd- 3FOACB5E-5056-9439- 7ECC91599349438D	21:13.1	Raeann Scott	<i>(Submitter left answer blank)</i>	<p>I appreciate that NIH is conducting a workshop on responsible oversight of non-human primate research, but am concerned that the draft agenda does not appear to include how non-animal alternatives can replace primate use, nor address the need for better monitoring and defining of primate psychological well-being. The scientific efficacy of non-animal alternatives has been demonstrated in varied and multiple areas of research in which primates are used. The draft agenda, however, does not position such new technologies and areas of research for discussion. Additionally, there is no mention of stress effects on primates, from a welfare or research perspective. NEAVS submitted a Petition for Rulemaking in an effort to require that the USDA measurably define psychological well-being in primates. Though given some consideration in the AWA, the matter is largely treated as an afterthought by the USDA and—given its glaring absence on this agenda—also by the NIH. I understand this agenda is a draft, and hope the final version acknowledges the areas of concern highlighted here. If not, the workshop promises to be only an opportunity for those vested in primate use to continue their own agenda. NIH is mandated to look at emerging science and respect the public’s growing opposition to animal use. I trust NIH will remember the outcome of the IOM’s Chimpanzees in Biomedical and Behavioral Research: Assessing the Necessity, which, with data-backed science and rightful infusions of ethics, formed a cornerstone in the long overdue ending of chimpanzee use in the U.S.”</p>
--	---------	--------------	--	---

RESPONSEID_73688377_a e15c6ff71391693-31DA2B80-5056-9439-7E7652C1072EFE5A	07:14.3	Cathy Liss	Animal Welfare Institute	1) How might you maximize teaching animals to cooperate. and other practices that can reduce animal suffering and improve the science, but aren't mandated? 2) What about addressing use of wild-caught versus purpose-bred primates? Or whether it is justifiable for both ethical and scientific reasons to use primates who are self-mutilating and/or exhibiting stereotypic behaviors? 3) How do panelists feel about adding a second public member to the IACUC? 4) Are there some examples of research in primates that members of the panel can agree may well be unacceptable for ethical reasons?
RESPONSEID_73730017_1 fe5a226b63fb693-3C98DA90-5056-9439-7E531C562C499F2D	46:46.2	Lily Mejia	(Submitter left answer blank)	It is harmful, dangerous hypocrisy to regard any animal as being inferior beings while concurrently conducting experiments on them for our benefit.
RESPONSEID_73730510_9 8dcf4cc5705b52e-3CC0D07C-5056-9439-7EB6DA3568334E79	35:27.1	Doreen Rasanen	(Submitter left answer blank)	I DON'T BELIEVE IN USING ANIMALS OR PRIMATES FOR MEDICAL RESEARCH . WE HAVE AND KNOW ENOUGH NOW, IT'S TIME TO SET THEM ALL FREE NOW. MORE OFTEN THAN NOT, HUMANS, ANIMALS AND PRIMATES GET SICK FROM THEIR ENVIRONMENT AND WHAT THEY EAT AND DRINK. THERE ARE FAR TOO MANY TOXIC CHEMICALS AROUND AND UNHEALTHY FOODS, AND FAR TOO MANY HUMANS ON THIS PLANET THAT'S CAUSING PROBLEMS. IF WE LIVED PROPERLY PEOPLE WOULDN'T GE SICKLY. SET ALL THE ANIMALS AND PRIMATES FREE TO GOOD SANCTUARIES.
RESPONSEID_73732143_9 a06e59ca2cde85f-3D57C09C-5056-9439-7E9708B0780C660E	34:34.1	serge vantalon	(Submitter left answer blank)	please i am respectfully asking you to do your best to end the suffering of primates in laboratories ! i thank you for your attention

RESPONSEID_73730500_8 e29bde8f8bf9d2e- 3CBFFC9A-5056-9439- 7EA6BF12A4679764	18:02.0	Benita Crow	<i>(Submitter left answer blank)</i>	<p>We appreciate that NIH is conducting a workshop on responsible oversight of non-human primate research, but are concerned that the draft agenda does not appear to include how non-animal alternatives can replace primate use, nor address the need for better monitoring and defining of primate psychological well-being. The scientific efficacy of non-animal alternatives has been demonstrated in varied and multiple areas of research in which primates are used. The draft agenda, however, does not position such new technologies and areas of research for discussion. Additionally, we see no mention of stress effects on primates, from a welfare or research perspective. NEAVS submitted a Petition for Rulemaking in an effort to require that the USDA measurably define psychological well-being in primates. Though given some consideration in the AWA, the matter is largely treated as an afterthought by the USDA and—given its glaring absence on this agenda—also by the NIH. We understand this agenda is a draft, and hope the final version acknowledges the areas of concern highlighted here. If not, the workshop promises to be only an opportunity for those vested in primate use to continue their own agenda. NIH is mandated to look at emerging science and respect the public’s growing opposition to animal use. We trust NIH will remember the outcome of the IOM’s Chimpanzees in Biomedical and Behavioral Research: Assessing the Necessity, which, with data-backed science and rightful infusions of ethics, formed a cornerstone in the long overdue ending of chimpanzee use in the U.S.</p>
RESPONSEID_73729650_e 22f7702ec8372d7- 3C7C9B7B-5056-9439- 7EF715447D6E0487	11:44.8	jennifer valentine	<i>(Submitter left answer blank)</i>	use alternatives to animal testing

RESPONSEID_73728207_9 ce023558e462c1e-3C06DD03-5056-9439-7EBE2B66084D515D	57:07.6	Marie Gil	(Submitter left answer blank)	There is no need for animal testing, there are alternative methods. There are plenty of humans who would do it for pay or prisoners who could do it for a lesser sentence all good ideas!
RESPONSEID_73724379_2 40f61c04ca568ed-3ACB44D4-5056-9439-7EE43A14D1272C73	25:17.9	J Mark Cline	Wake Forest School of Medicine	<p>1 NHP use is classically justified by anatomic and pathophysiologic similarities in specific key organ systems (brain, female reproductive system, immune responses/AIDS). 2 Genomic/transcriptomic/proteomic similarities are high for macaques (e.g. 95% plus for RNA targets of interest in my lab). This reflects the high translatability of NHP studies. 3 FDA Animal Rule: For targeted drugs or mitigators that have specific receptor targets (e.g. growth factors, therapeutic antibodies), NHP use may be the best or only path for FDA approval of drugs for human use. In vitro and rodent studies can miss human toxicity and efficacy by orders of magnitude. 4 Spontaneous disease investigation in NHP is an under-utilized strategy. For example breast and cervical cancer occur naturally in macaques, and we are now studying novel targeted anti-cancer immunotherapies for which a precise antigenic fit is required (drugs that only work in human/NHP). We are "adopting" monkeys with spontaneous cancers, which would otherwise be euthanized, but can be treated with cutting-edge approaches with minimal toxicity. 5 There is not nearly enough attention paid to unexpected diseases and comorbidities in NHP. Many studies focus is on a single organ system and other diseases are considered distractors. I recommend greater awareness of whole-animal health, which requires the involvement of veterinary clinician-scientists--a rare phenotype. In that regard, every NHP should get a complete post-mortem examination to maximize the information gained from these valuable animals.</p>

<p>RESPONSEID_73723892_2 8578edfd9b890de-3AA723DD-5056-9439-7E6ACA43EED23E92</p>	<p>21:37.0</p>	<p>Nicole Loh</p>	<p><i>(Submitter left answer blank)</i></p>	<p>I was disappointed to learn that the current draft agenda for the upcoming NIH workshop on primate experiments appears to reinforce the status quo. As you know, members of Congress asked NIH to carry out an ethical review of experiments on primates after PETA exposed a series of cruel maternal deprivation and psychopathology experiments on infant monkeys--which the agency had conducted for more than 30 years. It is abundantly clear that current oversight protocols are not sufficient to protect nonhuman primates in laboratories. I believe that the criteria defined by the Institute of Medicine (IOM) as new oversight measures for experiments on chimpanzees would be a good starting point for a discussion about the ethics of experiments on other nonhuman primates--and I ask that the agenda for the September 7 meeting be revised to focus on ways to apply the IOM criteria to all nonhuman primates. The workshop should help ensure that rules governing the use of primates in experimentation are updated to reflect the current science on animal welfare, research translation, and non-animal methods.</p>
<p>RESPONSEID_73718833_f 1286bfb898bd445-39A75B84-5056-9439-7EFE9A58035613F3</p>	<p>59:26.1</p>	<p>Diane Vandiver</p>	<p><i>(Submitter left answer blank)</i></p>	<p>Research that is conducted by the NIH cannot be handled "responsibly" as you "move forward in advancing (y)our mission to seek fundamental knowledge and enhance health outcomes." The torture, outmoded experiments, confinements, deliberate painful applications, and more serve only to continue an outdated system of chronic, repetitive, and non-productive practices which, after decades, have not been applicable to humans, or are in any way justifiable. After seeing video of these "experiments", I am convinced that the researchers have bigger issues that access to helpless non-human primates allows their perversions to continue unabated.</p>

RESPONSEID_73694833_9 415378d2563114a-342BB3AB-5056-9439-7E317BC4FAF7D51E	37:40.8	Barbara J. King, PhD	College of William and Mary, Department of Anthropology (professor emerita)	Peer-reviewed publications show that animal-research oversight committees as currently constituted are highly skewed towards animal researchers and institutional veterinarians who have vested interests in continuing animal research. Given this situation, citing protective guidelines for subject animals as entirely adequate ethically misses the high probability of within-institution approval bias. Can this be discussed please?
RESPONSEID_73714662_1 4b7ed80dcd63a9e-38F6D650-5056-9439-7EB1C4866118919A	34:54.9	Sharon	(Submitter left answer blank)	We should admit that the infliction of suffering on beings who are capable of feeling is ethically problematic and that the amazing human brain should set to work to find new ways of testing and experimenting that will not involve the use of live, sentient beings." Dr. Jane Goodall. Stop this madness.
RESPONSEID_73682912_b 035c379828e855d-2FBCC129-5056-9439-7EB1DE1FBD8620E6	16:34.9	Sarah Oakes	Medical University of South Carolina	Suggestion to address Dr. Claire's point that communicating the successes of animal research to the public is a critical failure: what about a television show that would focus on this issue? Shows like House or Extreme Makeover: Home Edition focus on the health issues or plight of an individual or family and the improvements made to better the situation. Add a great narrator in the format of Cosmos with Neil deGrasse Tyson and you have a STEM show that is both engaging and entertaining with history, mystery and discovery. Focus might include science or engineering that benefit animals and humans as well. Talk about the negative results as well as the successes. Tell a story based on the latest scientific discoveries with cool graphics like in House and interviews like in Extreme Makeover. The narrator can create a buffer zone between animal rights activists and the researchers providing the necessary details without identifying information. These types of shows exists in limited form on NOVA and Science History shows.

RESPONSEID_73712358_4 e6565ceac9cb0a6-3870E791-5056-9439-7EE102B32D716EFB	16:00.0	LeAnn Bukacek	(Submitter left answer blank)	.
RESPONSEID_73710910_5 8c5c7e7c6223fd5-3809181D-5056-9439-7E5FC04EE541BC52	06:43.7	Barbara Hegedus	(Submitter left answer blank)	THERE IS NO JUSTIFICATION FOR THE SUFFERING INFLICTED ON NON-HUMAN PRIMATES IN LABS - NONE! THESE ANIMALS, LIKE CHIMPS, ARE NOT HUMAN, SO HOW DEPENDABLE IS ANY EXPERIMENT YOU FORCE ON THEM, INCLUDING THE HORROR OF BEING REMOVED AS INFANTS FROM THEIR SCREAMING MOTHERS???. DO ANY OF YOU PEOPLE IN LABS HAVE A CONSCIENCE OR COMPASSION???
RESPONSEID_73702166_9 2cc37564cc49d8e-36C664E6-5056-9439-7E0A34630486CD94	47:24.0	Mark Prescott	NC3Rs	Will NIH be taking into account how major public funders of NHP research in other countries address the issues? For example, those in another scientific 'superpower', the UK. The Medical Research Council and Wellcome Trust have worked with the UK's national centre for the 3Rs to develop procedures and initiatives that support excellent science using NHPs AND effective implementation of the 3Rs (and the advancement of both), helping to assure public confidence. Isn't this what Congress and NIH wants? I hope there will be more focused discussion of NIH policies and procedures in this area; the talks and discussion are interesting, but it's not at all clear how the workshop format will help to advance primate welfare and scientific discovery in the USA. Happy to share information on our experiences and initiatives offline - from peer review procedures, targeted research funding calls, and retrospective evaluation of funded research, to pre-competitive data sharing (to provide an evidence base for change), training resources and scientific networks.

<p>RESPONSEID_73702826_b 77940aabe497714- 36FF7C01-5056-9439- 7E22EA8ACCA6A52B</p>	<p>41:20.9</p>	<p>Jacqui Skill</p>	<p>concerned for vulnerable life being exploited by the cruel human species</p>	<p>“We appreciate that NIH is conducting a workshop on responsible oversight of non-human primate research, but are concerned that the draft agenda does not appear to include how non-animal alternatives can replace primate use, nor address the need for better monitoring and defining of primate psychological well-being. The scientific efficacy of non-animal alternatives has been demonstrated in varied and multiple areas of research in which primates are used. The draft agenda, however, does not position such new technologies and areas of research for discussion. Additionally, we see no mention of stress effects on primates, from a welfare or research perspective. NEAVS submitted a Petition for Rulemaking in an effort to require that the USDA measurably define psychological well-being in primates. Though given some consideration in the AWA, the matter is largely treated as an afterthought by the USDA and—given its glaring absence on this agenda—also by the NIH. We understand this agenda is a draft, and hope the final version acknowledges the areas of concern highlighted here. If not, the workshop promises to be only an opportunity for those vested in primate use to continue their own agenda. NIH is mandated to look at emerging science and respect the public’s growing opposition to animal use. We trust NIH will remember the outcome of the IOM’s Chimpanzees in Biomedical and Behavioral Research: Assessing the Necessity, which, with data-backed science and rightful infusions of ethics, formed a cornerstone in the long overdue ending of chimpanzee use in the U.S.”</p>
--	----------------	---------------------	---	--

RESPONSEID_73701591_7 e9b9b3c96e592d7-369A23E1-5056-9439-7EB4611D2FF9FE1B	38:01.8	Jeremy Borjon	Princeton University	We scientists, especially those working with primates, have failed the public in openly communicating how primate research is conducted and why. We allow extreme anti-experimentation groups to steer the public conversation, and are losing a window to inform and educate the public at large. As a graduate student conducting primate research, I fully believe the NIH and Universities receiving NIH funding need to make a concerted effort to aggressively educate the public about the merits of animal research, especially primate research. If we fail to educate the public, we will ultimately experience cuts in funding (particularly to basic science, which may be a few steps away from translational applicability).
RESPONSEID_73701808_9 e84db9a76faccdc-36AC741A-5056-9439-7EBEEF1A922B5C93	29:49.0	Michele A Basso	UCLA	I am listening to the discussion and I am struck by Kahn's comments, as it appears that a discussion of how science works may be relevant. One of the points that Peter Strick made so eloquently is that we cannot know a priori how what we learn is going to benefit humans. This was the case for Mahlon DeLong's experiments, it was the case for Hubel and Wiesel's experiments in the 60s and 70s that impacted how ophthalmologists treat kids with strabismus. There are many examples of this. What we stand to lose is this, and sadly we won't actually know in advance.
RESPONSEID_73700328_d 354dabbd5099a14-3630845C-5056-9439-7E058F13BEAE4B89	29:28.0	Jeffrey Roberts	Associate Director CNPRC	The discussion this morning was an outstanding overview of the importance of nonhuman primate research. I think a critical statement is the danger in dividing basic and applied research. We tend to focus almost exclusively on translational research. It is important to remember that decades of basic neuroscience research have brought us to the point where we can give disabled human patients more control over their mobility and environment.

RESPONSEID_73688401_a 7e9498f227ace3a-31DD3F6D-5056-9439-7E3D7B83033B5904	25:39.1	Peggy Cunniff	National Anti-Vivisection Society	Clarification: Is this panel concluding that any possible or potential benefit for humans justifies the use of nonhuman primates if there is no other model available?
RESPONSEID_73687090_6 d0ea867d880ce6-31649510-5056-9439-7E997C6A1DC52601	22:15.4	Kathleen Conlee	The Humane Society of the United States	There is an inherent problem in expecting people to publicly state what they are failing to do properly, particularly in front of their main funder. Would participants support an independent examination as Jeff Kahn has suggested? If not, why not?
RESPONSEID_73700665_7 f2881ae4f15d72-36498F52-5056-9439-7E1E81EF3CEA8902	15:03.2	Alka Chandna	People for the Ethical Treatment of Animals	According to a survey authored by Taylor Bennett and published earlier this year, 10,572 primates are singly housed in US laboratories (with zero opportunity for tactile contact with conspecifics) and an additional 3,384 primates are housed alone with opportunities for "protected contact." These data were gleaned from self-reports and many laboratories—including those at NIH—will report that primates are not singly housed when the primates are in one room, but in separate cages. There is overwhelming evidence that singly housing primates adversely affects their physiological and psychological well-being. Rather than spending hours talking up the "importance" of using primates and discussing how this might be more effectively communicated to the public, it seems that some time could be spent discussing strategies for successful cohousing of primates.
RESPONSEID_73632821_f 351fc70476b3952-1C9185DE-5056-9439-7EEA3E5773B973CD	10:21.4	Dario Ringach	UCLA	One of the criteria that came out of the IoM panel was "that the knowledge gained must be necessary to advance the public's health." Can Dr. Kahn explain how a scientists can prove, with certainty, that any proposed studies are absolutely necessary? Wouldn't the application of such criteria rule out all basic research and prevent the development of the advances described in the workshop so far?

RESPONSEID_73697483_4 c01d240beef2606- 352B2F40-5056-9439- 7ED01D42DEA037D8	47:46.4	Lauren	(Submitter left answer blank)	What about a organisation such as the NC3Rs in the US? Could an organisation such as this be of use to US primate research and if so, how do we promote it's creation and interaction with NIH primate research? What role could it play? Such a framework seems like it could improve the quality of science produced.
--	---------	--------	---------------------------------	---

RESPONSEID_73685979_a 834adf6638d02b6- 30F868E8-5056-9439- 7EE00C2DC4E90A11	56:47.3	Adam Shriver	University of Pennsylvania	Question for Professor Platt: given what we know about the importance of social connections and complex social interactions for monkeys, what do you think about the common practice of using single housing on primates? What types of welfare concerns does single housing create?
--	---------	--------------	----------------------------	--

RESPONSEID_73697063_a 3014e5da034799e- 3502A658-5056-9439- 7E220D5F19E41BE7	39:54.6	Lozz Starseed	(Submitter left answer blank)	We have witnessed an end to the use of chimpanzees in research – our closest genetic relative. With your support, NEAVS will continue to work tirelessly to end the use of all non-human primates in unnecessary, inhumane and unscientific research and testing.
RESPONSEID_73696833_c b5f278d4bbc0caf- 34ED5794-5056-9439- 7E082165FFE8B93A	38:13.0	Gail Roberts	(Submitter left answer blank)	A country can be judged by the way it treats it's animals.
RESPONSEID_73696605_9 5d50d4668f2a201- 34D5F878-5056-9439- 7E205FDA0BF747C1	35:40.3	Jayne Goldman	(Submitter left answer blank)	We have the responsibility to ensure no suffering for all animals.
RESPONSEID_73695076_c bc18e99c081afce- 34427A58-5056-9439- 7E675A7B8B3DBC0E	28:41.4	Peggy Cunniff	National Anti-Vivisection Society	Given the Congressional directive re the purpose of this workshop, why would the ETHICAL concerns for NHPs differ from human research subjects when they share cognition, emotion and memory? What has been the COST of the research "successes" highlighted in this morning's presentations?
RESPONSEID_73556143_b 55f7269ff96cc07- 01032660-5056-9439- 7E2D84D27E41692E	22:51.1	Kathy Guillermo, Senior VP, PETA	People for the Ethical Treatment of Animals	Where, on the speaking schedule, are the bioethicists and animal welfare community representatives that Congress mandated? This is a room full of animal experimenters talking about how important they think their own work is.
RESPONSEID_73695030_1 0c32387c7796bc4- 344048D4-5056-9439- 7EBF10352371C6B7	22:44.1	Lucia nuñez	(Submitter left answer blank)	Stop hurting animals
RESPONSEID_73693222_d bc5a62fa623992d- 339C7A8B-5056-9439- 7EC9D84D2976BB8D	01:49.5	Pamela Raup- Kounovsky	(Submitter left answer blank)	They are sentient beings. To use them is as unethical as using children.

<p>RESPONSEID_73692961_4 3792d683743cb79- 33830D47-5056-9439- 7EC414278320848A</p>	<p>57:30.3</p>	<p>Sandra Materi</p>	<p>(<i>Submitter left answer blank</i>)</p>	<p>We appreciate that NIH is conducting a workshop on responsible oversight of non-human primate research, but are concerned that the draft agenda does not appear to include how non-animal alternatives can replace primate use, nor address the need for better monitoring and defining of primate psychological well-being. The scientific efficacy of non-animal alternatives has been demonstrated in varied and multiple areas of research in which primates are used. The draft agenda, however, does not position such new technologies and areas of research for discussion. Additionally, we see no mention of stress effects on primates, from a welfare or research perspective. NEAVS submitted a Petition for Rulemaking in an effort to require that the USDA measurably define psychological well-being in primates. Though given some consideration in the AWA, the matter is largely treated as an afterthought by the USDA and—given its glaring absence on this agenda—also by the NIH. We understand this agenda is a draft, and hope the final version acknowledges the areas of concern highlighted here. If not, the workshop promises to be only an opportunity for those vested in primate use to continue their own agenda. NIH is mandated to look at emerging science and respect the public’s growing opposition to animal use. We trust NIH will remember the outcome of the IOM’s Chimpanzees in Biomedical and Behavioral Research: Assessing the Necessity, which, with data-backed science and rightful infusions of ethics, formed a cornerstone in the long overdue ending of chimpanzee use in the U.S.”</p>
--	----------------	----------------------	---	---

RESPONSEID_73623105_a 1ded6194cf80b2e- 17438B4C-5056-9439- 7E8FC496E2841	56:29.9	Sue Leary	Alternatives Research & Development Foundation	The Session 1 presentations are not covering any reference to the welfare experiences of the nonhuman primates in the studies. Considering the intent of this workshop, that is highly relevant. So, we're hearing 'benefit' and not 'cost'. In preparation for Session 2, could each of the presenters take some time in the discussion period to present 'supplemental material' on the experiments in that regard? For example, the processes that suppressed immune systems and the effects on the monkeys and welfare problems encountered.
RESPONSEID_73692382_1 5f4c20cf7ba1a0d- 33538120-5056-9439- 7E74322B0F4C9FBA	54:22.9	Kathryn Nathan	(Submitter left answer blank)	I urge the NIH office of Science Policy to stop using any and all non-human primates and other sentient beings (animals) in biomedical research. We must find alternative methods that do not involve keeping animals captive and subjecting them to physically or psychologically cruel and inhumane conditions. Thank you.
RESPONSEID_73692201_c b54abe13118396d- 3341990A-5056-9439- 7E850D5D8070C949	51:03.2	Sue Chard	(Submitter left answer blank)	"We appreciate that NIH is conducting a workshop on responsible oversight of non-human primate research but are concerned that the draft agenda does not appear to include how non-animal alternatives can replace primate use, nor address the need for better monitoring and defining of primate psychological well-being. The scientific efficacy of non-animal alternatives has been demonstrated in varied and multiple areas of research in which primates are used. The draft agenda, however, does not position such new technologies and areas of research for discussion. Additionally, we see no mention of stress effects on primates, from a welfare or research perspective
RESPONSEID_73690583_e 411cead83cfeed4- 32B0801D-5056-9439- 7EDB80136A68C6F7	35:40.8	LOIS HAMILTON	(Submitter left answer blank)	Do the right thing. For once in your lives.

RESPONSEID_73689024_3 393db2eb62ab865- 321C1756-5056-9439- 7E088A3A02233D1D	20:24.3	Dameta Robinson	<i>(Submitter left answer blank)</i>	I appreciate that NIH is conducting a workshop on responsible oversight of non-human primate research, but I'm concerned that the draft agenda does not appear to include how non-animal alternatives can replace primate use, nor address the need for better monitoring and defining of primate psychological well-being. The scientific efficacy of non-animal alternatives has been demonstrated in varied and multiple areas of research in which primates are used. The draft agenda, however, does not position such new technologies and areas of research for discussion. Additionally, I see no mention of stress effects on primates, from a welfare or research perspective. Thank you.
RESPONSEID_73687509_8 6925ed729451a16- 318E2D7D-5056-9439- 7E4BF0E0B3CEA4C4	05:27.5	Carola Tschiemer	<i>(Submitter left answer blank)</i>	It is time to release all non human primates to sanctuaries and end the needless suffering and torture! Carola and Bob Tschiemer

RESPONSEID_73684137_5 1a7b106db0d042a- 304A6B5F-5056-9439- 7E84540A5D1A0FBB	31:07.7	Jim Conroy	<i>(Submitter left answer blank)</i>	<p>I am concerned that the draft agenda does not appear to include how non-animal alternatives can replace primate use, nor address the need for better monitoring and defining of primate psychological well-being. The scientific efficacy of non-animal alternatives has been demonstrated in varied and multiple areas of research in which primates are used. The draft agenda, however, does not position such new technologies and areas of research for discussion. I see no mention of stress effects on primates, from a welfare or research perspective. NEAVS submitted a Petition for Rulemaking in an effort to require that the USDA measurably define psychological well-being in primates. Though given some consideration in the AWA, the matter is largely treated as an afterthought by the USDA and—given its glaring absence on this agenda—also by the NIH. I understand this agenda is a draft, and hope the final version acknowledges the areas of concern highlighted here. If not, the workshop promises to be only an opportunity for those vested in primate use to continue their own agenda. NIH is mandated to look at emerging science and respect the public’s growing opposition to animal use. I hope NIH will remember the outcome of the IOM’s Chimpanzees in Biomedical and Behavioral Research: Assessing the Necessity, which, with data-backed science and rightful infusions of ethics, formed a cornerstone in the long overdue ending of chimpanzee use in the U.S. Do the right thing. Quit hiding behind politics!</p>
--	---------	------------	--	--

RESPONSEID_73669326_5 bc8fe9f6a19a98d- 2BAD5002-5056-9439- 7E86F29E98642A7B	14:35.0	Chantal Buslot	(Submitter left answer blank)	I was disappointed to learn that the current draft agenda for the upcoming NIH workshop on primate experiments appears to reinforce the status quo. As you know, members of Congress asked NIH to carry out an ethical review of experiments on primates after PETA exposed a series of cruel maternal deprivation and psychopathology experiments on infant monkeys--which the agency had conducted for more than 30 years. It is abundantly clear that current oversight protocols are not sufficient to protect nonhuman primates in laboratories. I believe that the criteria defined by the Institute of Medicine (IOM) as new oversight measures for experiments on chimpanzees would be a good starting point for a discussion about the ethics of experiments on other nonhuman primates--and I ask that the agenda for the September 7 meeting be revised to focus on ways to apply the IOM criteria to all nonhuman primates. The workshop should help ensure that rules governing the use of primates in experimentation are updated to reflect the current science on animal welfare, research translation, and non-animal methods.
RESPONSEID_73679996_1 540a52ac0fae706- 2E719C72-5056-9439- 7ED21602478D560A	06:37.6	Karen Furniss	(Submitter left answer blank)	Stop testing on innocent beings! "The greatness of a nation and its moral progress can be judged by the way its animals are treated... I hold that, the more helpless a creature, the more entitled it is to protection by man from the cruelty of man" MAHATMA GHANDI
RESPONSEID_73682347_4 9d97741a7d77aec- 2F72D68F-5056-9439- 7E015793F9964428	03:58.3	Rebecca Marshall	(Submitter left answer blank)	end the use of all non-human primates in unnecessary, inhumane and unscientific research and testing.
RESPONSEID_73681975_a 5e89d7bda155de7- 2F4CD650-5056-9439- 7E6DFB37193AF03A	03:08.1	C. Mead	(Submitter left answer blank)	Be kind to animals. Do no harm. I wish we could keep animals out of experiments. We need the strictest laws possible to protect non-human primates.

RESPONSEID_73680701_f 7be0817d4048a8b- 2EB87BC9-5056-9439- 7EDD476262ECD3A9	51:48.5	Nancy Roeber	(Submitter left answer blank)	Scientists have been saying for years that non-human experiments do not equate to human effectiveness. Why does animal testing continue? It's a waste of time and resources.
RESPONSEID_73681223_e c8eaa357d5446e5- 2EF0F975-5056-9439- 7EEE407DA856784C	48:58.8	Vicky lafrati	(Submitter left answer blank)	There is no such thing as responsible research on animals! If it is so responsible , use humans!
RESPONSEID_73680777_2 d6ea43f2f73f80d- 2EC08557-5056-9439- 7E7AFD9C425FAFD2	46:25.1	charlie burns	(Submitter left answer blank)	Treat animals right

<p>RESPONSEID_73680226_1 4f419978268ac40- 2E841B22-5056-9439- 7E7EEOCE11E0C643</p>	<p>40:13.7</p>	<p>Christine U</p>	<p><i>(Submitter left answer blank)</i></p>	<p>“It is appreciated that NIH is conducting a workshop on responsible oversight of non-human primate research, but are concerned that the draft agenda does not appear to include how non-animal alternatives can replace primate use, nor address the need for better monitoring and defining of primate psychological well-being. The scientific efficacy of non-animal alternatives has been demonstrated in varied and multiple areas of research in which primates are used. The draft agenda, however, does not position such new technologies and areas of research for discussion. Additionally, we see no mention of stress effects on primates, from a welfare or research perspective. NEAVS submitted a Petition for Rulemaking in an effort to require that the USDA measurably define psychological well-being in primates. Though given some consideration in the AWA, the matter is largely treated as an afterthought by the USDA and—given its glaring absence on this agenda—also by the NIH. We understand this agenda is a draft, and hope the final version acknowledges the areas of concern highlighted here. If not, the workshop promises to be only an opportunity for those vested in primate use to continue their own agenda. NIH is mandated to look at emerging science and respect the public’s growing opposition to animal use. We trust NIH will remember the outcome of the IOM’s Chimpanzees in Biomedical and Behavioral Research: Assessing the Necessity, which, with data-backed science and rightful infusions of ethics, formed a cornerstone in the long overdue ending of chimpanzee use in the U.S.”</p>
--	----------------	--------------------	---	--

RESPONSEID_73678275_f 5688892c0338545- 2DA4791E-5056-9439- 7E3164C812113317	29:50.4	Rosemarie Caruso	(Submitter left answer blank)	Primates are close to us as humans with the mentality of children, it is like torturing a child or mentally challenged person. If they could speak they would be pleading for mercy-begging for freedom. Imagine this, imagine them begging, pleading and crying for freedom from pain, freedom to roam, freedom to have a normal life-close your eyes and give them a voice in your head. Can you allow this now- can you leave them to this fate. Just because they cannot communicate our way-with words, we ignore their plight. How can we as thinking, feeling creatures ignore the fact that we are torturing other thinking, feeling creatures when we all know there are alternative ways and many of these experiments are unnecessary. It is mostly greed and the unwillingness to upset the apple cart that keeps these programs going. I am ashamed of the human race. We see terrible thing done to animals by uneducated, ignorant people in other countries and our own that are disgusting. But, when these tortures and purposeful inflicting of torture and pain are done by educated people that should know better, it is put evil. Please stop - make this the day we stood up for humanity. We stopped putting money before good. Yes, we need to close this down and it will cost jobs and make people uncomfortable, but this torture must stop.
--	---------	------------------	---------------------------------	---

RESPONSEID_73610400_c f188094dc5e96bd- 110AE212-5056-9439- 7E5F1FCBD74D5AC8	26:27.1	David Caudell	Wake Forest School of Medicine	<p>1. Nonhuman primates have hematopoietic and immune systems that are hierarchically similar to humans making them suitable models for studying a variety of infectious diseases, as well as elucidating the transcriptome and proteomic regulatory networks of these systems. 2. Macaques are proven models for toxicology studies necessary in supporting drug discovery and preclinical testing platforms, e.g., cancer immunotherapy. Thus NHPs are important for fulfilling the FDA's two-animal rule for therapeutic development. 3. Because of the biological similarities in response to radiation injury, NHP are a reliable model for developing transplant therapies, which include the development of Chimeric Antigen Receptor (CAR) T-cells used in treating cancer.</p>
RESPONSEID_73676439_8 0c29818eb965594- 2D3F36FD-5056-9439- 7E6DE4694B66E98C	18:35.8	Matthew Jorgensen	Wake Forest School of Medicine	<p>I would strongly encourage the workshop to consider the white paper published by the Foundation for Biomedical Research entitled "The Critical Role of Nonhuman Primates (NHPs) in Scientific and Medical Research" (https://fbresearch.org/). As described in this document, nonhuman primates account for <0.5% of the animals used in biomedical research yet they have been absolutely essential for making advances in the treatment of scores of diseases and have helped improve the lives of millions of people.</p>

RESPONSEID_73677485_2 667bc1185952add- 2D7E0B94-5056-9439- 7EB8E597F2652FFD	14:44.1	Marina Mooney	(Submitter left answer blank)	I appreciate that NIH is conducting a workshop on responsible oversight of non-human primate research, but are concerned that the draft agenda does not appear to include how non-animal alternatives can replace primate use, nor address the need for better monitoring and defining of primate psychological well-being. The scientific efficacy of non-animal alternatives has been demonstrated in varied and multiple areas of research in which primates are used. The draft agenda, however, does not position such new technologies and areas of research for discussion. Additionally, we see no mention of stress effects on primates, from a welfare or research perspective. Please adopt the positions submitted in the NEAVS Petition for Rulemaking to require the USDA to measurably define psychological well being in primates. Thank You.
RESPONSEID_73676510_b 0f9e235765ea01a- 2D446494-5056-9439- 7E8C7077C841D23B	07:59.8	jean ogorzaly	(Submitter left answer blank)	It is time to find alternatives to the use of animals in bio research. If the Physicians' Committee for Responsible Medicine (PCRM) can do it, why can't the the NIH?
RESPONSEID_73673344_3 35f9b4c83f957af- 2C5ABD64-5056-9439- 7EB596CB949CA5FF	39:18.2	Karen francis	(Submitter left answer blank)	Please consider ending the use of all animals in research. There are better alternative non animal models that are being used in research.
RESPONSEID_73673376_5 6cd7b8a6a71e5c2- 2C5F276D-5056-9439- 7E481B6847A23B6A	37:52.5	Andrea Feig	(Submitter left answer blank)	How to make this more public to shame them into releasing those poor creatures!
RESPONSEID_73670968_c 528afda61d3a2cb- 2C06B22A-5056-9439- 7E978E5A42868B8A	33:15.2	Norma Whittaker	Taxpayer , concerned and aware!	Isolation has proven nothing in recent studies , yet NIH continues this barbaric practice for no apparent reason. People in lab coats seem immune to moral or ethical behavior . Perhaps a study should be done on this.

RESPONSEID_7366850_e d0f751d8e74ebde- 2A8898F3-5056-9439- 7E4E1FDF4AA165A0	24:55.5	Patricia Mace	An interested member of the general public, not in research, against the use of living creatures	The time has come, it is here NOW! There NEEDS to be / HAS to be a GIANT leap inside our research community FROM using ANY living creature for invasive or non invasive, physical or mental pain and torture, TO the gene and computer generated emerging knowledge within research. NO HUMAN even knows WHY we are here, or what the Universe actually IS ! Our amazing planet is what it is, and what we have; and I don't think MANKIND has any reason to be responsible for the planet and other species other than the fact WE are here and aware of being here and so should be responsible to the other species sharing this planet Earth since it could be UNIQUE. I am not a scientist, but a human aware of our position in the Solar System and Universe. , and I think we have reached a level where we need to begin to show some respect and deeper caring for our earth and the other creatures who share it. WE do have brains and can make decisions.
RESPONSEID_73668603_2 2f76de2bddbecbd- 2B75F660-5056-9439- 7E67FB061E227C0B	17:15.1	T. Haynes	(Submitter left answer blank)	I think it is time we leave other life alone & find other means for testing. Please stop using primates and other life forms for testing that could be done other ways.
RESPONSEID_73668267_4 11cd2558cb58afc- 2B563B94-5056-9439- 7E7700EA8FB3B598	10:04.2	Kate Cassidy	(Submitter left answer blank)	(Submitter left answer blank)
RESPONSEID_73667539_e 8ebfa88eb3f1a26- 2AEC09D2-5056-9439- 7E4F34CB3405D268	58:27.6	alec hendrickson	(Submitter left answer blank)	Humans technically are primates, so why are other primates not treated well?
RESPONSEID_73660664_a b8164281e0f4ffb- 278C7C3F-5056-9439- 7E6A4BDB375A6EF0	24:43.1	Deepak Vohra	(Submitter left answer blank)	Release all the non human primates to a sanctuary or back to their habitat. NO RESEARCH ON NON-HUMAN PRIMATES

RESPONSEID_73660418_1 7773cd40b85f8cc- 27536D57-5056-9439- 7E02817FE32DC969	18:07.3	Borgeaud Anne	(Submitter left answer blank)	Stop it right now ! Stop cruelty towards animals. Animals are like us (well not exactly, they are much better !). What a shame....
RESPONSEID_73659369_f 7f8d38dec568d47- 2685D4E7-5056-9439- 7EF07152E0231B3E	54:38.3	Karla Barrios	(Submitter left answer blank)	Please stop the cruelty
RESPONSEID_73659149_c 881f21eabfa033e- 2665C8DA-5056-9439- 7E8B26D1E0593522	51:52.1	Jana Pruse	(Submitter left answer blank)	Stop torture!
RESPONSEID_73659000_4 b7f4d0197fb67d3- 264D435B-5056-9439- 7E2EEFCB25BBCD62	49:37.9	Monika Koestler	(Submitter left answer blank)	It has often and often been declared by responsible scientists that animal testing has no relevance on the effects on humans and therefore need not be carried out. Most labs are only after the money provided by the government - leaving aside the fact that there are always a few people working there who enjoy torturing helpless beings.
RESPONSEID_73646034_a 36a23ad1b8aeb75- 22D4AC07-5056-9439- 7ECF57CE7944EE2C	11:18.9	tom harris	(Submitter left answer blank)	Animals should not suffer!
RESPONSEID_73644745_5 67b753a17543aa7- 2233570A-5056-9439- 7EF418A9BF5FE20F	01:48.4	Vicky Tuorto	N/A	I don't know why you want to keep these animals in the hells they must be in when living in a lab, waiting terrified to be used for experiments. You think they feel terrified as we would. Does this not bother you?
RESPONSEID_73644308_6 acea84d1e8916be- 22015310-5056-9439- 7ECA885B67D957EE	53:39.0	Jerry Davis	(Submitter left answer blank)	Using any animals for experimental purposes are done for making money. Take away this monetary greed and see how many experimental labs would discontinue this gruesome practice.

RESPONSEID_73644396_2 26f0e033d845e4c- 221143F9-5056-9439- 7EAD6BEC31A57AD0	48:59.6	Richard Natoli- Rombach	(Submitter left answer blank)	No feedback
RESPONSEID_73640617_c 3dafbc055555f91- 2054EB53-5056-9439- 7EE31B45546A9EAA	02:18.1	maria	(Submitter left answer blank)	"We appreciate that NIH is conducting a workshop on responsible oversight of non-human primate research, but are concerned that the draft agenda does not appear to include how non-animal alternatives can replace primate use, nor address the need for better monitoring and defining of primate psychological well-being. The scientific efficacy of non-animal alternatives has been demonstrated in varied and multiple areas of research in which primates are used. The draft agenda, however, does not position such new technologies and areas of research for discussion. Additionally, we see no mention of stress effects on primates, from a welfare or research perspective
RESPONSEID_73639714_9 0341d26197a8804- 1FB30077-5056-9439- 7E5A0DD557E77341	46:28.9	Vicky Arcaro	(Submitter left answer blank)	Please release all animals from your facility and ensure you exercise your responsibility by having them accommodated at a reputable sanctuary.
RESPONSEID_73639660_b 7c3b866a5d2dfd- 1FA80D1B-5056-9439- 7E6BDB99A5A53ED0	45:49.9	Lorna Brown	(Submitter left answer blank)	It is cruel and a disgrace to the human race to use these poor animals for experimentation .. it should not be allowed ever. No animals should be experimented on. There are other ways. Stop the cruelty.
RESPONSEID_73635594_b d41c321d1394f89- 1E2D46A4-5056-9439- 7E05120F01DA9738	06:10.4	Anu Garg	(Submitter left answer blank)	Please do not permit the torture of sentient animals in research. Thank you.
RESPONSEID_73634652_a 795d20e6b280fc9- 1DD6AC07-5056-9439- 7EE59666E7743811	00:43.5	Kathie Free	(Submitter left answer blank)	I hope the leaders of the National Institutes of Health will finally get the message that animal testing/experimentation is now unnecessary, immoral and archaic.

RESPONSEID_73634888_3 789defd00b34e0e- 1DEBD7DB-5056-9439- 7E2A9EE77EA568A0	55:40.0	Billy "The WiZaRd" Angus	(Submitter left answer blank)	No more testing on any animal (including primates)!!....Period!!! This is the 21st Century now and it's time to use computers and simulators
RESPONSEID_73632831_e 9578fcc863256fe- 1C93FA91-5056-9439- 7E99FBCA5759C658	19:45.4	c. martinez	(Submitter left answer blank)	Do unto others as you would have done to you. Animals are not here on earth for you to do whatever you want to them, no more than you are here for others to use as they wish. Stop the pain, suffering and torture NOW !!! Release all animals to a proper sanctuary immediatley!!!
RESPONSEID_73632925_4 58bfe68e8060ad4- 1CA7227E-5056-9439- 7E3DDEB474FF1930	18:33.2	Jody Harlan	(Submitter left answer blank)	Non-animal alternatives are the way to go. It's time to make the change to humane treatment and improved research. The world is watching.

RESPONSEID_73632248_4 79619b10e4d8d85- 1C2AC607-5056-9439- 7E8313B8B8CF4EFF	09:10.9	Connie Cell	<i>(Submitter left answer blank)</i>	<p>“We appreciate that NIH is conducting a workshop on responsible oversight of non-human primate research, but are concerned that the draft agenda does not appear to include how non-animal alternatives can replace primate use, nor address the need for better monitoring and defining of primate psychological well-being. The scientific efficacy of non-animal alternatives has been demonstrated in varied and multiple areas of research in which primates are used. The draft agenda, however, does not position such new technologies and areas of research for discussion. Additionally, we see no mention of stress effects on primates, from a welfare or research perspective. NEAVS submitted a Petition for Rulemaking in an effort to require that the USDA measurably define psychological well-being in primates. Though given some consideration in the AWA, the matter is largely treated as an afterthought by the USDA and—given its glaring absence on this agenda—also by the NIH. We understand this agenda is a draft, and hope the final version acknowledges the areas of concern highlighted here. If not, the workshop promises to be only an opportunity for those vested in primate use to continue their own agenda. NIH is mandated to look at emerging science and respect the public’s growing opposition to animal use. We trust NIH will remember the outcome of the IOM’s Chimpanzees in Biomedical and Behavioral Research: Assessing the Necessity, which, with data-backed science and rightful infusions of ethics, formed a cornerstone in the long overdue ending of chimpanzee use in the U.S.”</p>
--	---------	-------------	--	--

RESPONSEID_73631900_d 0b823ab543dc2ae- 1BFD7AF5-5056-9439- 7EF14A99D9D00D59	06:34.5	Cynthia Thomas	(Submitter left answer blank)	Please ponder and seek advice on how non-human primates can be spared the horrifying conditions present in current research. My family and I are very concerned about the practice of using non-human primates for research when it has been proven over and over that the suffering they endure is so much greater than any positive contributions made. Please make ethical and humane decisions for these beautiful creatures. Thank you!
RESPONSEID_73630677_e 0cc61811371116b- 1B6229E0-5056-9439- 7EC136404510C4C8	49:17.5	Todd Fisk	(Submitter left answer blank)	Humans share the planet with other species and are not more important than other species. Subjecting any animal to incarceration and experimentation is cruel and unethical. Please make it illegal for any person or organization to capture or purchase any animal. Thank you for considering my comments.
RESPONSEID_73630413_4 cc8ffd887a87bec- 1B3863FB-5056-9439- 7E3494CC3F0BABAD	39:58.1	Gabriel Corza	(Submitter left answer blank)	“One day the absurdity of the almost universal human belief in the slavery of other animals will be palpable. We shall then have discovered our souls and become worthier of sharing this planet with them.” - Martin Luther King
RESPONSEID_73630344_f a884eaf13d7933b- 1B2BE5EF-5056-9439- 7EF65FB2C5ED47B5	39:48.5	Susan Herzer	(Submitter left answer blank)	“I'm glad that NIH is conducting a workshop on responsible oversight of non-human primate research, but I'm concerned that the draft agenda does not appear to include how non-animal alternatives can replace primate use, nor address the need for better monitoring and defining of primate psychological well-being. The scientific efficacy of non-animal alternatives has been demonstrated in varied and multiple areas of research in which primates are used. The draft agenda, however, does not position such new technologies and areas of research for discussion. Additionally, I see no mention of stress effects on primates, from a welfare or research perspective.

RESPONSEID_73630078_3 3c875155353bfc1-1AFEA5CE-5056-9439-7E1536850CF402F3	34:11.1	Denelle Ergh	(Submitter left answer blank)	Animal testing simply isn't necessary in most cases anymore and it should be brought to the attention of anyone present that the practice should be eliminated altogether.
RESPONSEID_73628647_7 edc0a9d7a778b7b-1A3F9E81-5056-9439-7EE5DF4693443E97	11:56.6	Dennis Miller	(Submitter left answer blank)	We must protect the rights of all non-Human primates.
RESPONSEID_73611898_4 d8bfe22ad68b474-11BFBF94-5056-9439-7E7D453FE71ED7C1	07:06.7	Cathleen Hothersall	(Submitter left answer blank)	Every person participating in this discussion should first read the article that appeared in this Sunday's New York Times Sunday Review written by John Gluck, "Second Thoughts of an Animal Researcher." And if you don't see this post until the meeting is underway, then please read it when you get a break, or during lunch. It seems to me that you are asking the wrong questions. The question isn't how can you responsibly continue to conduct research on "sentient, helpless, non-consenting beings", (p.13, Mr. Gluck's article) but rather how quickly can you eliminate it? Please consider this quote of the famous Indian thinker Mahatma Gandhi: "A civilization and it's moral progress may be judged by the way in which its animals are treated." Well, so it is with NIH. Consider how NIH will be judged by future generations for its treatment of these creatures, as well as present public opposition to this research. Thank you for the opportunity to give input, and for your consideration of my post..
RESPONSEID_73627810_a d5551ac23839559-19C3EB0D-5056-9439-7E4063A29DEF2BC2	01:16.9	Therese Ryan	(Submitter left answer blank)	You used them, you benefited from your findings, you ultimately made money. You have a responsibility to look after them in a sane & humane way for the rest of their lives.

RESPONSEID_73626152_4 2f66affd6369df5- 18C53DC6-5056-9439- 7E64891B618CE6D9	33:13.8	Sabrina Kastrati	(Submitter left answer blank)	Please stop testing on animals
RESPONSEID_73625855_9 e69874cf5bb0a1- 18A21767-5056-9439- 7EB17991C9C6423B	29:14.1	S Jitreun	(Submitter left answer blank)	please end the use of all non-human primates in unnecessary, inhumane and unscientific research and testing. we need not cruelty, barbaric treatment to our fellow animals.
RESPONSEID_73625516_2 8dd4b1ba8632499- 18717B86-5056-9439- 7E78FF1177ABEC6E	25:49.4	Nandita Shah	(Submitter left answer blank)	I appreciate that NIH is conducting a workshop on responsible oversight of non-human primate research. My concerns are that the draft agenda does not appear to include how non-animal alternatives can replace primate use, nor address the need for better monitoring and defining of primate psychological well-being. The scientific efficacy of non-animal alternatives has been demonstrated in varied and multiple areas of research in which primates are used. The draft agenda, however, does not position such new technologies and areas of research for discussion. Additionally, we see no mention of stress effects on primates, from a welfare or research perspective. Its high time we look at all sides of this issue and also the extreme pain and torture that living beings are forced to undergo.
RESPONSEID_73625346_b fd7d9bac612e39b- 18546A20-5056-9439- 7E364DACE28EC1EC	24:30.7	Christina Nevshehir	(Submitter left answer blank)	Do NO harm; science, not mad science, with US tax dollars.
RESPONSEID_73625452_1 d824d271544ab30- 186706A0-5056-9439- 7E2AC0769AB7A04B	19:52.1	Kristen trusty	(Submitter left answer blank)	.

RESPONSEID_73622513_c 1cf79060827e274- 16EFBDA6-5056-9439- 7EC1618BC117EA9F	18:46.8	Michelle A Rodrigues	University of Illinois	<p>I am a primatologist who has studied primate social behavior extensively in the wild as well as in captivity. From both a professional and personal standpoint, I find it problematic that we have declared it unethical to conduct biomedical research on chimpanzees, but still deem it ethical for other primates. While chimpanzees have more complex cognition than most other primates, these differences are not clear cut. For example, capuchins monkeys use tools more frequently than most non-chimpanzee apes, and perform comparably to chimpanzees on many cognitive tasks. Spider monkeys perform comparably to orangutans and chimpanzees on inhibition tasks. Furthermore, the similarity in physiology and psychology that make other primates valuable models for human mental illness means that they experience the same sort of emotional and psychological suffering that humans do.. I believe it can be ethical to keep primates in captivity and conduct minimally invasive research, but only if they are maintained in species-appropriate social groups in enriched environments. They should not be subjected to procedures that cause pain, undue stress, or deprive them of social companions. Furthermore, offspring should not be removed or separated from their mothers until adolescence, and transfers of adolescents/young adults should follow species-typical dispersal patterns. Finally, collection of biological samples should only be permitted if they can be obtained non-invasively, collected in conjunction with routine veterinary exams, or examined after naturally-occurring deaths.</p>
RESPONSEID_73603050_8 21b076e1af4eb98- 0DED06B4-5056-9439- 7EDC5CF8C6132AC3	11:34.6	Sargon Donabed	<i>(Submitter left answer blank)</i>	Please stop testing on primates. It is unethical and the results are inconclusive. thank you.

RESPONSEID_73622802_7 528e2d2793ee651- 17185C94-5056-9439- 7E5AAB44875D071C	44:34.9	Kathy Newman	(Submitter left answer blank)	I believe it's unnecessary, unethical, and irresponsible to do research on non-human primates and should be stopped immediately. The primates should be sent to a sanctuary.
RESPONSEID_73622325_8 c395ca6d673c14- 16D63A7E-5056-9439- 7E56A9AD63EE8109	39:05.1	Allison Argo	(Submitter left answer blank)	The use of non-human research models is both out-dated and inhumane. I strongly oppose my tax dollars being used in inappropriately.
RESPONSEID_73621999_d 664de3d2028826b- 16A5D762-5056-9439- 7EDE126FDAE2A430	37:28.8	Jackie Darmitz	(Submitter left answer blank)	The day that animals can give their consent to being used in any type of research is the day that they should be used. Until then, there is no need to abuse animals even if it is thought that it will promote human health. There are now many alternatives available (and many people who would consent to some experiments) . If non- human primates and any other animals are physically harmed or stressed, then it is not responsible research!!!
RESPONSEID_73622102_c 793658c7504c0fe- 16B3A8EB-5056-9439- 7EF9E17BD0B30E22	33:31.8	La Vaughn Standridge	(Submitter left answer blank)	IT IS PAST TIME TO RETIRE ALL ANIMALS USED IN RESEARCH! MY TAX DOLLARS SHOULD NOT BE USED TO TORTURE AND EXPLOIT ANY ANIMAL! THERE IS NO(NEED TO EXPERIMENT OR TEST ON ANIMALS! IT IS USELESS AND DOES NOT CORRELATE!
RESPONSEID_73620708_9 73a40ae5663fac6- 1608E5F4-5056-9439- 7E0AC9965B6BF68C	23:26.0	Linda Berd	(Submitter left answer blank)	The New Paradigm: ALL LIVING BEINGS MUST BE TREATED HUMANELY & W/RESPECT. This applies to ALL animals in labs, including primates as well as mice, rabbits, etc.. People finally realize these animals are being tortured mentally, emotionally & physically, It is time to redirect efforts toward NOT CAUSING SUFFERING WHILE ENDEAVORING TO SOLVE PROBLEMS SCIENTIFICALLY. This is where humanity is heading and governments & their agencies must respond. WE MUST 'DO THE RIGHT THING'. And everyone, deep inside, knows what that is...the avoidance of pain & suffering to all living beings. The end does not justify the means.

<p>RESPONSEID_73619914_1 895f4b4375d5321-1599E3D8-5056-9439-7ED9810727321CEE</p>	<p>12:41.2</p>	<p>Stephanie Weis</p>	<p>(Submitter left answer blank)</p>	<p>I am sick that we, the public, are paying for your unconscionable experimentation with our sentient cousins. We live in the 21st century and have superior human based methods which allow us to advance science without harming, torturing our fellow living beings. The infinitesimal bit of research that has "benefited" humans is not worth the barbaric, inhumane treatment these beings endure. If the public KNEW what you are really doing, it would end. Be transparent. Photos, videos, please. "Vivisection is a social evil because if it advances human knowledge, it does so at the expense of human character." ~George Bernard Shaw "I abhor vivisection with my whole soul. All the scientific discoveries stained with innocent blood I count as of no consequence." Mahatma Ghandi " "I am not interested to know whether vivisection produces results that are profitable to the human race or doesn't...The pain which it inflicts upon unconsenting animals is the basis of my enmity toward it, and it is to me sufficient justification of the enmity without looking further." ~Mark Twain</p>
<p>RESPONSEID_73620271_f 6bb1d014f86b854-15CD5001-5056-9439-7EBF45E052822C7D</p>	<p>11:34.6</p>	<p>Lacey Levitt</p>	<p>(Submitter left answer blank)</p>	<p>As a psychologist and a researcher, I am concerned that the draft agenda of NIH's workshop on responsible oversight of non-human primate research does not appear to include how non-animal alternatives can replace primate use, nor the need for improved definition and monitoring of primate psychological well-being. The scientific efficacy of non-animal alternatives has been demonstrated in multiple areas of research but the draft agenda does not position these new technologies for discussion. NIH is mandated to look at emerging science and respect the public's growing opposition to animal use. Additionally, there is no mention of stress effects on primates, from a welfare or research perspective. Please address these issues in the final version of the agenda.</p>

<p>RESPONSEID_73619965_3 0d4e66be52872ac- 15A27E68-5056-9439- 7E4AE7AB3D7611A0</p>	<p>03:50.3</p>	<p>Jonathan Balcombe</p>	<p>(Submitter left answer blank)</p>	<p>Central to any discussion of “ethical policies and processes” related to the use of primates in research is a clear understanding of the harms suffered by primates in laboratories. In 2014, I produced an analysis of 6,000 pages of detailed records from two National Primate Research Centers, obtained through a Freedom of Information Act request (1). The records, spanning three decades, document the potential hardships faced by three populations of monkeys held at the facilities and offer a glimpse into the daily existence of monkeys in NIH-funded laboratories. Data were organized under several categories including demographic and mortality, housing history, environmental enrichment, experimental procedure, handling and other non-experimental manipulations, chemical agents, illness and injury—and revealed that the quality of life for the typical laboratory primate is very poor. These animals face regular or chronic sources of pain and distress including noxious experimental and non?experimental events and illness and injury; and severe and prolonged social disruptions. Pain relief is meager by comparison to that normally provided to humans, despite legislative requirements to minimize pain and distress and assume similarity to humans in terms of ability to experience pain and distress. Living environments are usually confinement indoors to a metal cage, often alone, and often with a minimum of physical or mental stimulation. If it is to be meaningful, NIH’s ethics workshop on primate research must include consideration of the misery endured by primates in laboratories. 1. Balcombe, J. (2014). A Longitudinal View of Primate Life in Two American Laboratories. http://animalstudiesrepository.org/acwp_arte/5/</p>
---	----------------	-------------------------------	--	--

RESPONSEID_73619936_1 9f254380d4f8f20-159CF324-5056-9439-7E911FAF7628D933	03:42.1	missy hargraves	(Submitter left answer blank)	please pay attention to this very important issue
RESPONSEID_73619809_2 f86ad634e860427-158BD53B-5056-9439-7E60652025AD3C40	01:15.0	Debra Cameron	(Submitter left answer blank)	Protect animsls
RESPONSEID_73619037_8 dee6762463b71a9-154162B0-5056-9439-7E2C59B960591201	53:23.3	Vicky lafrati	(Submitter left answer blank)	There is no such thing as responsible research on animals! If it is so responsible , use humans!
RESPONSEID_73618466_1 03a00fbc651ee26-15090D6E-5056-9439-7E21200A0E519E9B	47:08.2	Claire Lloyd	(Submitter left answer blank)	I am writing to ask that you consider leaving animals out of experimentation. It is no longer justifiable and wastes money that could better be spend studying illness and disease in humans or on human and cell tissue samples. Please do the right think and retire animals (particularly primates) from research. Sincerely, Claire Lloyd.
RESPONSEID_73618365_9 4a26dd9e28cc163-14FBA2B0-5056-9439-7EEC75BCDAF3A6EE	45:03.1	Jennifer Gorgo	(Submitter left answer blank)	Very cruel to be testing on animals
RESPONSEID_73617954_7 c3374010dade93a-14CB0D0A-5056-9439-7E52C39DA4DC0611	43:53.8	Deborah Crump	(Submitter left answer blank)	Stop the cruel testing. Release these poor animals to sanctuaries.
RESPONSEID_73612841_e 8f6d2ee42680560-123E0AAB-5056-9439-7E05AC53AC4C6631	40:00.8	Kathy summers	(Submitter left answer blank)	No monkey deserves to be in labs set them free

RESPONSEID_73614882_ff e375f07e361309- 133B15DB-5056-9439- 7EED6227EEE678B0	38:37.7	Joyce Angleberger	(Submitter left answer blank)	Behavioral research -- An opportunity for outreach exists here. Many public zoos and many more privately operated zoos witness abnormal behaviors in animals forced to live in artificial structures and environments and without the necessary social groups. NIH scientists may conduct long-term observations of categorized situations such as exposure to the public, lack of social peers, sterile environments, unsuitable climate, etc. at selected public and private zoos; ultimate feedback and instructions to zoos will improve the health and well-being of animals. For example, koalas in a restricted environment not allowing them to learn about predatory behavior or to be unable to forage naturally are difficult to rehabilitate for return to reclaimed koala habitat, the ultimate best goal for any zoo. Such NIH outreach to zoos could steer them faster and more capably toward a stronger and much needed end goal of easier rehabilitation and successful reintroductions. A happy side benefit of the outreach would be the positively enhanced reputations of zoos and NIH.
RESPONSEID_73617854_c e340185568ada21- 14BFB494-5056-9439- 7ED4C7DC1C2969D6	37:48.3	William Clement	None	Stop using non-human primates in research.
RESPONSEID_73617397_a 3e2ebd40dc79c71- 148459DE-5056-9439- 7E69FA2012EA9353	37:17.5	Angela Stuebben	(Submitter left answer blank)	Having worked in tear protein research, I question whether the information obtained in any laboratory warrants the use of animals. I disagree with the use of animals in laboratories now, and with the use of tax money in funding the work. For science to move into the future, I believe non-animal techniques using cell/molecular models must be started and perfected. Thank you,

RESPONSEID_73617311_8 3eb8c615a181a1c- 1476A197-5056-9439- 7E6B28FE03BF7B81	35:13.7	Tina Shurtleff	(Submitter left answer blank)	The American Medical Association has come out against animal testing because the results are flawed. To torture another living being for largely ineffective research is unconscionable. These animals especially primates who are intelligent social animals that live in family groups do not deserve to be tortured. Stop this unnecessary do called medical research.
--	---------	----------------	---------------------------------	---

RESPONSEID_73617446_3 1f50b568f27afb2- 14898FEF-5056-9439- 7ECBDD32AA00C9D0	34:26.1	Ginger Carter	<i>(Submitter left answer blank)</i>	<p>I appreciate that NIH is conducting a workshop on responsible oversight of non-human primate research, but are concerned that the draft agenda does not appear to include how non-animal alternatives can replace primate use, nor address the need for better monitoring and defining of primate psychological well-being. The scientific efficacy of non-animal alternatives has been demonstrated in varied and multiple areas of research in which primates are used. The draft agenda, however, does not position such new technologies and areas of research for discussion. Additionally, I see no mention of stress effects on primates, from a welfare or research perspective. NEAVS submitted a Petition for Rulemaking in an effort to require that the USDA measurably define psychological well-being in primates. Though given some consideration in the AWA, the matter is largely treated as an afterthought by the USDA and—given its glaring absence on this agenda—also by the NIH. I understand this agenda is a draft, and hope the final version acknowledges the areas of concern highlighted here. If not, the workshop promises to be only an opportunity for those vested in primate use to continue their own agenda. NIH is mandated to look at emerging science and respect the public’s growing opposition to animal use. I trust NIH will remember the outcome of the IOM’s Chimpanzees in Biomedical and Behavioral Research: Assessing the Necessity, which, with data-backed science and rightful infusions of ethics, formed a cornerstone in the long overdue ending of chimpanzee use in the U.S.</p>
RESPONSEID_73617618_9 030865fde1f77d9- 149F2DF6-5056-9439- 7E84F126E738FOAA	34:11.8	Theresa Morningstar	<i>(Submitter left answer blank)</i>	na

RESPONSEID_73617059_c 3f4d6b33c1938d0- 145B1C32-5056-9439- 7E43E47CCE7A87FE	30:36.6	Judi Germaine	(Submitter left answer blank)	Non-human primates are not humans, and as such are a poor substitute for research. If you must do it it can only be done on a small scale, for a very short period of time (months as opposed to years) and in a natural environment. Never should they be confined in cages, and separated from their family members. If they are orphans then another orphan should be introduced as a companion. Also, no painful medical procedures should ever be performed. Observational studies are the only humane studies that should be permitted.
RESPONSEID_73615158_6 98905d1cb671aa2- 1356A87A-5056-9439- 7EC96AD79D2E192C	16:20.5	Nicole Ford	(Submitter left answer blank)	Primates have a very complex social system, and are very intelligent. To subject them to experimentation, even "responsible experimentation", is torture to these sentient beings and is unethical. All animals want to be free, and to take that away this basic right is a grave injustice. I can only liken our current lax attitude towards animal slavery to human slavery, where it was acceptable and even deemed a right to enslave and abuse as slaves were considered property. We evolved, but we still have a lot of growing up to do. We need to view animals as the sentient beings they are. We need to understand animals are unable to voice their outrage and terror simply because they speak a different language - but I am sure it is written on their faces. I respectfully urge you to end animal experimentation.
RESPONSEID_73616199_1 9a1805f99858704- 13E85C5A-5056-9439- 7EB8CE29D171840F	14:53.6	Reevyn Aronson	(Submitter left answer blank)	Please end the use of all non-human primates in unnecessary, inhumane and unscientific research and testing.

RESPONSEID_73615979_6 a6360dc0cce324b- 13C280CC-5056-9439- 7E6CC9F4C3AE7107	10:25.6	Rev Dr Susan Lampinen	<i>(Submitter left answer blank)</i>	<p>We appreciate that NIH is conducting a workshop on responsible oversight of non-human primate research, but are concerned that the draft agenda does not appear to include how non-animal alternatives can replace primate use, nor address the need for better monitoring and defining of primate psychological well-being. The scientific efficacy of non-animal alternatives has been demonstrated in varied and multiple areas of research in which primates are used. The draft agenda, however, does not position such new technologies and areas of research for discussion. Additionally, we see no mention of stress effects on primates, from a welfare or research perspective. NEAVS submitted a Petition for Rulemaking in an effort to require that the USDA measurably define psychological well-being in primates. Though given some consideration in the AWA, the matter is largely treated as an afterthought by the USDA and—given its glaring absence on this agenda—also by the NIH. We understand this agenda is a draft, and hope the final version acknowledges the areas of concern highlighted here. If not, the workshop promises to be only an opportunity for those vested in primate use to continue their own agenda. NIH is mandated to look at emerging science and respect the public’s growing opposition to animal use. We trust NIH will remember the outcome of the IOM’s Chimpanzees in Biomedical and Behavioral Research: Assessing the Necessity, which, with data-backed science and rightful infusions of ethics, formed a cornerstone in the long overdue ending of chimpanzee use in the U.S.”</p>
--	---------	--------------------------	--	---

RESPONSEID_73616013_9 a92393ee13cd34c-13C7D18D-5056-9439-7EC5559DC5861950	10:21.0	Marci De Sart	(Submitter left answer blank)	We appreciate that NIH is conducting a workshop on responsible oversight of non-human primate research, but are concerned that the draft agenda does not appear to include how non-animal alternatives can replace primate use, nor address the need for better monitoring and defining of primate psychological well-being. The scientific efficacy of non-animal alternatives has been demonstrated in varied and multiple areas of research in which primates are used. The draft agenda, however, does not position such new technologies and areas of research for discussion. Additionally, we see no mention of stress effects on primates, from a welfare or research perspective.
RESPONSEID_73615556_a cd92d78320587f5-138DA164-5056-9439-7E19E186619264EC	08:20.7	Mrcedz Quinlan Labelle	sudbury animal rights group /citizen climate change	i presently have two pot bellied pig companions and recognize that these non human beings are incredibly human like have had piggies for over twenty years and three days after the intro of my first baby pot belly i gave up eating the flesh of non human beings
RESPONSEID_73615737_3 3b3b97e17b242e6-13A4F601-5056-9439-7E24B2577625F18A	07:33.3	Olympia bravo	(Submitter left answer blank)	F
RESPONSEID_73615720_f e7da00bfe46b2cf-13A2BB34-5056-9439-7EA7F1096B53229C	06:50.2	john pasqua	(Submitter left answer blank)	end all non-human primate research today.

RESPONSEID_73610923_f 8dea7d33af258e7- 1146F13C-5056-9439- 7E47F3033942ABC4	06:27.1	marilyn evenson	none	My comments for your workshop where experts convene to discuss the governing of non-human primates in NIH-funded biomedical & behavioral endeavors on Sept 7 are: My concerns & suggestions would be more ideas for non-animal research in which I thought the NIH was striving for this goal. Non-animal alternatives are more accurate, less costly, & far more humane. Primates are intelligent, feeling, emotional beings that do not deserve to be used in invasive research. It's seldom animal testing & experimentation can be extrapolated to humans so animals suffer needlessly & humans do not benefit. I hope the moral, ethical principles of primate research is discussed along with the stress & psychological effects on the animals. Thank you
RESPONSEID_73615116_7 8a7d186ebecf761- 1351D6A0-5056-9439- 7E20FB61D57AA4FE	06:11.0	Toby Glanville	(Submitter left answer blank)	Why is there no discussion on non-animal alternatives? The exploitation of primates needs to stop. In terms of physical and mental feelings, they are no different than us. I will never support an organization that continues to experiment on innocent animals. Society is quickly recognizing the pervasive suffering of animals used for experiments. The clock is ticking...
RESPONSEID_73615441_4 bd66f775f41f0dd- 137BF51F-5056-9439- 7E13774EF336F43E	02:45.2	Ann Sandritter	(Submitter left answer blank)	Leave the animals alone!!!!

RESPONSEID_73602438_6 3dcb69f57dbfb73- 0DBB7D58-5056-9439- 7E96CDC6B3F22CF9	57:39.3	Pamela Miller	<i>(Submitter left answer blank)</i>	<p>“We appreciate that NIH is conducting a workshop on responsible oversight of non-human primate research, but are concerned that the draft agenda does not appear to include how non-animal alternatives can replace primate use, nor address the need for better monitoring and defining of primate psychological well-being. The scientific efficacy of non-animal alternatives has been demonstrated in varied and multiple areas of research in which primates are used. The draft agenda, however, does not position such new technologies and areas of research for discussion. Additionally, we see no mention of stress effects on primates, from a welfare or research perspective. NEAVS submitted a Petition for Rulemaking in an effort to require that the USDA measurably define psychological well-being in primates. Though given some consideration in the AWA, the matter is largely treated as an afterthought by the USDA and—given its glaring absence on this agenda—also by the NIH. We understand this agenda is a draft, and hope the final version acknowledges the areas of concern highlighted here. If not, the workshop promises to be only an opportunity for those vested in primate use to continue their own agenda. NIH is mandated to look at emerging science and respect the public’s growing opposition to animal use. We trust NIH will remember the outcome of the IOM’s Chimpanzees in Biomedical and Behavioral Research: Assessing the Necessity, which, with data-backed science and rightful infusions of ethics, formed a cornerstone in the long overdue ending of chimpanzee use in the U.S.”</p>
RESPONSEID_73614578_e a01fa9d8b6b70b8- 13164BCF-5056-9439- 7E6D32824F61043F	50:43.3	Erika Sullivan	<i>(Submitter left answer blank)</i>	please consider non-animal models for research

RESPONSEID_73613885_6 d963b9ae317092c- 12BF6FE7-5056-9439- 7E4F4C9B4F1BAD4A	46:20.5	Linda Fante	(Submitter left answer blank)	Ethical policies are essential for animal welfare oversight
--	---------	-------------	---------------------------------	---

<p>RESPONSEID_73612981_b 67bedad73f64350- 12516683-5056-9439- 7E38978FB9AD128B</p>	<p>44:20.6</p>	<p>Heidi Handsaker</p>	<p>(Submitter left answer blank)</p>	<p>The current animal welfare regulations are not strict enough and are not being enforced enough, in animal research labs across our country --- the USDA may possibly issue the labs a fine, the labs pay it, and then go on with their extremely inhumane and even tortuous research....There are true crimes being committed against primates in some research labs --- even if maternal deprivation experiments are now being phased out, there are still shocking drug-addiction and vivisection experiments that are NOT acceptable at all, upon any non-human animal, including primates...(You can go to the SAEN website: Stop Animal Experimentation Now, to find out more about these labs --- and also WhiteCoatWaste.org)....There needs to come a time when mentally or physically invasive experiments should be phased out completely --- the only experiments allowed should be very compassionate and humane behavioral and consciousness research....Non-human animals DO have individual consciousness, personality, emotions and thoughts that are far beyond instincts -- - if we would not use human children or handicapped people in experiments, without their consent, why are animals allowed to be used? Simply because they can't tell us 'no' in spoken human language? They have other lan- guages that we could hear and perceive, if we would listen, respect, and try to understand them more, even on a spiritual level....The way many non-human animals have been used in research is a crime against Creation --- but we still have the chance, and the heart and soul and consciousness, to set that aright, and make amends....</p>
--	----------------	------------------------	--	---

<p>RESPONSEID_73613756_3 efc3784b9363479- 12B11780-5056-9439- 7EC4F81AF61C4620</p>	<p>40:22.7</p>	<p>EVERETT Halligan</p>	<p>(Submitter left answer blank)</p>	<p>“We appreciate that NIH is conducting a workshop on responsible oversight of non-human primate research, but are concerned that the draft agenda does not appear to include how non-animal alternatives can replace primate use, nor address the need for better monitoring and defining of primate psychological well-being. The scientific efficacy of non-animal alternatives has been demonstrated in varied and multiple areas of research in which primates are used. The draft agenda, however, does not position such new technologies and areas of research for discussion. Additionally, we see no mention of stress effects on primates, from a welfare or research perspective.</p>
<p>RESPONSEID_73612635_2 6e8885824458ee2- 122870A6-5056-9439- 7E0488F77494908C</p>	<p>38:56.7</p>	<p>lorraine r cecere</p>	<p>(Submitter left answer blank)</p>	<p>I am asking the NIH to stop using animals for research of any kind. More people are stepping forward that have been a part of the horrors from this kind of research and they state along with many researchers that any results that come about can never be used on humans anyway. I put the life of all these animals that live and die in ways we cannot imagine before the money part of it. For those who feel animals have no feelings (which is so far from the truth) tax dollars are being totally wasted and have been for a very long time. The year is 2016. Animal research should have faded out long ago. For me personally, it actually makes me literally ill when I see what is being done to animals, for no good reason. Shame on us.</p>

RESPONSEID_73612565_7 f2cfbcf1e573b6d- 121FD95C-5056-9439- 7E56211C9AC9CA66	36:28.2	Jacalyn Strouble	(Submitter left answer blank)	The NIH needs to address the psychological well-being of captive non-human primates in their regulations, agendas and workshops. Such discussions should be based on the same regulations that apply to human subjects and to human prisoners. There is no intrinsic difference between the suffering of humans and animals. Torture has the same definition in both regards. This fact should be the cornerstone of all future discussions of the welfare of animals. The only difference is that human subjects/captives have, in some regard or another, entered into their situation voluntarily. There should also be a very urgent move to substitute other models for animal ones. Animal studies have a very limited usefulness in regards to human medicine. Time and time again, it has been demonstrated that animal studies are more of a long-standing tradition than a scientific tool. This is the 21st century. We can do better.
RESPONSEID_73613417_2 fed7ccebeeee5720- 127FA4F4-5056-9439- 7E6FBDBDBE7AE12C	35:42.2	Elizabeth M Darovic	(Submitter left answer blank)	Please halt use the use of non-human primates in testing as soon as possible. Their continued use of horrific, unethical and unnecessary. Please find other options that are cruelty-free.
RESPONSEID_73613396_b 67be046561107ff- 127B6B11-5056-9439- 7E25E4A521ABDB72	34:14.4	darlene driver	(Submitter left answer blank)	NO ANIMAL SHOULD SUFFER AT THE HANDS OF HUMANS FOR TESTING. WE HAVE PLENTY OF CANDIDATES IN PRISONS YOU CAN TEST ON!!!
RESPONSEID_73613033_2 4dc22aeaa0c8468- 12577D83-5056-9439- 7E8CEB43660D54D9	31:40.0	Dennis Tackett	(Submitter left answer blank)	Please stop the torture of primates.
RESPONSEID_73612927_3 84bdaa671ef3a9b- 1248D778-5056-9439- 7E92AC1B557D6185	29:58.9	Joan Hunncutt	(Submitter left answer blank)	Ethics and animal welfare are the top priority as far as I am concerned. This is LONG OVERDUE!!

RESPONSEID_73612541_f b125daa3b3d99f1- 121CE1DF-5056-9439- 7E3E03244CB10982	28:08.8	Susan Becker	(Submitter left answer blank)	I urge you to study the latest scientific evidence and respect the public's growing opposition to animal use. It is unethical to continue the use of non human primates in NIH funded research. Please do the right thing and stop ALL research using living beings.
RESPONSEID_73611712_5 ecfd29a47e7102e- 11A5C202-5056-9439- 7ED937CF8A74853C	24:57.5	S. Nico	n/a	Well....morality and ethics have NOT been strong in our society for quiet a while now. But their are ethical specialists and mentors in Psychology. One xInt ethicist of renown is Patricia Keith Spiegel in Calif. Ethicists can be hired for consultation on scientific/medical testing. They can assist in planning / overseeing to ensure that at least the LEAST amount of testing to involve lifetimes of enslaved torture and suffering. Given we often feel humans can be helped but if one test for similar results has already been documented...why put other animals to suffer. Monitoring the testing of all institutions/labs etc of animals could mean we could save a LOT of animals from unethical repetition, truly unnecessary testing, and protect them from people who simply have NO compassion for animal rights would be a milestone. One very appreciated by these intelligent sweet social animals. They have compassion....why don't we?
RESPONSEID_73612241_3 08fb42cbb318623- 11F11876-5056-9439- 7E1299AE3A4C8239	23:23.9	L Kifer	(Submitter left answer blank)	It is time to stop using animals!! They are abused, tortured , and have a horrible life! There are so many other ways . Mankind must stop the cruelty!

RESPONSEID_73612086_4 a80bdf8a98989b5- 11D99DB8-5056-9439- 7E75EBD51EEA1A85	21:29.5	Deborah Pospisal	(Submitter left answer blank)	All living species experience fear, pain and suffering. Being the most intelligent species, it is the responsibility of humans to protect all life. Innocent life does not deserve to suffer at the hands of humans. If you don't want it done to you, don't do it to anything else. Life has advanced for the human race but has stayed the same for other species. What people do to other life forms is barbaric and outdated. We can make a difference. People have to change. The past is no longer acceptable. We are smarter than this now.
RESPONSEID_73611193_e 3f231f484a98931- 1164FD49-5056-9439- 7E051406AF615446	09:34.2	Aixa Fielder	(Submitter left answer blank)	Our consciousness has been raised and growing. We are giving more attention to Non-human Primates. It is time to quickly abolish confinement and bad treatment in cages and circuses. It's time!

<p>RESPONSEID_73610781_e d2c58772f0fd5f6- 11370305-5056-9439- 7EDC2CD45C5B3DEC</p>	<p>07:52.1</p>	<p>Kathleen Corby</p>	<p>(Submitter left answer blank)</p>	<p>The draft agenda does not appear to include how non-animal alternatives can replace primate use, nor address the need for better monitoring and defining of primate psychological well-being. The scientific efficacy of non-animal alternatives has been demonstrated in varied and multiple areas of research in which primates are used. The draft agenda, however, does not position such new technologies and areas of research for discussion. Additionally, there is no mention of stress effects on primates, from a welfare or research perspective. NIH is mandated to look at emerging science and respect the public's growing opposition to animal use. Like NEAVS, I trust NIH will remember the outcome of the IOM's Chimpanzees in Biomedical and Behavioral Research: Assessing the Necessity, which, with data-backed science and rightful infusions of ethics, formed a cornerstone in the long overdue ending of chimpanzee use in the U.S. We have witnessed an end to the use of chimpanzees in research – our closest genetic relative. I support NEAVS point of view on this issue and I will continue to advocate tirelessly to end the use of all non-human primates in unnecessary, inhumane and unscientific research and testing. Thank you.</p>
<p>RESPONSEID_73610375_9 477cf4456c3e67c- 1106DF40-5056-9439- 7EE68532FB5B95AF</p>	<p>03:31.6</p>	<p>Dave and Rita Cross</p>	<p>(Submitter left answer blank)</p>	<p>Chimpanzees, our closest relatives, share many of our human characteristics! They deserve our respect and compassion and should never be exploited or abused! Please consider retiring all of these intelligent and sentient beings to the awesome U.S. sanctuaries! Their basic needs have never been met, and we owe them a retirement where they can behave normally and feel contentment!</p>

RESPONSEID_73603294_a cb2f316495a399a- 0E0460EB-5056-9439- 7E67C728DDDB46F6	52:52.6	Leah Kurtz	(Submitter left answer blank)	I oppose the use of non- human primates and other animals in experimentation unless there is an absolutely urgent necessity and the options of computer models and all other forms of experimentation have been ruled out. These animals suffer just like we do from isolation, pain, fear and all other ills you impose on them in "research". As a rabbi in the Conservative Movement I cannot tolerate the kinds of unnecessary research that is done because the money is there and for no other good reason . The pain of living beings is real and it should horrify you when you undertake research on animals. Please limit research on animals; do not increase it.
RESPONSEID_73609992_7 efdf042300884f6- 10D85B5C-5056-9439- 7E55BBOA6E823983	51:31.4	Deborah Boomhower	(Submitter left answer blank)	The use of primates or any animals for research is just not right. What gives us (humans) the right to torture these beautiful, smart and loving beings. There has to be other ways to test besides using animals.
RESPONSEID_73606164_e 1f3256438477684- 0F18FE6F-5056-9439- 7EA45E55585E54BB	48:12.2	Mari Elvi	(Submitter left answer blank)	XXIst century scientists should be already agreeing to consider nerved-systemmed beings as non human persons who should not be subjected to testing or experimenting on. There are new theoreticians as well as concepts already in use on this matter which renders unacceptable for researchers not to be acquainted with.
RESPONSEID_73608524_6 e0aaf4388347c67- 1020652E-5056-9439- 7E8EC2FA605FFB07	48:01.6	Dr. April Modesti	(Submitter left answer blank)	Non-human primates are sentient beings, and it is my belief that they have rights of health and well-being, including the ability to have contact with others of their kind and the ability to have contact with the earth.

RESPONSEID_73608459_1 32baca937d1a2ee-1017AA51-5056-9439-7E934893303E4AA0	46:36.1	Phyllis Charnoff	(Submitter left answer blank)	This workshop should include a discussion about how Non-Animal alternatives can replace primate use. The scientific efficacy of non-animal alternatives has been demonstrated in varied and multiple areas of research in which primates are used. Primates are thinking, feeling beings with attention needed to address their psychological well-being. The stress that these primates are subjected to is enormous. These considerations are a must if we are to be humane. Please interject your humanity. It is disheartening to read about the treatment that these animals endure.
RESPONSEID_73609199_a 059dc78683fab5f-1074EEAE-5056-9439-7E0FF3C14A59D446	41:04.5	Suzanne J Lopez	(Submitter left answer blank)	Only cruel, unfeeling people use chimps or any other animal in research. Even though these people are suppose to be smart and learned, they are evil when they use any animal in research. They don't even realize that these innocents CANNOT speak up and tell us of their EXTREME PAIN, SUFFERING, AND FEAR. I want these cruel research experiments stopped TODAY.
RESPONSEID_73609186_d 7d5f5c13e890e26-10730BE8-5056-9439-7E8FD07AB1AF4480	38:30.2	Marianne Crawford	(Submitter left answer blank)	Please help these innocent animals.
RESPONSEID_73608887_5 ca996f624e67774-1051E2CA-5056-9439-7E0310C9494107B0	37:59.2	Anita Walsh	(Submitter left answer blank)	I am quite certain that further research with ANY non-human primates is inappropriate. Separation from family, pain and suffering and fear should not be inflicted on any of them. They are cognizant and sensitive. Furthermore, funding should go towards human-centric research for solutions to human disease. There are advanced models of research (DNA on a chip) etc., synthetic skin and massive records of humans who both succumb, and defeat disease. This is where the dollars should go, no more animal research. It is cruelty by its very nature. Let them live to their own purposes.

RESPONSEID_73608302_c 9ed7cb33e887e68- 100D91FC-5056-9439- 7E465180AC3CCD45	36:02.7	Mary T. Graffeo	(Submitter left answer blank)	There are NO research principles that are correct when USING non-human primates! They are animals, who feel pain, have concrete emotions, and they are close enough to humans that RESEARCH SHOULD NEVER BE CONDUCTED ON THEM. There can be excellent animal welfare laws (and NONE EXIST PRESENTLY) in place, but when that lab door closes - there is NO OVERSIGHT, and anything can and does happen (like boiling a primate cage with the primate ALIVE in it, which happened in a lab last year). There is also the fact that, USUALLY, not once in a while, a statement is issued, which says that "results obtained in animal research DO NOT PERTAIN TO HUMANS!" So then: why are non-human primates experimented on AT ALL? THERE IS NO REASON!
RESPONSEID_73608304_ff fea4de85a7ddc7- 100E094C-5056-9439- 7ECE6AFC20AE7A9A	34:54.4	janna	(Submitter left answer blank)	This needs to stop!
RESPONSEID_73608710_e 49ff7f1e9916718- 10398702-5056-9439- 7E4EFCD1F809891E	33:03.3	Chuck Thomas	(Submitter left answer blank)	Please consider phasing out the use non-human primates in all research. Certainly in 2016 there has to be better ways to conduct research.

RESPONSEID_73607018_1 30c7b32612843e- 0F7ACFD6-5056-9439- 7E6CC09B8E8590E5	27:42.7	Susan Matthews	(Submitter left answer blank)	1. Will the people leading the workshop be those who are actually involved in administering the various experiments on these non human...key word..primates. 2. Why in the 21st century do you feel its justifiable to place a human life above that of a non human primate. 3. No suffering is worth the end product...IF there is ever an end product. 4. Its just wrong. Torture. Inhumane.You know it, or you should. Genuinely worried that perhaps you don't know it's wrong...but its a wage yeah so as long as your not in pain and distress, locked in a world where no one speaks your language, it's ok to keep perpetuating the violence of your very barbaric excuse of pushing the boundaries of science. 5. Sleep well on the bed and pillow earned from the suffering of non human primates.
RESPONSEID_73608242_8 d13d620c5c4aea6- 1005665B-5056-9439- 7E8C42958D962BC6	25:43.3	Jim CORRIERE	Write it Right!	End all animal cruelty!
RESPONSEID_73604297_2 24b58a0ecd01bd8- 0E62F012-5056-9439- 7E733AFCE4C54BAE	25:06.4	Peter Wood	(Submitter left answer blank)	Experimenting on non-human primates is inherently cruel and unethical. It is also inexcusable and unconscionable. There should be discussion on the moral issues related to experimenting on non-human primates. There should also be discussion on moving away from this archaic and barbaric practice.
RESPONSEID_73608115_6 c8680f836f2c50- 0FF62D50-5056-9439- 7E816E6EAA389594	24:47.2	Elise Clyde	(Submitter left answer blank)	We are their voice

RESPONSEID_73607215_f eb37745acfc4612- 0F8F504C-5056-9439- 7EDA39757E961ECA	20:06.5	Valerie Lovejoy	concerned citizen	Using any animal in a lab is barbaric, every sentient being on this planet has the right to happiness and freedom to live there life without some Nazi type of individual. You remember the Nazi, they considered it alright to use human being in a lab because that were not Nazi!! This is the same thing, if you think because these animals are non human, you have a right to do this, you are no better than the Nazi!!!
--	---------	-----------------	-------------------	---

RESPONSEID_73607536_a 007284f1945134e- 0FB58CBA-5056-9439- 7E312499CCA46634	19:45.1	Robert Foley Jr	<i>(Submitter left answer blank)</i>	<p>The draft agenda does not include how non-animal alternatives can and should replace primate use, nor address the need for better monitoring and defining of primate psychological well-being. The scientific efficacy of non-animal alternatives has been demonstrated in varied and multiple areas of research in which primates are used. The draft agenda, does not position such new technologies and areas of research for discussion. Additionally, I see no mention of stress effects on primates, from a welfare or research perspective. NEAVS submitted a Petition for Rulemaking in an effort to require that the USDA measurably define psychological well-being in primates. Though given some consideration in the AWA, the matter is largely treated as an afterthought by the USDA and—given its glaring absence on this agenda—also by the NIH. I understand this agenda is a draft, and hope the final version acknowledges the areas of concern highlighted here. If not, the workshop promises to be only an opportunity for those vested in primate use to continue their own agenda. NIH is mandated to look at emerging science and respect the public’s growing opposition to animal use. I trust NIH will remember the outcome of the IOM’s Chimpanzees in Biomedical and Behavioral Research: Assessing the Necessity, which, with data-backed science and rightful infusions of ethics, formed a cornerstone in the long overdue ending of chimpanzee use in the U.S.” We have witnessed an end to the use of chimpanzees in research – our closest genetic relative. It's well past due to STOP all</p>
RESPONSEID_73607623_6 b253e4428d267c2- 0FC02353-5056-9439- 7E9AC9D518A0C2AA	18:45.0	Jo DeGeorge	<i>(Submitter left answer blank)</i>	389

RESPONSEID_73607294_d ee429f80b6fdeae- 0F97EF1B-5056-9439- 7E43ED097DC2A316	16:55.0	Ann Bicking	(Submitter left answer blank)	You shrugged your responsibilities to these chumps! You should be ashamed! The very least you can do is give them their freedom at a sanctuary! They deserve that much! You've abused them and should have to pay for food and housing as well. They served humanity beyond belief. You've done nothing but destroy their lives! ??
RESPONSEID_73606907_b 28811fcae0c643f- 0F6BA190-5056-9439- 7E1BB5B2CAC6F619	15:47.5	BOBBI GOLDIN	(Submitter left answer blank)	The NIH must go the whole 9 yards and stop all experimentation on primates and other animals for that matter and start using the non-animal models which have been tested for years and years and are shown to be more reliable and effective. Also, what should be discussed is how animals should be cared for and what happens to them afterwards--all part of NIH responsibility. They must be cared for with great empathy after all they've endured in many useless, repeated experiments. I am aware of the repetition of experiments shown to be ineffective for decades and the NIH has consistently wasted tax dollars over and over, not to mention the incalculable harm and pain caused to animals of all kinds. It's time to fully remedy the old methods and use non-animal experiments.
RESPONSEID_73607222_3 7e8f7bab7141b10- 0F90A738-5056-9439- 7ED4C8021A396C33	13:07.1	jana austin	(Submitter left answer blank)	just is not necessary anymore

RESPONSEID_73604653_e 5cbef60142b6eab- 0E869C1B-5056-9439- 7E09E2D73DB7EC9E	09:26.4	Carol A. Shively, PhD	Wake Forest School of Medicine	Results extrapolated from rodent studies often fail to accurately predict human responses. Disorders that are manifested late in life, which include most of the financially costly chronic disease of aging, are difficult to accurately model in relatively short lived animals. The human genome contains many thousands of long noncoding RNA, a third of which are specific to primates. These long noncoding RNAs are critical regulators of gene expression throughout the lifespan. Likewise, like humans, NHPs exhibit the extensive elaboration and differentiation of the metabolically costly brain. These primate specific characteristics may in part explain the success of NHP models for several leading causes of morbidity and mortality including obesity, cardiovascular disease, and depression, the investment in these models by NIH and the Department of Defense to develop radiation countermeasures, and suggest that NHP models will be necessary to understand the coming epidemic of Alzheimer’s and other diseases of aging. NHP research, once common in Western Europe, is nearly completely terminated, primarily due to animal rights activism resulting in nearly insurmountable regulatory hurdles and associated financial constraints. The US NHP research enterprise is rapidly shrinking for similar reasons. China has impressive NHP resources, is not constrained by activism, perceives the importance of NHP research, and is positioning itself to be the world leader in NHP research. Left unchecked, China may dominate discovery, and novel therapeutics may have to be validated in China.
--	---------	--------------------------	--------------------------------	---

RESPONSEID_73604379_8 589e7ef52d3aac8- 0E6C68B6-5056-9439- 7EC738120392181C	06:57.0	Jade M Scileppi	(Submitter left answer blank)	As a physician, I understand the need for medical research. What I can't understand is why we persist in using animals. Researchers use every kind of species in the now recognized mistaken belief that what holds true for them holds true for humans. Some, like mice, are used primarily because they're inexpensive and easy to handle. None are used with true consideration for their suffering. A prime example is the rabbit. Bunnies are generally silent with unchanging facial expressions, so it's easy for researchers to be unaware of their distress and avoid possible pangs of conscience over what they're doing to them. People think their silence makes them unreadable but bunnies communicate constantly. People must have renounced all natural intelligence to dare to advance that animals are but animated machines. Attentively observing the character of animals and distinguishing among them the different voices of need, suffering, joy, pain, love, anger, and of all their affections. It would be strange that they should express so well what they could not feel. ~Voltaire, <i>Traité sur la tolerance</i>
RESPONSEID_73606338_b 5834fb8d4529fa4- 0F2B2791-5056-9439- 7EE097DEBDB62A3A	02:08.1	David Forjan	(Submitter left answer blank)	Please consult your con-science, and commune with God a little too, and just stop using animals in any experiments whatsoever, please.
RESPONSEID_73606268_a 87c44018ad1c379- 0F250C83-5056-9439- 7E1A97375CFB6B8F	01:30.2	Phillip Mitche;;	(Submitter left answer blank)	I strongly support the discontinuance of any animal testing. Thank you.
RESPONSEID_73605851_3 93ac2f20cd30e94- 0EFC1F1C-5056-9439- 7EF49C19E6EF7F71	58:51.0	Susan Querze	(Submitter left answer blank)	It is the right thing to do

RESPONSEID_73605674_5 7c14945a5318325- 0EE951FF-5056-9439- 7E334282ACF9E924	56:11.5	doug krause	(Submitter left answer blank)	we have no right to USE animals to suit out needs. Stop all forms of research and testing on all animals please!
RESPONSEID_73605430_1 18decc001d598ad- 0ED67992-5056-9439- 7EAC131157C5B496	55:26.8	mgarie	(Submitter left answer blank)	There are alternatives to using live animals for experimentation. The callous, cruelty in using defenseless animals, some for decades is monstrous. Please do all you can to release these captives into sanctuary.
RESPONSEID_73605604_e 28f428dd3f17763- 0EE43BC7-5056-9439- 7E5232E67E849301	54:30.9	Marilyn Overton	(Submitter left answer blank)	All animals, in all environments, must be treated with care and kindness. It is the humane thing to do, and we owe it to our fellow inhabitants of this planet. Thank you.
RESPONSEID_73605732_d f06f58fadea030c- 0EEE4D22-5056-9439- 7EBF7A0E924A6306	54:24.7	Debby Baker	(Submitter left answer blank)	PLEASE. JUST PLEASE.
RESPONSEID_73605056_8 cdd1f6244de3adc- 0EAEC489-5056-9439- 7E54E30878A60B8E	52:25.0	Nicole Weber	(Submitter left answer blank)	I appreciate that NIH is conducting a workshop on responsible oversight of non-human primate research, but I am concerned that the draft agenda does not appear to include how non-animal alternatives can replace primate use, nor address the need for better monitoring and defining of primate psychological well-being. The scientific efficacy of non-animal alternatives has been demonstrated in varied and multiple areas of research in which primates are used. The draft agenda, however, does not position such new technologies and areas of research for discussion. Please put it on the agenda.

<p>RESPONSEID_73604495_e 059ae6dd03065f1- 0E78A14E-5056-9439- 7E2F279242570FF0</p>	<p>49:19.9</p>	<p>Dr. Kevin Boileau, PhD, PhD, JD/LLM</p>	<p>Executive Director at BCS Science, EPIS Psychoanalytic Institute, 3RZ Design Research</p>	<p>It is imperative that you phase our ALL testing on animals, or you have the very same testing protocols with all primates, including human primates. It has been proven over and over again that our primate cousins have the same capacities to suffer as humans do, the same autonomy, and the same freedom in how they conduct their lives. Even IF you attained important data from non-human primates, it is not morally justifiable that you do so. I have read all the research protocols, and the basis for justification is a specious use of utilitarianism because of your deep assumption of ontological disparity between humans and other primates. This begs the question about value and unfairly distorts any real utilitarian analysis. Instead, you should be using a Kantian analysis that includes all primates. The second issue is your blatant disregard for the development of non-animal model testing, which has many cost-effective and practical benefits. Because you do not put these items on the agenda, it once again looks like you are pandering to capitalist interests. It also looks like your committee is incapable of critical thinking, which would obviously include the items I present. Dr. Boileau.</p>
<p>RESPONSEID_73604046_4 b8fc5b065e6233d- 0E445EF5-5056-9439- 7E55FE799E8895AA</p>	<p>49:00.9</p>	<p>Alex Walsh</p>	<p>none</p>	<p>Dear NIH, At the 9 a.m. Opening Remarks at the workshop, can you give the background as to why the U.S. Congress requested that the NIH do a primate ethics review? Can you read the specific text from the U.S. House Appropriations Bill which is found on page 72? Here is the link http://appropriations.house.gov/uploadedfiles/hrpt-114-hr-fy2016-laborhhsed.pdf This link is also found on the announcement page for workshop. Also, please provide a copy of page 72 to each panelist. This is important because it will give the panelists a comprehensive understanding of this primate ethics workshop. Thank you.</p>

RESPONSEID_73603366_7 a3b2ed7329c706d- 0E0B8F80-5056-9439- 7E8842CBBECAEAA5	46:43.9	Jodie Zupancic	(Submitter left answer blank)	Animals should not be tested as this day and age of computers and everything else "smart" there is no need to continue an antiquated form of testing which is no better than medieval torture. To hook up another animal against their will and poke and dissect based on curiosity is a poor way to show advancement. There are models and computer generation that can explore cures and scientific methods without harming any non human creatures at all. To live a life no more than a test tube under a Petrie dish does nothing for evolution. Enough with the torture and stop caging creatures solely for entertainment of your need to satisfy control. This horror ending in euthanasia is no more than an excuse not to have human trials to find a way for a real cure with people who want to try other methods.
RESPONSEID_73604988_6 9ab2b45a173154b- 0EA581BD-5056-9439- 7EBDA6AF00905C67	46:32.9	carrie west	(Submitter left answer blank)	n

RESPONSEID_73604775_e 291652bf00278bd- 0E921180-5056-9439- 7E2080729E1B9979	46:01.7	Teresa Iovino	<i>(Submitter left answer blank)</i>	<p>I appreciate that NIH is conducting a workshop on responsible oversight of non-human primate research, but are concerned that the draft agenda does not appear to include how non-animal alternatives can replace primate use, nor address the need for better monitoring and defining of primate psychological well-being. The scientific efficacy of non-animal alternatives has been demonstrated in varied and multiple areas of research in which primates are used. The draft agenda, however, does not position such new technologies and areas of research for discussion. Additionally, we see no mention of stress effects on primates, from a welfare or research perspective. NEAVS submitted a Petition for Rulemaking in an effort to require that the USDA measurably define psychological well-being in primates. Though given some consideration in the AWA, the matter is largely treated as an afterthought by the USDA and—given its glaring absence on this agenda—also by the NIH. We understand this agenda is a draft, and hope the final version acknowledges the areas of concern highlighted here. If not, the workshop promises to be only an opportunity for those vested in primate use to continue their own agenda. NIH is mandated to look at emerging science and respect the public’s growing opposition to animal use. We trust NIH will remember the outcome of the IOM’s Chimpanzees in Biomedical and Behavioral Research: Assessing the Necessity, which, with data-backed science and rightful infusions of ethics, formed a cornerstone in the long overdue ending of chimpanzee use in the U.S.A.</p>
--	---------	---------------	--	---

RESPONSEID_73602487_9 6f71e9fa50de315- ODBE894B-5056-9439- 7E48CD43C8701212	45:48.7	Diane Kent	(Submitter left answer blank)	Technology is far more advanced today and humans are extremely aware of the horrific impact on animals that continued testing is no longer required or acceptable. When reviewing this option, you as individuals, have a moral obligation to protect all life. Put yourselves in the animals place and then determine what the right course of action should be.
RESPONSEID_73603549_f 245f684939b3e2e- 0E1AD147-5056-9439- 7E5541F42D4CC2A5	45:35.3	Reverend Jane Eagle	(Submitter left answer blank)	Experimenting on animals is outmoded. Animals, even chimpanzees who are so genetically close to humans, have different reactions to procedures and medications that we do. I must see 10 commercials every day for class action law suits against medications and procedures that were tested on animals with success, but proved extremely detrimental or fatal to humans. I am sure that you must know that computer modeling is far more accurate, and so should be utilized instead of torturing animals. I frequently read of laboratories that "experiment" aka torture animals for huge sums of grant money. This is not only unconscionable, but evil. People who enjoy torturing and killing animals are mentally ill and should be securely locked away from decent people and all living beings until they regain their health. There is no excuse for this kind of 18th century "science".
RESPONSEID_73604691_d 3cc88244c09cf76- 0E8A990B-5056-9439- 7E96FC8DEB433AF4	44:46.4	Kevin Treine	(Submitter left answer blank)	To put non-human primates in cages is the highest form of cruelty. We used to be cutting edge in America. Stop holding us back.

<p>RESPONSEID_73603239_e 04cee227a2ecff2- ODFECE91-5056-9439- 7EFC22CFFCE0D114</p>	<p>44:20.7</p>	<p>Jordan Glass</p>	<p>(Submitter left answer blank)</p>	<p>I am admittedly speechless that in this age of alternatives that animals -- mammals or otherwise, but particularly primates, are still used in research. There was a time that we did not have the technology, wisdom, knowledge or empathy to understand what violations we were committing, but that time has passed. In each generation, and sometimes more quickly, we learn tolerance and compassion for some previously unconsidered group. Once we endorsed slavery. Women could not vote. Miscegenation was once "a thing." LGBTQIUA's were pariahs. We learned, but always too late to right the wrongs for millions. We continue to violate the environment, dishonor the native Americans, and ignore our lack of knowledge because it doesn't create pain directly to our own immediate families. It is time to set an agenda by which all living things are treated with respect, for what we don't know about consciousness today might become tomorrow's awareness. Once the world was flat, there were no other galaxies, and 99% of DNA was garbage. Today we know better. Think of what we will know tomorrow. We can afford to err on the side of compassion, and it's high time that we do so. The world will thank us in ways we can not yet foresee. Consider it a new form of exploration: what happens if we explore the world of compassion? I don't pretend to know. But let's find out together.</p>
<p>RESPONSEID_73604059_f 75ec48856912a50- 0E45D0EA-5056-9439- 7E114C21DB55C4A4</p>	<p>44:17.4</p>	<p>Paul Fortin</p>	<p>(Submitter left answer blank)</p>	<p>It is time to stop tests on all primates. The tests are generally misleading, cause much suffering and are generally a waste of tax dollars. If your scientists want something useful to do, have them figure out ways to test without using animals. Or at least get them to learn about and use all the wonderful non animal tests that already exist. To not do so is criminal and cruel.</p>

RESPONSEID_73604162_1 0c3a0d88489a284- 0E5238C1-5056-9439- 7E80CC522D095541	42:42.2	Vincent J Hardt	(Submitter left answer blank)	Please consider and provide information in the workshop on non-animal alternatives to research conducted on animals. Please consider the effects of psychological stress as well as physical injury or change to the subject animals. Please include provisions for the safe retirement of healthy animals to sanctuaries after use in non-lethal research.
RESPONSEID_73604412_b fb4437fe269eb92- 0E6FE926-5056-9439- 7EC0708BD95C0EA0	42:09.0	Lindy Morrow	(Submitter left answer blank)	research on animals must stop, if you can hurt or be cruel to an animal, you don't have a heart
RESPONSEID_73604155_2 4594e36bbc0e7dc- 0E516298-5056-9439- 7EE9478CB1297087	41:53.6	Pam Wilbourn	(Submitter left answer blank)	Please consider that animals have rights to enjoy GODS EARTH as we do.GOD PLEASE BLESS AND PROTECT YOUR MOST INNOCENTS,YOUR ANIMALS,AND HOLD THOSE ACCOUNTABLE FOR THEIR HORRIFIC ACTIONS!
RESPONSEID_73602609_7 56c12e7598c0c8e- 0DC7F67F-5056-9439- 7E80BAE4BBA356AE	41:42.7	Karen Redd	(Submitter left answer blank)	In my opinion the ones who are 'non human' are the absolutely cold and heartless people who sadly cause the inhumane suffering of the poor, poor animals who feel pain just like we do. Like what I heard on a natural medical show where they have drug studies on wound healing on them. The thought of the wounds being caused by humans is... incomprehensible to me. In my opinion it seems that the only kind of person who could do this has the sick, demented, devious mind of a vicious serial killer that can't wait to come out. They're just like us and who do we think we are to torture them? I can't stand the thought of their suffering- DEAR GOD PLEASE PLEASE BLESS THEM AND EASE THEM OF THEIR SUFFERING. Please?

RESPONSEID_73603626_5 e0e480ffbca0ef6- 0E22378F-5056-9439- 7E9C40E45EF8DA0A	41:28.9	Anne Bar	(Submitter left answer blank)	I appreciate that NIH is conducting a workshop on responsible oversight of non-human primate research, but I'm concerned that the draft agenda does not appear to include how non-animal alternatives can replace primate use, nor address the need for better monitoring and defining of primate psychological well-being. The scientific efficacy of non-animal alternatives has been demonstrated in varied and multiple areas of research in which primates are used. The draft agenda, however, does not position such new technologies and areas of research for discussion. Additionally, I see no mention of stress effects on primates, from a welfare or research perspective. I understand this agenda is a draft, and hope the final version acknowledges the areas of concern highlighted here. If not, the workshop promises to be only an opportunity for those vested in primate use to continue their own agenda. NIH is mandated to look at emerging science and respect the public's growing opposition to animal use. I trust NIH will remember the outcome of the IOM's Chimpanzees in Biomedical and Behavioral Research: Assessing the Necessity, which, with data-backed science and rightful infusions of ethics, formed a cornerstone in the long overdue ending of chimpanzee use in the U.S.
--	---------	----------	---------------------------------	--

RESPONSEID_73604397_7 9b26b0cf1da76e6- 0E6E0A8C-5056-9439- 7E9FD2F290DBF7D5	41:15.7	Will Foster	<i>(Submitter left answer blank)</i>	<p>“We appreciate that NIH is conducting a workshop on responsible oversight of non-human primate research, but are concerned that the draft agenda does not appear to include how non-animal alternatives can replace primate use, nor address the need for better monitoring and defining of primate psychological well-being. The scientific efficacy of non-animal alternatives has been demonstrated in varied and multiple areas of research in which primates are used. The draft agenda, however, does not position such new technologies and areas of research for discussion. Additionally, we see no mention of stress effects on primates, from a welfare or research perspective. NEAVS submitted a Petition for Rulemaking in an effort to require that the USDA measurably define psychological well-being in primates. Though given some consideration in the AWA, the matter is largely treated as an afterthought by the USDA and—given its glaring absence on this agenda—also by the NIH. We understand this agenda is a draft, and hope the final version acknowledges the areas of concern highlighted here. If not, the workshop promises to be only an opportunity for those vested in primate use to continue their own agenda. NIH is mandated to look at emerging science and respect the public’s growing opposition to animal use. We trust NIH will remember the outcome of the IOM’s Chimpanzees in Biomedical and Behavioral Research: Assessing the Necessity, which, with data-backed science and rightful infusions of ethics, formed a cornerstone in the long overdue ending of chimpanzee use in the U.S.”</p>
--	---------	-------------	--	--

RESPONSEID_73602697_2 837e23f585cb218- 0DCF694B-5056-9439- 7EA83DF52121C7F0	40:44.6	Iris Rochkind	(Submitter left answer blank)	Testing on any animals are wrong and morally unacceptable. There are so many alternatives to testing to advance disease and treatment controls animals no longer need to be disregarded like an old sock. If advancement is needed there are trials that should be using humans as they have been given the right to consent where other animals have their decisions made and their lives destroyed. Animal testing is a form of human empowerment and gives dominion over creatures who should be helped AND not poked and prodded and euthanized in the name of science. This is just an attempt to justify the means by a sadistic cause.
RESPONSEID_73602030_c 460bace9a33dc6e- 0D96DDD7-5056-9439- 7E1B491856486DE3	37:09.1	Gaye Georges	(Submitter left answer blank)	The non-human primates should not be experimented on. Especially with all the redundancy that NIH supports. As a matter of fact - all animals should not be used in these awful horrible experiments that do not benefit mankind.
RESPONSEID_73603882_d 45908ccff390eee- 0E3492A2-5056-9439- 7E91F4C15406999D	36:48.9	Stacey McRae	(Submitter left answer blank)	FREE THE PRIMATES TO A SANCTUARY!

RESPONSEID_73603993_2 c60f3b40a5c7ea0- 0E3E63C5-5056-9439- 7E395E9BF7289CC1	35:59.5	Christina Hawthorne	<i>(Submitter left answer blank)</i>	<p>“We appreciate that NIH is conducting a workshop on responsible oversight of non-human primate research, but are concerned that the draft agenda does not appear to include how non-animal alternatives can replace primate use, nor address the need for better monitoring and defining of primate psychological well-being. The scientific efficacy of non-animal alternatives has been demonstrated in varied and multiple areas of research in which primates are used. The draft agenda, however, does not position such new technologies and areas of research for discussion. Additionally, we see no mention of stress effects on primates, from a welfare or research perspective. NEAVS submitted a Petition for Rulemaking in an effort to require that the USDA measurably define psychological well-being in primates. Though given some consideration in the AWA, the matter is largely treated as an afterthought by the USDA and—given its glaring absence on this agenda—also by the NIH. We understand this agenda is a draft, and hope the final version acknowledges the areas of concern highlighted here. If not, the workshop promises to be only an opportunity for those vested in primate use to continue their own agenda. NIH is mandated to look at emerging science and respect the public’s growing opposition to animal use. We trust NIH will remember the outcome of the IOM’s Chimpanzees in Biomedical and Behavioral Research: Assessing the Necessity, which, with data-backed science and rightful infusions of ethics, formed a cornerstone in the long overdue ending of chimpanzee use in the U.S.”</p>
--	---------	------------------------	--	--

RESPONSEID_73603301_d e988773bb1e82d8- 0E04E07E-5056-9439- 7E0CC4ED49D8383B	35:44.7	Martha W D Bushnell	(Submitter left answer blank)	It is time to stop using non-human primates in research. Non-human primates have the sensitivities similar to ourselves, but they can not consent to any research for they can not communicate with us without considerable education. Therefore, we must stop using non-human primates in research.
RESPONSEID_73603490_ff c6791ca331d2d1- 0E16ACCB-5056-9439- 7EA3CE53B51ABDDA	32:10.0	Ursela Rabe	(Submitter left answer blank)	In suffering all animals are our equal.
RESPONSEID_73603448_7 7231373714787f0- 0E134885-5056-9439- 7EE0158246F0041A	31:36.6	Ellen Dorfman	(Submitter left answer blank)	primates are NOT ours to torture and /or murder to test things on. The best way to test things on humans is on humans. Plenty of people who are rapists and murderers if you want to test on them. Stop the insanity and cruelty with MY taxpayer dollars. Yes even if some drugs dont get produced that is fine with me. NIH is funded with taxpayer dollars we have the right to say stop this insanity with our money
RESPONSEID_73602980_f 35cfb229e5787c8- 0DE78E7C-5056-9439- 7EABD35D0B8F201F	30:26.4	robert dowling	(Submitter left answer blank)	with a technological world all around us 24/7/365, using any animal for research, eperiments, etc. is totally not our right. where in any form of communication is it noted we have the right to dictate the lives of any animal-only nature has that right in the daily being of each individual animal.

RESPONSEID_73602506_b 839ff77780885ed- ODC07D0D-5056-9439- 7E9BE82376777B11	29:35.7	Ana Roca	(Submitter left answer blank)	There is something we call ethics. There is also humanity and morality. The use of animals by this agency has been none of the above. We do not have the tight to infringe harm and death to defenseless animals who suffer pain and trauma just like we do. It has also been shown that animal experiments are most often unnecessary and offer incorrect results. Why this cruelty? Please stop using animals for needless and often useless experiments. We have no right. It is wrong. There are other methods that have been shown can be used. Improve your image also. Give these animals their life back, send them to a sanctuary. Thank them, provide for them. You have MY tax dollars and I don't want them used to hurt animals. Thank you
RESPONSEID_73601720_d d9f7dc6b38a14f0- OD83826C-5056-9439- 7E57602716770AFC	26:58.5	Patricia Giurleo	(Submitter left answer blank)	I disagree with testing on any non human sentient beings, especially primates.
RESPONSEID_73601950_3 3993fd1579622c5- OD901838-5056-9439- 7E9C9850B911B1E5	25:55.3	Danielle Spitz	(Submitter left answer blank)	It is noteworthy that the draft agenda does not appear to include how non-animal alternatives can replace primate use. The scientific efficacy of non-animal alternatives has been repeatedly demonstrated in varied and multiple areas of research in which primates are used. Additionally, it is imperative that the need for better monitoring and defining of primate psychological well-being is addressed. There is no mention of stress effects on primates, from a welfare or research perspective. These areas should be included in the agenda.
RESPONSEID_73602461_5 8e4d7e588b6a312- ODBD759B-5056-9439- 7ED31A778B5A446F	25:54.4	Mika Stickford	(Submitter left answer blank)	The successful use of non-animal alternatives has been demonstrated in varied and multiple areas of research in which primates are used. I strongly urge you to evolve your work to this level of advancement and compassion. Thank you.

RESPONSEID_73602701_8 3a846a544022048- 0DCFAA4A-5056-9439- 7EE5C6182A79DDA0	25:22.2	Armella Feil	(Submitter left answer blank)	Please stop using all animals for testing! The cruelty must be stopped!
RESPONSEID_73602834_5 6b5447bfcdf8138- 0DDB4554-5056-9439- 7E447E1CB4CEFFA5	24:45.9	Anita Faulkner	(Submitter left answer blank)	
RESPONSEID_73602193_1 9e96fcc95fce31- 0DA607AA-5056-9439- 7E428565C41ADB93	24:34.6	Antoinette Ambrosio	(Submitter left answer blank)	Using animals in experiments is inhumane. Why not request masochistic humans, I'm sure there will be many volunteers. Antoinette Ambrosio
RESPONSEID_73601997_a c8ef8194ee64f10- 0D93E440-5056-9439- 7EEBA725086A8A17	24:32.8	Belinda Dodd	(Submitter left answer blank)	There is nothing ethical, humane, or justified in taking any living non-human primate from its' natural environment, and way of life for the use of human research. I believe that this practice of using non-humans in research is nothing short of unconscionable criminal behavior.
RESPONSEID_73602673_7 ed230abd91f3d17- 0DCD9767-5056-9439- 7EAF34D4ACF1BBB9	23:10.2	Kristine Dove	(Submitter left answer blank)	.
RESPONSEID_73602541_6 1a42ae318e64488- 0DC320F0-5056-9439- 7ED5331696EDE49C	22:25.4	Virginia Collins	(Submitter left answer blank)	People are animals too, let us do ALL we can to save ALL animals from needless torture, and certain early death!!!

RESPONSEID_73602490_d 565299f3f511a00- 0DBEB653-5056-9439- 7E086874E5A14A8B	21:51.3	Leslie Just	<i>(Submitter left answer blank)</i>	<p>We appreciate that NIH is conducting a workshop on responsible oversight of non-human primate research, but are concerned that the draft agenda does not appear to include how non-animal alternatives can replace primate use, nor address the need for better monitoring and defining of primate psychological well-being. The scientific efficacy of non-animal alternatives has been demonstrated in varied and multiple areas of research in which primates are used. The draft agenda, however, does not position such new technologies and areas of research for discussion. Additionally, we see no mention of stress effects on primates, from a welfare or research perspective. NEAVS submitted a Petition for Rulemaking in an effort to require that the USDA measurably define psychological well-being in primates. Though given some consideration in the AWA, the matter is largely treated as an afterthought by the USDA and—given its glaring absence on this agenda—also by the NIH. We understand this agenda is a draft, and hope the final version acknowledges the areas of concern highlighted here. If not, the workshop promises to be only an opportunity for those vested in primate use to continue their own agenda. NIH is mandated to look at emerging science and respect the public’s growing opposition to animal use. We trust NIH will remember the outcome of the IOM’s Chimpanzees in Biomedical and Behavioral Research: Assessing the Necessity, which, with data-backed science and rightful infusions of ethics, formed a cornerstone in the long overdue ending of chimpanzee use in the U.S.”</p>
RESPONSEID_73602457_f 334f9a0df600162- 0DBD3EDA-5056-9439- 7EEB5EAD3F4F4AC9	21:43.3	Dr. Douglas E. Johnston, Jr.	<i>(Submitter left answer blank)</i>	Humans are to be good stewards of all animals.

RESPONSEID_73602249_8 ce95a29fd57b17- 0DAB10F9-5056-9439- 7E09D895E3513A10	21:25.1	Sharon Baron	<i>(Submitter left answer blank)</i>	The day and age is here where specificity is necessary for any reliable research. That includes NON primate research. There have been inventions of other means to obtain real results without interference from species unrelated.
RESPONSEID_73602086_7 0494daa419e6bd- 0D9C5C7A-5056-9439- 7E9DC4A9F2A8521B	20:30.7	Timothy Dunn	<i>(Submitter left answer blank)</i>	I appreciate that NIH is conducting a workshop on responsible oversight of non-human primate research, but I am concerned that the draft agenda does not appear to include how non-animal alternatives can replace primate use, nor the need for better monitoring and defining of primate psychological well-being. The scientific efficacy of non-animal alternatives has been demonstrated in varied and multiple areas of research in which primates are used. The draft agenda, however, does not position such new technologies and areas of research for discussion. Additionally, we see no mention of stress effects on primates, from a welfare or research perspective. NEAVS submitted a Petition for Rulemaking in an effort to require that the USDA measurably define psychological well-being in primates. Though given some consideration in the AWA, the matter is largely treated as an afterthought by the USDA and—given its glaring absence on this agenda—also by the NIH. We understand this agenda is a draft, and hope the final version acknowledges the areas of concern highlighted here. If not, the workshop promises to be only an opportunity for those vested in primate use to continue their own agenda. NIH is mandated to look at emerging science and respect the public’s growing opposition to animal use. We trust NIH will remember the outcome of the IOM’s Chimpanzees in Biomedical and Behavioral Research: Assessing the Necessity, which, with data-backed science and rightful infusions of ethics, formed a cornerstone in the long overdue ending of chimpanzee use in the U.S.

RESPONSEID_73601972_1 5aa50fe8a688dbf- 0D914B46-5056-9439- 7E744B7C39B1ADC4	20:29.2	V.L. Brandt	<i>(Submitter left answer blank)</i>	<p>I am concerned that the draft agenda does not allow the possibility of non-animal alternatives to replace primate use, nor address the need to better define and maintain primate psychological well-being. The scientific efficacy of non-animal alternatives has been demonstrated in numerous areas of research in which primates are used. The draft agenda, however, does not position such new technologies and areas of research for discussion. I also see no mention of stress effects on primates, from a welfare or research perspective. Though given some consideration in the AWA, the matter is largely treated as an afterthought by the USDA and—given its glaring absence on this agenda—also by the NIH. I understand this agenda is a draft and hope the final version acknowledges the areas of concern highlighted here. If not, the workshop will be only an opportunity for those vested in primate use to continue it. The NIH is mandated to look at emerging science and respect the public’s growing opposition to animal use. We trust NIH will remember the outcome of the IOM’s Chimpanzees in Biomedical and Behavioral Research: Assessing the Necessity, which, with data-backed science and rightful infusions of ethics, formed a cornerstone in the long overdue ending of chimpanzee use in the U.S.</p>
--	---------	-------------	--	---

<p>RESPONSEID_73602146_1 2734b5fc305316e- 0DA1CE97-5056-9439- 7E0014F67AB20F08</p>	<p>20:27.1</p>	<p>Monique Biglia</p>	<p>(Submitter left answer blank)</p>	<p>I appreciate that NIH is conducting a workshop on responsible oversight of non-human primate research, but are concerned that the draft agenda does not appear to include how non-animal alternatives can replace primate use, nor address the need for better monitoring and defining of primate psychological well-being. The scientific efficacy of non-animal alternatives has been demonstrated in varied and multiple areas of research in which primates are used. The draft agenda, however, does not position such new technologies and areas of research for discussion. Additionally, we see no mention of stress effects on primates, from a welfare or research perspective. NEAVS submitted a Petition for Rulemaking in an effort to require that the USDA measurably define psychological well-being in primates. Though given some consideration in the AWA, the matter is largely treated as an afterthought by the USDA and—given its glaring absence on this agenda—also by the NIH. We understand this agenda is a draft, and hope the final version acknowledges the areas of concern highlighted here. If not, the workshop promises to be only an opportunity for those vested in primate use to continue their own agenda. NIH is mandated to look at emerging science and respect the public’s growing opposition to animal use. We trust NIH will remember the outcome of the IOM’s Chimpanzees in Biomedical and Behavioral Research: Assessing the Necessity, which, with data-backed science and rightful infusions of ethics, formed a cornerstone in the long overdue ending of chimpanzee use in the U.S.”</p>
<p>RESPONSEID_73601877_4 3569660b4c51506- 0D8CB3E8-5056-9439- 7E1691E029C3B1BA</p>	<p>20:26.0</p>	<p>siegrid berman</p>	<p>(Submitter left answer blank)</p>	<p>HAVE ANY OF THE PEOPLE WHO DO THE EXPERIMENTS CONSIDERED WHAT IT WOULD TAKE FOR THEM TO DO THE EXPERIMENTS ON THEIR 2 YEAR OLD CHILDREN? THE PRIMATES THEY EXPERIMENT ON DON'T UNDERSTAND WHY THEY ALWAYS GET PAIN..... DO YOU?</p>

RESPONSEID_73602262_3 2f7fe1a62947b10- 0DAC8F64-5056-9439- 7E4C51E6E62D87FC	20:07.5	Anne LaBouy	(Submitter left answer blank)	It's time to stop using animals for testing!!!!!!
RESPONSEID_73602286_7 4fc09a4418f7ddd- 0DAF9CB3-5056-9439- 7E197C3076F08546	20:03.2	Phyl Morello	(Submitter left answer blank)	NO NO NO USING ANY ANIMAL FOR RESEARCH/EXPERIMENTS/TESTING! NEVER AGAIN!

RESPONSEID_73602207_a 1341c780a7c6324- ODA76FF1-5056-9439- 7E04541C91D0E5D5	19:38.4	summer marasco	<i>(Submitter left answer blank)</i>	<p>We appreciate that NIH is conducting a workshop on responsible oversight of non-human primate research, but are concerned that the draft agenda does not appear to include how non-animal alternatives can replace primate use, nor address the need for better monitoring and defining of primate psychological well-being. The scientific efficacy of non-animal alternatives has been demonstrated in varied and multiple areas of research in which primates are used. The draft agenda, however, does not position such new technologies and areas of research for discussion. Additionally, we see no mention of stress effects on primates, from a welfare or research perspective. NEAVS submitted a Petition for Rulemaking in an effort to require that the USDA measurably define psychological well-being in primates. Though given some consideration in the AWA, the matter is largely treated as an afterthought by the USDA and—given its glaring absence on this agenda—also by the NIH. We understand this agenda is a draft, and hope the final version acknowledges the areas of concern highlighted here. If not, the workshop promises to be only an opportunity for those vested in primate use to continue their own agenda. NIH is mandated to look at emerging science and respect the public’s growing opposition to animal use. We trust NIH will remember the outcome of the IOM’s Chimpanzees in Biomedical and Behavioral Research: Assessing the Necessity, which, with data-backed science and rightful infusions of ethics, formed a cornerstone in the long overdue ending of chimpanzee use in the U.S.</p>
--	---------	----------------	--	--

RESPONSEID_73601882_5 ecd6bf39f2e6860- 0D8D407F-5056-9439- 7E5B80AF9E0A67A4	18:59.6	Deb Brown	(Submitter left answer blank)	Please address how non-animal alternatives can replace primate use, and address the need for better monitoring and defining of primate psychological well-being. Thank you. "Mankind's true moral test, its fundamental test (which lies deeply buried from view), consists of its attitude towards those who are at its mercy: animals." --Milan Kundera "There is little that separates humans from other sentient beings - we all feel pain, we all feel joy, we all deeply crave to be alive and live freely, and we all share this planet together." "The greatness of a nation and its moral progress can be judged by the way its animals are treated." -- Gandhi
RESPONSEID_73602060_5 8eb616c12a65f6f- 0D99944E-5056-9439- 7EEE5F0C7AFB0963	18:36.7	kelly byrnes	(Submitter left answer blank)	please end the use of all non-human primates in unnecessary, inhumane and unscientific research and testing. thanks you
RESPONSEID_73601740_1 93cb15925aa3fad- 0D85A4A6-5056-9439- 7EEBF7B29B8B77EA	18:04.4	Sandra Iseman	(Submitter left answer blank)	I am appreciative that NIH is conducting a workshop on the responsible oversight of non-human primate research, but I am gravely concerned that the draft agenda does not appear to include how non-animal alternatives can replace primate use, nor address the need for better monitoring and defining of primate psychological well-being. The scientific efficacy of non-animal alternatives has been demonstrated in varied and multiple areas of research in which primates are used. The draft agenda, however, does not position such new technologies and areas of research for discussion. Additionally, I see no mention of stress effects on primates, from a welfare or research perspective. Please act with humanity, compassion, and a scientific diplomacy -- animal testing is unnecessary and faulty. Please move towards sustainable, reliable, and non-cruel research, exclude animals from your research now. Thank you,

RESPONSEID_73601711_6 4a1963c0e7e148- 0D82E7F9-5056-9439- 7E6C6B02C862DOCA	14:39.6	Kat Raisky	(Submitter left answer blank)	This has to stop....
RESPONSEID_73594124_3 befe8e3f4103f51- 0B092264-5056-9439- 7E769B6ECA127D6A	12:59.8	Cathy Schroeder	(Submitter left answer blank)	Having read the proposed agenda for the upcoming workshop, I feel it is clearly biased toward maintaining the status quo with regard to animal testing. Please include topics that explore alternatives and the drawbacks to using animal testing. Otherwise, this workshop appears to be nothing but theatre, with the goal of justifying the current methods and level of animal use. Thank you for this opportunity to provide input.
RESPONSEID_73551887_3 e880bfc398eaa92- FFB9C1F1-5056-9439- 7E1B412457006F09	49:04.1	William McMullin	(Submitter left answer blank)	I'm disappointed that the current draft agenda for the upcoming NIH workshop on primate experiments doesn't appear to address real concerns about practices related to the use of primates in NIH-funded projects. As you know, members of Congress asked NIH to carry out an ethical review of experiments on primates after PETA exposed a series of cruel maternal deprivation and psychopathology experiments on infant monkeys--which the agency had conducted for more than 30 years. It's abundantly clear that current oversight protocols are not sufficient to protect nonhuman primates in laboratories. I believe that the criteria defined by the Institute of Medicine (IOM) as new oversight measures for experiments on chimpanzees would be a good starting point for a discussion on the ethics of experiments on other nonhuman primates--and I ask that the agenda for the September 7 meeting be revised to focus on ways to apply the IOM criteria to all nonhuman primates. The workshop should help ensure that rules governing the use of primates in experimentation are updated to reflect current science on animal welfare, research translation, and non-animal methods.

<p>RESPONSEID_73549584_e 7163c8cdcc3f202- FEEC316A-5056-9439- 7E7590CD8391B22B</p>	<p>29:32.5</p>	<p>Andrew Fenton, PhD</p>	<p>Assistant Professor (Bioethicist), Dalhousie University and Fresno State University</p>	<p>Some conscientious animal researchers explicitly advocate securing the cooperation of cognitively and socially complex animals when using them in research (e.g., Berns et al 2012; Matsuzawa 2006). In 2013, the NIH officially accepted most of the recommendations of an independent advisory council regarding chimpanzees used in NIH-funded research. This included only using acquiescent chimpanzees in comparative genomic and behavioral research (Altevogt et al 2011). What's more, there is good evidence that cooperative animals make for less stressed out research subjects, and stress is a known confounder in animal research (Coleman 2010). There is no morally significant difference between the dogs discussed by Berns et al, or the chimpanzees discussed by Matsuzawa and Altevogt et al, and such nonhuman primates as baboons, macaques, or marmosets. The NIH should ensure that, moving forward, the cooperation of nonhuman primates is required when using them in NIH-funded research. Altevogt, B.M., Pankevich, D.E., Shelton-Davenport, M.K., and Kahn, J.P. Chimpanzees in biomedical and behavioral research: assessing the necessity. Washington, D.C.: National Academies Press, 2011. Berns, G.S., Brooks, A.M., and Spivak, M. Functional MRI in Awake Unrestrained Dogs. PLoS One 2012; 7(5): 1-7. Coleman, K. Caring for Nonhuman Primates in Biomedical Research Facilities: Scientific, Moral and Emotional Considerations. American Journal of Primatology 2010; 71: 1-6. Matsuzawa, T. Sociocognitive Development in Chimpanzees: A Synthesis of Laboratory Work and Fieldwork. In Cognitive Development in Chimpanzees. Matsuzawa, T., Tomonaga, M., and Tanaka, M., eds. Tokyo: Springer-Verlag Tokyo, 2006: 3-33.</p>
--	----------------	-------------------------------	--	---

RESPONSEID_73541200_e 1f7b22a23753686- FB9E8473-5056-9439- 7E83839DB87C5009	59:03.1	Nathan Nobis	Associate Professor of Philosophy, Morehouse College, Atlanta, GA	I encourage you to restrict the use of primates in harmful, non-therapeutic biomedical research for the reasons that harmful, non-therapeutic biomedical research shouldn't be allowed on human beings: it is harmful to the subject of the research, it is not in their benefit - it is an attempt to "use" one for the potential benefit of another, they do not and would not consent to it, and we would not agree to it, if we saw from their perspectives. In short, every powerful reason to not allow harmful experimentation on non-consenting human beings also applies to non-human primates. Given that, research on them should , at least, be seriously restricted or, ideally, outright banned, for ethical reasons.
--	---------	--------------	--	---

<p>RESPONSEID_73533582_5 b947e480b61b1db- F9477B76-5056-9439- 7E4E1EE2E65518A5</p>	<p>57:06.5</p>	<p>Mindy Kursban</p>	<p>Physicians Committee for Responsible Medicine Board Chair</p>	<p>I urge all members of the Committee to read this opinion piece by a primate experimenter that was published in the New York Times last week, and give serious discussion to the ethical issues that exist in using primates in experimentation, regardless of the welfare measures enacted. Just as with chimps, the time is now to stop experimenting on non-human primates. http://www.nytimes.com/2016/09/04/opinion/sunday/second-thoughts-of-an-animal-researcher.html?_r=0 Albuquerque, N.M. — Five years ago, the National Institutes of Health all but ended biomedical and behavioral research on chimpanzees, concluding that, as the closest human relative, they deserved “special consideration and respect.” But chimpanzees were far from the only nonhuman primates used in research then, or now. About 70,000 other primates are still living their lives as research subjects in labs across the United States. On Wednesday, the N.I.H. will hold a workshop on “continued responsible research” with these animals. This sounds like a positive development. But as someone who spent decades working almost daily with macaque monkeys in primate research laboratories, I know firsthand that “responsible” research is not enough. What we really need to examine is the very moral ground of animal research itself. Like many researchers, I once believed that intermittent scientific gains justified methods that almost always did harm. As a graduate student in the late 1960s, I came to see that my natural recoil from intentionally harming animals was a hindrance to how I understood scientific progress. I told myself that we were being responsible by providing good nutrition, safe cages, skilled and caring caretakers and veterinarians</p>
--	----------------	----------------------	--	--

<p>RESPONSEID_73487246_6 1428538e757a831- E714A25C-5056-9439- 7EA0F861CC0BE963</p>	<p>34:47.3</p>	<p>Carol A Tavani MD, MS, DLFAPA</p>	<p>Christiana Psychiatric Services</p>	<p>As a physician (neuropsychiatrist) and scientist I am concerned about the wording in the description of this meeting. Innumerable studies have repeatedly cast doubt on the validity of research studies using nonhuman primates. Much has been phased out entirely but much continues. There are two issues which cannot be ignored. One is the validity of such studies. Increasingly the fallacy of extrapolation validity from one species to another has been shown. The Thalidomide fiasco is a stunning example. HIV and hepatitis research is another. The other issue is the ethics of such research. These are sentient beings with amazing intelligence. Their suffering has been evident time and time again. To rip away, for example, an infant from its mother in a species which in nature maintains bonds similar to those in humans for years is not only cruel but invalidates any study by virtue of the trauma and stress response involved. Thus ethics and validity become inextricably entwined. Please ensure that these matters are raised, and that the trend away from animal research continues, rather than continuation of an effort to justify what can no longer be considered conscionable. Many thanks for the opportunity to contribute my input.</p>
<p>RESPONSEID_73437157_9 9e399767702adf4- CE31C47C-5056-9439- 7ED0C10437186C3F</p>	<p>48:54.3</p>	<p>Patricia Rossi</p>	<p>Previously Military Public Health with training at Brooks AFB another home of animal abuses.</p>	<p>Don't you think you attract Sociopaths that enjoy making animals suffer in your "work"</p>

RESPONSEID_73434257_9 430e07800f0233e- CC45524E-5056-9439- 7E4461E747EF89BE	07:32.8	Charles Jennings	McGovern Institute for Brain Research at MIT	We recently published a Perspective article in Nat Neurosci in which we address several of the questions on the draft agenda. We argue that advances in transgenic technologies will create new opportunities for genetic primate models of CNS disorders, many of which have been difficult to model in rodents. The article is titled "Opportunities and challenges in modeling human brain disorders in transgenic primates" and is accessible via this link: http://rdcu.be/jX84 (see also http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/27571191)
RESPONSEID_73408014_c e63dfb2321ab668- BFCEf22C-5056-9439- 7E9AC85B49D14055	02:19.3	Ari Zivotofsky	Bar Ilan University	Dear NIH, I have been made aware of your upcoming Sept 7 Workshop on Ensuring the Continued Responsible Oversight of Research with Non-Human Primates. Please ensure a fair and balanced review of primate experiments! I have become aware the PETA and other such organizations are trying to put pressure to bias the workshop and NIH decision making. As an NIH-trained neuroscientist, I recognize both the importance of non-human primate research and of the proper treatment of animals. Please continue to maintain the balance without infringing on the all important scientific research that NIH supports.

RESPONSEID_73375099_1 ccc6eb1ad0ff5ee- B0F9BC19-5056-9439- 7E8E222345F1BFEB	10:57.5	Andy Coffin	<i>(Submitter left answer blank)</i>	<p>Recently, several forward-thinking members of Congress—who know that NIH's cruel and archaic experiments caused tremendous harm to infant monkeys and were largely irrelevant to understanding human mental illness—added language to the Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2016—a federal spending bill signed into law by President Obama—that requires the agency "to conduct a review of its ethical policies and processes" related to the use of nonhuman primates in experiments. The law asks that NIH consult "with outside experts" to ensure "appropriate justification" for using primates in experiments. The agency announced that it would be organizing a workshop on September 7, at which experts on science, policy, ethics, and animal welfare would discuss the ethics of experimenting on nonhuman primates as well as the oversight framework that governs their use. Throughout this process, PETA has called on NIH to publish the names of workshop participants and to be transparent in its organization of the workshop. However, earlier this month, NIH published a draft agenda for the workshop that appears not to comply with Congress' request. Instead, it seems to be dedicated to maintaining the status quo, explaining why experiments on monkeys must continue and propping up the false notion that current oversight practices are adequate to protect primates used in experiments. We need an honest conversation about the suffering of primates in laboratories, whether or not experiments even make sense scientifically, and the abject failure of current oversight mechanisms to ensure even minimal protections for primates in laboratories.</p>
--	---------	-------------	--	---

RESPONSEID_73370699_b 160b62d7513983b- AE6364C4-5056-9439- 7E74C67D631B2C5A	57:48.9	Nik Kulkarni, MD	(Submitter left answer blank)	<p>In 1966, Henry Beecher called attention to common ethical problems associated with human research at the time. His publication, "Ethics and Clinical Research," in the New England Journal of Medicine, helped lead to major advancements in the area of human clinical research ethics and medicine. Like Beecher was, I am an anesthesiologist. I care deeply about my patients and their potential involvement in research. I'm grateful that we have acceptable moral standards to guide the conduct of human research today. I am also concerned about the suffering of animals. Nonhuman primates are autonomous and intelligent individuals. NIH needs to better examine the ethics of using these sentient beings in research, and problems with their use, as Beecher did for human research fifty years ago. An increasing number of physicians and scientists are calling attention to problems with translating nonhuman primate research to human clinical scenarios. This has major implications for patient care. Viable, more ethical, predictive alternatives exist. NIH should focus on supporting the implementation of these alternatives, and developing other more valid and reliable human-centered research models. For humane, scientific, and medical reasons, NIH needs to move away from using nonhuman primates as non-consenting vulnerable research subjects.</p>
--	---------	------------------	---------------------------------	---

RESPONSEID_73255412_e a74f230fc63bdc2- 75B68FB2-5056-9439- 7ED675F2C007F4F0	53:44.0	Robert Hampton	(Submitter left answer blank)	What steps is the NIH taking to promote positive messages about the quality of care of nonhuman primates in research, and to correct inaccurate messages promoted by animal rights groups? Negative images and accounts of research practices are often extremely out of date and/or significant distortions of the reality of research laboratories. The public deserves accurate information. Doesn't the NIH, as a financial supporter of work with nonhuman primates, have a responsibility to ensure that the public receives accurate information?
--	---------	----------------	---------------------------------	--

<p>RESPONSEID_73224252_3 d898f9fa5396740- 690AA656-5056-9439- 7E8B47828EE64B77</p>	<p>19:53.0</p>	<p>Hope Ferdowsian, MD, MPH, FACP, FACPM</p>	<p>University of New Mexico Department of Medicine; Georgetown University School of Medicine</p>	<p>As Dr. John Gluck points out in his recent Opinion Editorial in The New York Times, in 1974, a federal commission was formed to develop ethical principles for human research. [1] In contrast, no similar, comprehensive and principled effort has addressed the use of animals in research – despite the large body of science showing how animals can suffer physically and mentally. To address this gap, Dr. Gluck, Dr. Tom Beauchamp, many other colleagues, and I worked on a multi-disciplinary National Science Foundation grant exploring the limits of existing animal research guidelines, as well as potential solutions. [2] Results were reported in multiple publications, including a special issue of Theoretical Medicine and Bioethics called Rethinking the Ethics of Research Involving Nonhuman Animals. [3] One of the articles, authored by primatologist Dr. Agustin Fuentes and myself, addressed the imbalance between the harms of research involving nonhuman primates and deprivation of benefits to them. We concluded much of the laboratory research conducted today has inadequate standards, leading to significant physical, psychological, and social harms to nonhuman primates. [4] Several other articles in the series examine how widely recognized bioethical principles could better inform decisions about the use of animals, including nonhuman primates, in research. [5] I urge you to consider factors such as these in your deliberations. Please see the following links for reference: 1. http://www.nytimes.com/2016/09/04/opinion/sunday/second-thoughts-of-an-animal-researcher.html?_r=0 2. http://www.nsf.gov/awardsearch/showAward?AWD_ID=1058186&HistoricalAwards=false 3. http://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/s11017-014-9291-7 4. http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/24627264 5. http://petrieflom.law.harvard.edu/resources/entry/special-issue-rethinking-the-ethics-of-research-involving-non-human-animals If</p>
--	----------------	--	--	---

RESPONSEID_73210278_7 b42649406b4364c- 6387CBC2-5056-9439- 7ECC9C9BFD09326A	26:54.8	Angela Dunham	(Submitter left answer blank)	There is an obvious mis-understanding of the directive from the President and from the opinions of the taxpayers that have inspired this workshop. This workshop should be targeting the elimination of primate testing, not justifying it. - What are alternatives to primate testing? - In effort to minimize primate testing, what is the experiment approval selection process? - What are the historical break-throughs? Has the benefit of the findings been significant enough to offset the pain that the primates endured? How can this information be used to agree or disagree to proposed experiments? Please review and modify the meeting agenda to target the reduction and ultimate elimination of primate testing, in lieu of the scheduled meeting that appears to have the exact opposite of the correct objective.
--	---------	---------------	---------------------------------	--

<p>RESPONSEID_73211144_7 139f79a5a883ef4- 6409CE41-5056-9439- 7E594AB01ACFEF2C</p>	<p>21:10.0</p>	<p>Mary Lawrence</p>	<p>(Submitter left answer blank)</p>	<p>A recent NYT opinion piece by John Gluck, professor emeritus of psychology at the University of New Mexico, faculty affiliate at the Kennedy Institute of Ethics, and former animal researcher, disputes the NIH claim that laboratory animals are necessary for research. He writes, "Like many researchers, I once believed that intermittent scientific gains justified methods that almost always did harm ... What did I learn from my research? ... There is no research more valuable than our own integrity and ethical coherence, and our treatment of animals is a direct reflection of our values toward life and one another." http://www.nytimes.com/2016/09/04/opinion/sunday/second-thoughts-of-an-animal-researcher.html?action=click&pgtype=Homepage&clickSource=story-heading&module=opinion-c-col-right-region&region=opinion-c-col-right-region&WT.nav=opinion-c-col-right-region&_r=0 This panel needs representation from bioethicists such as Marc Bekoff and Barbara King, and members of the animal rights community such as Steven Wise of the Non-Human Rights Project, who can speak on behalf of the animals.</p>
--	----------------	----------------------	--	--

RESPONSEID_73207775_e 00c587f7fb6054a- 624FC484-5056-9439- 7E25C4D97EF968CE	36:51.5	Kathryn Caldwell	PETA	It is clear to everyone that this "workshop" is NIH's intention to try to trick people into thinking that you are actually concerned about the welfare of the primates that you torture every minute with your so called humane experiments. You should be entirely truthful and discontinue animal experimentation altogether and let these animal live out their lives in peace at a responsible primate sanctuary. They are not needed to "seek fundamental knowledge and enhance health outcomes". That has been proven many times and animal activists in the millions will continue to educate you so-called scientists until you finally release every animal used for experimentation.
--	---------	------------------	------	--

<p>RESPONSEID_73195933_7 67704aa1c5b62e9- 5E10B9D2-5056-9439- 7E00EF08A0F82DA6</p>	<p>42:56.7</p>	<p>KM QUINN</p>	<p>(Submitter left answer blank)</p>	<p>as a 55yr old health care prof for human and animal, whos father is a DVM, i will comment that this world of experimentation is vastly changed. there are no needs as we return to natural methods, holistic and less toxic remedies, and certainly more fully conscious that labratory animals are treated cruelly and inhumanely. people are outraged, your reputation is mud, and none of it matters. for instance; even a lay person knows maternal deprivation messes anyone up. your employees behaviors set off a public awareness and it got worse from there. ive visited NIH while at georgetown decades ago, and more recently and i will honestly say, i was not impressed. i have known employees and i do NOT believe you are working with integrity. i believe the establishment is grasping at straws. stop all animal experiments. there are many safe and noninvasive methods to come up with answers. most of your answers are meaningless. the cures lie in whole health, not treating the symptoms. the compounding pharmacy field, the nutrition field, the holistic health field, is growing in leaps and bounds. this i have witnessed personally, to the extend of cancer cures with no radiation or chemo. theyve got it right. and i started out as an allopathically trained professional.</p>
<p>RESPONSEID_73186861_5 7854d260300f31c- 5B2BBB4E-5056-9439- 7E1F0E95AC8124E1</p>	<p>09:17.8</p>	<p>Laura Gery</p>	<p>(Submitter left answer blank)</p>	<p>Animal research is cruelty. With advanced computer modeling and algorithms today, there is no need for such horrors.</p>

RESPONSEID_73092724_d c76bd03c6619230- 462FB2A8-5056-9439- 7E8EE55F00944B26	44:48.0	Kristin Otero	Animal supporter	NIH has a long history of torturing animals in the name of scientific advancement. Scientists have given themselves free reign to do whatever they please to animals in order to be publish. Non-human primates are utilized in research because they are genetically like humans. You cannot claim they are so like humans in one breath and in the next justify heinous experimentation on them. Animals feel and experience pain and have the same desires to experience a life of freedom. The younger generation of scientists will not continue to allow these antiquated practices. In 100 years, animal experimentation will be as shockingly horrific as concentration camps. Frances Collins and Co will die off and be replaced by a fearless group that know that a success built on the torture of others is empty and spiritually bereft. Scientists take into account the physical but not the soul or the mind, and yes, animals have them too.
RESPONSEID_73081392_f 47be7d2e4f4ed81- 419F0D9C-5056-9439- 7EF1DC5A2683415B	16:00.1	Phil Fitzgerald	None	You have a responsibility to see that your research id ethical and necessary which I understand is not always the case. I hope you follow the mandate of Congress. Thank You, Phil Fitzgerald

RESPONSEID_73075346_2 caec6446b69d43d- 3E4E4838-5056-9439- 7E17E4E0F93B8BFA	47:31.5	Tracy Doherty	(Submitter left answer blank)	As a veterinarian, I can tell you that all animals suffer physically and psychologically when you use them in experiments that, often times, don't even have any relevance to humans. There are many more humane and accurate ways to "enhance health outcomes". By the simple fact alone of keeping such intelligent animals in a laboratory environment demonstrates that research in a laboratory setting can't be done humanely. These animals should not be subjected to such intense suffering for so little advancement. Animal experiments often end up harming humans because animals, even primates, process drugs etc. differently(vioxx, thalidomide). I ask that you stop using all animals in your experiments as it is extremely inhumane and not very scientific.
--	---------	---------------	---------------------------------	---

RESPONSEID_73056551_e aa4f524bd428004- 3815EE1D-5056-9439- 7E9A447452401274	46:07.9	L. Syd M Johnson	Michigan Technological University	<p>The mandate from Congress was for the NIH to “critically evaluate the ethical policies and processes surrounding all nonhuman primate research” and to do so “in consultation with outside experts, to ensure it has appropriate justification for animal research protocols...” This mandate clearly signals that the ethics of using nonhuman primates (NHPs) in research should be up for debate. The NIH signals it will not examine the ethics of research with NHPs, but will maintain the status quo and evade the Congressional mandate. This intent is clearly indicated in the blog post “Ensuring Continued Responsible Research with Non-Human Primates,” which maintains that current welfare regulations are adequate, and that the continuation of NHP research should be ensured, based on past (sometimes long past) contributions to science. The NIH appears unwilling to engage in critical self-reflection or ethical discussion, or to consider the actual meaning of “responsible research.” Given current, well-supported empirical evidence about NHPs, it cannot be responsible or ethical to rely on outdated, poorly informed animal welfare regulations, or to justify NHP research by looking to the past. The NIH must be impartial and forward-looking in its science and ethics, so that it might support the best biomedical research and maintain high ethical standards. This mandate is an opportunity for the NIH to do both, by convening ethicists – as the IOM did in its report in its 2011 report on chimpanzees – to participate in honest, impartial discussion of ethical and responsible science involving NHPs.</p>
--	---------	------------------	-----------------------------------	--

<p>RESPONSEID_73064478_5 17a48a7921d8ce8-3A170C45-5056-9439-7EE919818A65DCDC</p>	<p>43:31.1</p>	<p>Elizabeth Magner</p>	<p>New England Anti-Vivisection Society</p>	<p>We have concerns that NIH’s draft agenda does not show adequate discussion about when and how and why primates should not be used, as we assume that is a core component of what NIH is calling “responsible oversight.” As such, we suggest the following additions to your 11:00am group discussion draft agenda. (1) Why and how does a researcher decide to use a non-human primate model? ADD: Where can primates be replaced with non-animal methods? What is the researcher’s responsibility to thoroughly review the availability of non-primate models that exceeds the minimal review required of the Animal Welfare Act? (2) How do non-human primates uniquely contribute to our understanding of basic biological processes and disease states? ADD: What are the scientific limitations of the primate model that compel the use and/or development of alternative research strategies and infuses mandated ethical discussion prior to using any primate? (3) What are the emerging scientific opportunities and/or public health needs for which non-human primate research models may be required? ADD: For which specific areas of research traditionally using nonhuman primates do validated alternatives already exist? To show “responsible oversight” should a researcher include in all NIH grant applications a comprehensive section on the development of scientifically equal or superior alternatives to primates as part of his/her research agenda? We believe that absent these additions to NIH’s agenda’s bullet-pointed items for the morning group discussion the conference promises to lack any ethical considerations—even those based on scientifically indefensible use of primates.</p>
--	----------------	-------------------------	---	--

<p>RESPONSEID_73034296_5 3e32e8aaf45362c-31493B44-5056-9439-7ECFEFC2878C59D8</p>	<p>52:45.5</p>	<p>Kathleen Conlee</p>	<p>The Humane Society of the United States</p>	<p>The Humane Society of the United States welcomes the opportunity to provide comments regarding NIH's primate workshop. We have significant concerns that the agenda largely fails to seriously address ethical considerations, despite the fact that Congress specifically requested this focus, and instead seeks to defend the status quo. Further, it is unrealistic to achieve a serious discussion and outcomes during the course of one day. We hope that NIH intends to continue examination of this issue after the workshop. Investigations by The HSUS and others have revealed primate suffering at several NIH-supported laboratories and a critical examination of the use of monkeys is long overdue. We urge, as a first step, an independent assessment of the National Primate Research Centers, which receive tens of millions in taxpayer funding annually. There must be critical look at what changes NIH should make regarding support of primate research. When the NIH has closely scrutinized specific programs at the request of Congress in the past, it has often concluded that significant changes should be made; for example the end of invasive chimpanzee research and the use of dogs and cats from Class B dealers for research. We urge that the topic of primate research be given the same level of scrutiny. Primate research is expensive, involves welfare concerns, and has limited value, especially when compared to the promise of non-animal alternatives which are being developed at an astounding rate. Phasing out invasive primate research and increasing investment in alternatives should be an urgent priority.</p>
--	----------------	------------------------	--	--

<p>RESPONSEID_73047457_e 24927cd89c8e64e- 35FE931B-5056-9439- 7E57E67BC472755A</p>	<p>57:38.5</p>	<p>Barbara J. King, PhD</p>	<p>College of William and Mary, Department of Anthropology (professor emerita)</p>	<p>1. Peer-reviewed scientific evidence shows that many animals, including but not limited to nonhuman primates, certainly the 100,000+ monkeys now held in NIH-funded and other US laboratories, live complex family lives marked by intelligence, social acumen, and emotional response to events including individual stress and others' deaths. When animals are housed singly and/or undergo procedures especially but not only in level C, D, and E experiments, they are consciously prone to physical and emotional suffering. 2. INIH's research-proposal review should be updated to include full ethical consideration explicitly and directly among its primary concerns along with scientific value. 3. NIH emphasizes the existing layers of federal regulation and oversight that govern animal research. We know, however (e.g., L.A. Hansen, 2012, "Institution animal care and use committees need greater ethical diversity" Journal of Medical Ethics 39(3); 188-190), that the bar to gain approval to experiment on primates (and other animals) is low; that when research proposals are considered across rather than only within institutions approval rates go down significantly, suggesting a role for local approval bias; and that IACUCs as currently constituted are "highly skewed" towards animal researchers and institutional veterinarians who have "vested interests in continuing animal research." These problems were evident with biomedical research on chimpanzees at NIH, which in 2011 was deemed "unnecessary" by an independent Institute of Medicine review-- yet which for years prior had been approved and funded. 4. In conclusion, taking concrete steps to ensure better committee diversity/ transparency of oversight of ethical processes should become a top priority.</p>
--	----------------	---------------------------------	--	---

<p>RESPONSEID_72748350_5 d25a8381ae35b83- C39A4140-5056-9439- 7EDDE97A3F51A134</p>	<p>47:49.4</p>	<p>Jarrold Bailey</p>	<p>Cruelty Free International</p>	<p>Cruelty Free International (formerly BUAV) urges the NIH to adopt a critical view of nonhuman primate (NHP) experiments, and to note the following recent studies: Non-human primates in neuroscience research: The case against its scientific necessity. (2016). ATLA, 44: 43-69. Harm:Benefit assessments of NHP experiments are greatly skewed, due to exaggeration of proposed human benefit, understatement of NHP suffering, and underappreciation of the capacity of non-animal methods. We argue the increasing power of human-specific methods renders NHP approaches redundant. Predicting human drug toxicity and safety via animal tests: Can any one species predict drug toxicity in any other, and do monkeys help? (2015). ATLA, 43: 393-403. We show the absence of toxicity in NHPs, dogs, mice, rabbits, and rats provides little or virtually no evidential weight that adverse drug reactions will also be absent in humans. Human-focused alternative methods must, therefore, be adopted in their place as a matter of urgency. Monkey-based research on human disease: The implications of genetic differences. (2014). ATLA, 42: 287-317. Despite relative superficial genetic similarity between species, monkey data do not translate well to progress in clinical practice for humans. Examples include drug development, HIV/AIDS, Alzheimer's disease, Parkinson's disease and stroke. Key differences in all aspects of gene expression and protein function, from chromosome and chromatin structure to post-translational modification are responsible. The use of monkeys must be considered of questionable value, particularly given the breadth and potential of alternative methods of enquiry that are currently available to scientists. All available at: https://www.crueltyfreeinternational.org/sciencepublications</p>
--	----------------	-----------------------	-----------------------------------	--

<p>RESPONSEID_7265518_a 4e2dbd770babd37- 9CC57CE9-5056-9439- 7E78E55115190A6A</p>	<p>26:04.7</p>	<p>Theodora Capaldo, Ed.D.</p>	<p>New England Anti-Vivisection Society</p>	<p>We appreciate that NIH is conducting a workshop on responsible oversight of non-human primate research, but are concerned that the draft agenda does not appear to include how non-animal alternatives can replace primate use, nor address the need for better monitoring and defining of primate psychological well-being. The scientific efficacy of non-animal alternatives has been demonstrated in varied and multiple areas of research in which primates are used. The draft agenda, however, does not position such new technologies and areas of research for discussion. Additionally, we see no mention of stress effects on primates, from a welfare or research perspective. NEAVS submitted a Petition for Rulemaking in an effort to require that the USDA measureably define psychological well-being in primates. Though given some consideration in the AWA, psychological well-being is largely treated as an afterthought by the USDA and—given its glaring absence on this agenda—also by the NIH. We understand this agenda is a draft, and hope the final version acknowledges the areas of concern highlighted here. If not, the workshop promises to be solely an opportunity for those vested in primate use to continue their own agenda. NIH is mandated to look at emerging science and respect the public’s growing opposition to animal use. We trust NIH will remember the outcome of the IOM’s Chimpanzees in Biomedical and Behavioral Research: Assessing the Necessity, which, with data-backed science and rightful infusions of ethics, formed a cornerstone in the long overdue ending of chimpanzee use in the U.S.</p>
---	----------------	------------------------------------	---	---

RESPONSEID_72816667_e 643c54167c6c98f- DA4A03AC-5056-9439- 7E616C88859DBC5E	21:02.5	Suzann Withers M.S., CCC-SLP	(Submitter left answer blank)	First, I must explain why I included my professional designation, which is to let you know that I'm not an uneducated, uninformed dolt. . I have to take issue with your statement regarding your desire to provide "continued responsible oversight of research". We have known for many decades what harm is caused to humans who were neglected, abused, kept in isolation, etc. as children. I fail to see the relevance or continued use of these barbaric and costly experiments over and over again on non-human primates. It's deplorable. It's sadistic. It's wrong. I urge you to consider ending this insanity immediately, and to send the primates to sanctuaries where they can live out the rest of their lives in peace without human intentional torment, Do the right thing. If not for the sake of empathy, we all may have to answer for how we've treated all other living creatures we were supposed to share this planet with. How will you be judged?
--	---------	---------------------------------	---------------------------------	---

<p>RESPONSEID_72544744_b 2d5c489c1d96f82- 7223DF48-5056-9439- 7E89964209EB727C</p>	<p>33:17.2</p>	<p>Peggy Cunniff</p>	<p>National Anti-Vivisection Society(NAVS)</p>	<p>After reading the draft agenda for the nonhuman primate workshop, the National Anti-Vivisection Society(NAVS) feels it necessary to reiterate concerns we had previously expressed. The NIH workshop, in its current form, does not align with the intent of Congress, which requested that the NIH “conduct a review of its ethical policies and processes with respect to nonhuman primate research subjects, in consultation with outside experts, to ensure it has appropriate justification for animal research protocols and to provide an update on these efforts in the fiscal year 2017 budget.” Instead the NIH has organized a workshop based on the assumption that nonhuman primate experimentation is justified. Discussion questions on the agenda are biased. “How do non-human primates uniquely contribute to our understanding of basic biological processes and disease states?” presumes that non-human primates make unique contributions. When the chimpanzee model was similarly assessed to determine its “necessity,” chimpanzees were deemed not necessary, only after the presumption of necessity was removed by a bioethicist. For the NIH workshop to fulfill its purpose as intended by Congress, it should discuss:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Whether current research on nonhuman primates is justified in its endpoints; • Whether ethical considerations are given sufficient weight, given the phylogenetic proximity of nonhuman primates to humans; and • Whether animal welfare is adequately considered prior to and during the approval process for research protocols. <p>It is our hope that this draft agenda is merely a working copy and will be modified to address the concerns of Congress. Thank you. National Anti-Vivisection Society</p>
--	----------------	----------------------	--	---

RESPONSEID_72496899_9 0f7a8b378a481-62E61341- 5056-9439- 7ECF9F4FDD94C005	29:02.6	Amber Barnes	American Anti-Vivisection Society	<p>We endorse the request by Congress for the NIH to “review ethical policies and processes for appropriate justifications” for research involving NHPs. We commend the NIH for seriously considering this important matter. ? ? However, we question whether the discussion questions listed in the agenda will adequately address the request to review NIH ethical oversight. In particular, the current questions listed for the second group discussion are factual descriptions that could be covered during the preceding presentation. Questions that elicit more valuable information and international insight, and better align with Congressional intent, should be considered. We recommend the questions, 1. “What is the global state of ethics and new thinking about animals, and how can we apply this to the use of NHPs in research?” 2. “Given the cognitive abilities of and capacity for suffering in NHPs, is there a need for additional levels of review beyond IACUC and NIH committees to consider ‘justification’?” 3. “Could review by a multi-disciplinary team, particularly ethicists, provide more rigorous assessment?” ?Dr. Wolinetz’s blog stated, “periodically reviewing agency policies and processes ensures that this framework (referring to welfare measures) evolves in a manner consistent with emerging scientific opportunities and public health needs.” Yet it must also evolve ethically. Internationally, the field of ethics has made tremendous strides since current policies have been in place. An open discussion and analysis of our evolving ethics and knowledge regarding the cognitive abilities and capacity for suffering in NHPs would be most productive and fulfill the congressional intent.</p>
--	---------	--------------	-----------------------------------	---

<p>RESPONSEID_72314140_6 d57a96468e88904- 033DEF4E-5056-9439- 7E7376342A1DAA2B</p>	<p>01:35.5</p>	<p>David</p>	<p>Johns Hopkins University</p>	<p>One of the workshop's objectives is to study "the ethical principles underlying existing animal welfare regulations and policies." But there is a good argument to be made in favor of incorporating into the workshop a discussion not simple of the ethics underlying current regulatory framework, but of the ethics of research involving non-human primates more broadly. There should be a section devoted to questions that lie at the heart of research involving non-human subjects, such as: -What is the moral status of non-human primates? -Is it ethical to use primates as models for the study of human health and disease given (a) some of the problems associated with extrapolation from model to target systems and (b) existing alternatives to in vivo models (e.g., computational models)? -Should current regulations and policies concerning animal welfare be updated in light of (a) new discussions in ethical theory concerning the human-animal distinction and (b) new findings by welfare and behavioral scientists concerning the multiple (and, arguably, morally-relevant) 'capacities' of animals across various taxa? In short, there should be a more robust engagement with ethics that goes beyond talking about the ethics underlying the frameworks currently in place.</p>
---	----------------	--------------	---------------------------------	---

<p>RESPONSEID_71795074_6 e39f746ff163790-327CB369-5056-9439-7E83ABFB1612F2E1</p>	<p>05:13.7</p>	<p>Alex Walsh</p>	<p>none</p>	<p>Dear NIH, Congress requested "the NIH to conduct a review of its ethical policies and processes with respect to nonhuman primate research subjects, in consultation with outside experts, to ensure it has appropriate justification for animal research protocols and to provide an update on these efforts in the fiscal year 2017 budget request." However, the draft agenda for the Sept. 7th primate ethics workshop shows that the 11 a.m. Group Discussion is devoted to asking the panelists for reasons for NIH nonhuman primate experiments. This is not what Congress requested nor is it what Congress intended by calling for a primate ethics review. This workshop is supposed to be about ethical justification for nonhuman primate protocols at the NIH and whether the NIH has the ethical policies and processes in place to make this determination(s). Therefore, the 11 a.m. Group Discussion needs to be removed and replaced with a discussion about ethical justification and whether protocols for behavioral as well as biomedical (incl. neuroscience) experiments are ethically justified. To this end, the panelists should review a sample protocol for an anxiety experiment on infant, baby and/or juvenile monkeys because it was these type of experiments that led Congress to inquire and ultimately request an ethics review. Also, the panelists should review a sample protocol for an invasive eye movement experiment on monkeys. There are other sample protocols that can also be addressed. Thank you for your consideration.</p>
--	----------------	-------------------	-------------	--

RESPONSEID_72053994_7 99cc31ad8c1eec- 96E71308-5056-9439- 7E121533DA4705C3	31:54.6	Adam Shriver	The University of Pennsylvania	<p>I am writing to express my concern that the draft agenda for the NIH workshop is structured in a manner that fails to comply with Congress’s request. In the original Appropriations Bill Report, Congress asked for the NIH to “conduct a review of its ethical policies and process with respect to nonhuman primate research subjects, in consultation with outside experts, to ensure that it has appropriate justification for animal research protocols.” Asking for a review of procedures to ensure that they have appropriate justification clearly suggests that the workshop needs to address the following question: “are current animal research protocols with primates ethically justified?” However, the current workshop format is structured in a manner that does not attempt to answer that question. Rather than asking what the appropriate ethical principles underlying primate research should be, the workshop simply asks for a description of what the current policies are and a description of the veterinary science that was used when those policies were first put in place. Moreover, by asking “how” these procedures address welfare concerns, the report assumes, without discussion, that such concerns are addressed, rather than asking if they are addressed, which is what Congress requested. If the NIH wishes to be in compliance with Congress's request, the workshop should devote significant amounts of time to discussing different ethical perspectives on primate research, in conjunction with current evidence about primate cognitive and affective capacities, including evidence from studies of primates in their natural environments.</p>
---	---------	--------------	--------------------------------	--

<p>RESPONSEID_71664960_5 985a6f9f24b3cc4- FE315801-5056-9439- 7E31B80105357A33</p>	<p>35:19.4</p>	<p>Richard J. Brown, DVM</p>	<p>(Submitter left answer blank)</p>	<p>The U.S. Government Principles for the Utilization and Care of Vertebrate Animals Used in Testing, Research, and Training states that experiments involving animals “should be designed and performed with due consideration of their relevance to human or animal health, the advancement of knowledge, or the good of society.” However, analyses of the scientific literature documents that data gleaned from experiments on monkeys have failed to reliably translate to humans. Examples of disappointing failures in various areas of research abound. Taking HIV/AIDS as an example, nearly 90 vaccines have worked in monkeys and every single one has failed in humans (1). Nonhuman primate models of Parkinson’s disease “have failed to reproduce key features of Parkinson’s disease, both in function and in pathology” (2)—and several therapies that showed promise in monkey models of the disease failed in humans (3). Similar problems with extrapolation have been documented with the use of nonhuman primates in toxicology and drug testing, Alzheimer’s research, and stroke research (4). 1. Bailey J. An assessment of the role of chimpanzees in AIDS vaccine research. <i>Alternatives to Laboratory Animals</i> 2008;36:381–428. 2. Akhtar A. The flaws and human harms of animal experimentation. <i>Cambridge Quarterly of Healthcare Ethics</i>. 2015 Oct 1;24(04):407-19. 3. Lane E, Dunnett S. Animal models of Parkinson’s disease and L-dopa induced dyskinesia: How close are we to the clinic? <i>Psychopharmacology</i> 2008;199:303–12. 4. Bailey J. Monkey-based research on human disease: the implications of genetic differences. <i>Alternatives to laboratory animals: ATLA</i>. 2014 Nov 1;42:287-317.</p>
--	----------------	----------------------------------	--	--

RESPONSEID_71639069_5 6fcd179d12b2ae0- F54B8F87-5056-9439- 7ED69B8C6B1591B0	02:43.9	Peter Singer	University Center for Human Values, Princeton University	I hope that this workshop will have include specialists in ethics relating to animals, as that is a key question underlying what kind of research on primates is justifiable. There should be a full range of opinions, including some with strong pro-animal views.
RESPONSEID_71244979_3 5388a6e0cb8bcee- 4F94D21D-5056-9439- 7EA05175C2322471	55:40.5	Peter Singer	University Center for Human Values, Princeton University	I hope that this workshop will have include specialists in ethics relating to animals, as that is a key question underlying what kind of research on primates is justifiable. There should be a full range of opinions, including some with strong pro-animal views.

RESPONSEID_71051939_2 b62261d0721fdea- 02E739E1-5056-9439- 7E8D3DED624C08EA	56:50.6	Jeanne C. Folks, D.Min, LPC	<i>(Submitter left answer blank)</i>	Decades of research show that housing highly intelligent, social primates alone causes them extensive psychological and physical harm. One study documented that as many as 89 percent of singly-housed monkeys exhibit abnormal, stress-induced behaviors including incessant pacing, rocking, hair-pulling and even self-biting. They also suffer from higher incidence of physical ailments like heart disease. And yet, a recent survey based on self-reports from research institutions determined that 16 percent of primates in U.S. laboratories are singly housed (Bennett, 2016). The study reported that 10,572 primates in the survey respondents’ laboratories were housed alone with no opportunities for tactile contact with other primates, while an additional 3,384 primates were housed alone with limited contact with other primates. This is clearly unacceptable and all efforts must be taken to socially house nonhuman primates. Fundamentally, this means that laboratories must understand that if a primate is housed in a cage by herself—even if she is able to see, hear, and smell other primates—she is still singly housed and will be vulnerable to the myriad psychological and physiological deficits that have been thoroughly documented in the scientific literature. Bennett, B. T. (2016). Association of Primate Veterinarians 2014 Nonhuman Primate Housing Survey. Journal of the American Association for Laboratory Animal Science, 55(2), 172-174.
--	---------	--------------------------------	--	--

RESPONSEID_70545972_b bd59ae8787f8b61- 8FEDF08A-5056-9439- 7E82C838113F5530	35:30.7	Stacy Lopresti- Goodman, Ph.D.	Department of Psychology, Marymount University	<p>There is an urgent need for scrutiny of all primate research following the IOM’s finding that most NIH-funded invasive chimpanzee research was unnecessary. Chimpanzees comprise >1% of primates in U.S. laboratories, but similar problems exist with regard to all 100,000 primates in laboratories. Standard laboratory housing for primates lacks sufficient space, meaningful cognitive stimulation and adequate social contact, causing animals significant psychological and physical harms. Thousands of primates are singly-housed without scientific justification. Primates are subjected to painful experiments, sometimes without pain relief. Primates are used in research with little or no public health implication, that’s unlikely to translate to humans and/or for which alternatives exist. The new NIH rules instituted to reform chimpanzee research can address problems with all primate research. Specifically, NIH’s chimpanzee research criteria state (1) Knowledge gained must be necessary to advance public health, (2) No other research model could be used, and the research cannot be ethically performed on humans and (3)The animals used must be maintained either in ethologically appropriate environments or natural habitats. NIH also formed a panel of independent experts and laypersons to review chimpanzee research proposals. Additionally, federal rules state NIH-owned chimpanzees must be retired to sanctuaries (rather than killed) after research. Dr. Collins has acknowledged the need for additional scrutiny of primate research proposals. NIH bioethicists have called for restricting primate research. If fair and balanced, this workshop can help ensure that primate research rules are updated to reflect current science on animal welfare, research translation, and animal research alternatives.</p>
--	---------	-----------------------------------	---	---

<p>RESPONSEID_68246760_f 8ae5c5df4c2d616- 30C34BEC-5056-9439- 7E8AE9DF75E53283</p>	<p>17:58.2</p>	<p>Cindy Tait, RN, PHN, MPH</p>	<p>Center for Healthcare Education, Inc.</p>	<p>it is disturbing that much of the research has been futile and protracted (often for decades) for the sake of academics' imposing suffering on the magnificent animals for the sole goal of "publish or perish" to validate their positions, obtain tenure, get paid sabbaticals and receive 6-figure pensions. It is the recommendation of the staff, faculty, and medical board of directors of Center for Healthcare Education, Inc. that: 1. All primate experimentation be eliminated and replaced with computer/stem cell or other models for non-living animal research 2. Researchers be vetted for their motivation for participation – the suffering imposed on any living creature should not be without impunity. This should also include vetting of veterinarians, many who are only looking to build their resumes and/or find gainful employment making the animal's comfort and physiological needs secondary to their own. 3. The FDA's requirements for animal experiments be eliminated or significantly be culled back. 4. Any live animals used in experimentation be given the same protection as humans, i.e., IRB evaluations and full disclosure to the USA public with 24/7 live cameras on each animal both in its cage during awake, sleep, feeding, and other physiological care. Additionally, video observation of the actual experimentation including the use of chemical and physical restraints, impairing the animal with alcohol/drugs via forced nasogastric tubes, injections, sample taking, and the euthanasia as well as during the necropsy of the animal. The clandestine "behind closed doors" must stop. Feel free to contact me with any questions, need for clarification or an invitation to speak.</p>
--	----------------	-------------------------------------	--	--

<p>RESPONSEID_68226232_5 b00bb43a6887f7a- 29CB3959-5056-9439- 7E506B76CA051458</p>	<p>59:51.0</p>	<p>Peggy Cunniff</p>	<p>National Anti-Vivisection Society</p>	<p>NIH was asked “to conduct a review of its ethical policies and processes with respect to nonhuman primate research subjects, in consultation with outside experts, to ensure it has appropriate justification for animal research protocols” [emphasis added]. We have concerns that this intention is not being addressed based on language present in the NIH workshop announcement, which presumes that “the oversight framework for the use of non-human primates in research is robust and has provided sufficient protections to date.” NIH should not begin the process of review with the assumption that nonhuman primate experimentation is justified. This workshop was scheduled because a review of maternal deprivation studies, prompted by experts and animal advocacy organizations, resulted in research protocols being modified and procedures eliminated. Congress, in requesting this review, intends that NIH conduct a careful examination of current nonhuman primate use that includes bioethicists and primate behaviorists. This workshop should include an examination of the kinds of research that use primates, current ethical policies and processes, the number and source of primates, the direct and indirect costs, and an examination of alternatives to the use of primates. The statements of all participants, findings and recommendations should be made public. NAVS recommends that the following experts participate in the workshop: David DeGrazia Brian Hare Steven Ross Adam Shriver Thank you for your consideration. Peggy Cunniff National Anti-Vivisection Society</p>
--	----------------	----------------------	--	--

<p>RESPONSEID_68057484_3 a518eb8ad95c974- EE89916D-5056-9439- 7E4A4CFAEBD6D86B</p>	<p>27:44.2</p>	<p>Anne Barnhill, Steven Joffe and Franklin G. Miller</p>	<p>Perelman School of Medicine, U of Penn. (Barnhill and Joffe), Weill Cornell Medical College (Miller)</p>	<p>Invasive research on nonhuman primates raises difficult ethical issues. Studies such as recent infection challenge experiments of Ebola and Marburg vaccines can help develop novel therapies and vaccines with the potential to save thousands of human lives. On the other hand, these studies can intentionally expose sophisticated non-consenting animals to severe suffering and a high risk of death. In a recent paper we argued that there should be a presumption that harmful primate research is not ethically justifiable—but that this presumption can be overcome when studies meet strict criteria.* Exceptions to this prohibition are permissible, subject to substantive and procedural safeguards, when necessary to avert loss of life or severe morbidity for a substantial number of people. More specifically, harmful infection challenge studies on primates are ethically justifiable only when the research offers substantial benefits over all ethically permitted alternatives, including conducting equivalent experiments with human volunteers or moving directly to field experiments with at-risk or affected humans. Thus, to secure approval, researchers should need to justify why conducting infection challenge studies on primates is the next step in the research program, rather than studies with human volunteers or human field studies. We recommend that the workshop establish a rebuttable presumption that studies will be done in humans rather than primates, and provide guidance for researchers about what criteria must be met for primate research to be ethically justifiable. *Hastings Center Report 46(4):20, 2016</p>
--	----------------	---	---	--

RESPONSEID_67672860_c 45f1c4ddecee095- 5B1292EF-5056-9439- 7E907549A5F52CD2	09:54.0	Nedim C. Buyukmihci, V.M.D.	University of California, School of Veterinary Medicine, Davis, California	Regardless of 'enrichment', non-human primates have diminished well-being and welfare in captivity, resulting in substantive and confounding effects on data derived from them. Nevertheless, if it can be proved that the information applies to human beings, the validation methods used would entirely supplant the need for research in non-human primates. We need to place greater emphasis on the study of human beings using nature's 'experiments' as our laboratory. Moreover, understanding the human brain requires direct communication, not likely with other primates. The considerable success and importance of human studies is unequivocal. We are limited only by our willingness, resources and commitment to expand on such studies. We should not divert these to non-human primate studies. The primary issue is one of morality. Scientific rigor and practicality would demand the use human beings for this research, even if detrimental to a few, because this would provide us with far greater and more rapid benefits than relying on questionable non-human primate data. To subject human beings, however, to what we do to other primates would be immoral. It is precisely for the same reasons it must be considered immoral in the case of non-human primates. We find it morally repugnant to do certain things to human beings despite the potential for enormous benefits. We should find it equally repugnant in the case of other primates. If we use our intelligence and considerable talents compassionately, we can find ways to answer the questions we have without harming and killing those individuals.
--	---------	--------------------------------	--	--

<p>RESPONSEID_67644618_4 25beec7b2d53dc6- 55537DF5-5056-9439- 7EBEBC8158BB3D01</p>	<p>58:30.1</p>	<p>Marie Crandall, MD, MPH, FACS</p>	<p>Professor of Surgery, University of Florida Jacksonville</p>	<p>The widely acknowledged similarity of nonhuman primates to humans—stemming from our shared ancestry and manifest in shared characteristics such as strong mother-infant bonding, complex social organization, and sophisticated communication—introduces a critical ethical dimension to discussions regarding the use of nonhuman primates in research. Scrutiny similar to that brought by the NIH (1) and the Institute of Medicine (IOM) (2) to the scientific necessity of chimpanzee experiments—which revealed that chimpanzee use had been “largely unnecessary” and had “rarely accelerated new discoveries or the advancement of human health for infectious diseases”—should be brought to assessing the scientific necessity of using other nonhuman primates in research. Principles similar to those outlined by the IOM report—in particular, that the knowledge gained by proposed primate research must be necessary to advance the public’s health; that there must be no other research model by which the knowledge could be obtained; that the research cannot be ethically performed on human subjects; and that primates used in research must be maintained either in ethologically appropriate physical and social environments or in natural habitats—should be implemented for the assessment of proposed protocols involving all nonhuman primates. Applying such considerations to the experimental use of all primates would help bolster NIH’s mission to “ensure a continued high return on the public investment in research” and “exemplify and promote the highest level of scientific integrity, public accountability, and social responsibility.” 1. NIH (2013): http://dpcpsi.nih.gov/council/pdf/FNL_Report_WG_Chimpanzees.pdf 2. Institute of Medicine (2011): http://www.nap.edu/catalog.php?record_id=13257</p>
--	----------------	--	---	--

RESPONSEID_66854631_9 033ab33c9d18ece- F54C2445-5056-9439- 7E6A00904230E18E	34:55.0	Richard J. Brown, DVM	<i>(Submitter left answer blank)</i>	<p>The U.S. Government Principles for the Utilization and Care of Vertebrate Animals Used in Testing, Research, and Training states that experiments involving animals “should be designed and performed with due consideration of their relevance to human or animal health, the advancement of knowledge, or the good of society.” However, analyses of the scientific literature document that data gleaned from experiments on monkeys have failed to reliably translate to humans. Examples of disappointing failures in various areas of research abound. Taking HIV/AIDS as an example, nearly 90 vaccines have worked in monkeys and every single one has failed in humans (1). Nonhuman primate models of Parkinson’s disease “have failed to reproduce key features of Parkinson’s disease, both in function and in pathology” (2)—and several therapies that showed promise in monkey models of the disease failed in humans (3). Similar problems with extrapolation have been documented with the use of nonhuman primates in toxicology and drug testing, Alzheimer’s research, and stroke research (4). 1. Bailey J. An assessment of the role of chimpanzees in AIDS vaccine research. <i>Alternatives to Laboratory Animals</i> 2008;36:381–428. 2. Akhtar A. The flaws and human harms of animal experimentation. <i>Cambridge Quarterly of Healthcare Ethics</i>. 2015 Oct 1;24(04):407-19. 3. Lane E, Dunnett S. Animal models of Parkinson’s disease and L-dopa induced dyskinesia: How close are we to the clinic? <i>Psychopharmacology</i> 2008;199:303–12. 4. Bailey J. Monkey-based research on human disease: the implications of genetic differences. <i>Alternatives to laboratory animals: ATLA</i>. 2014 Nov 1;42:287-317.</p>
--	---------	--------------------------	--	---

<p>RESPONSEID_66282172_3 168a65cc1beab2- F5CA5037-5056-9439- 7E2D7C7991B4840E</p>	<p>57:38.3</p>	<p>Peggy Cunniff</p>	<p>National Anti-Vivisection Society</p>	<p>NIH was asked “to conduct a review of its ethical policies and processes with respect to nonhuman primate research subjects, in consultation with outside experts, TO ENSURE IT HAS APPROPRIATE JUSTIFICATION FOR ANIMAL RESEARCH PROTOCOLS” [emphasis added]. We have concerns that this intention is not being addressed based on language present in the NIH workshop announcement, which presumes that “the oversight framework for the use of non-human primates in research is robust and has provided sufficient protections to date.” NIH should not begin the process of review with the assumption that nonhuman primate experimentation is justified. This workshop was scheduled because a review of maternal deprivation studies, prompted by experts and animal advocacy organizations, resulted in research protocols being modified and procedures eliminated. Congress, in requesting this review, intends that NIH conduct a careful examination of current nonhuman primate use that includes bioethicists and primate behaviorists. This workshop should include an examination of the kinds of research that use primates, current ethical policies and processes, the number and source of primates, the direct and indirect costs, and an examination of alternatives to the use of primates. The statements of all participants, findings and recommendations should be made public. NAVS recommends that the following experts participate in the workshop: David DeGrazia Brian Hare Steven Ross Adam Shriver Thank you for your consideration. Peggy Cunniff National Anti-Vivisection Society</p>
---	----------------	----------------------	--	--

<p>RESPONSEID_65704827_9 1b4decf929642d4- F1702390-5056-9439- 7E4652FF52DF95DB</p>	<p>31:04.7</p>	<p>Darlene H. Moak, M.D.</p>	<p>Private Practice Addiction Psychiatrist, Adjunct Faculty Medical University of South Carolina</p>	<p>In June 2013, NIH Director Francis Collins eluded to the likeness of chimpanzees to humans, saying in a statement that greatly reducing the use of chimpanzees in experimentation was “the right thing to do.” I agree. But I also must ask, what attributes do the other nonhuman primates lack that they are locked out of this inner sanctum of greater consideration? Monkeys, who make up more than 98 percent of nonhuman primates in U.S. laboratories, are highly social and intelligent animals. They form intricate relationships, experience the same wide range of emotions that we do and exhibit a capacity for suffering similar to ours. They can count, use tools, recognize faces, communicate complex information and express empathy. They demonstrate a sense of fairness. There is also evidence of social culture among monkeys. Should our evolving understanding of the astonishing abilities of our primate cousins not inform how we draw the boundaries of our moral community—and help determine what constitutes “the right thing to do”? I think it should, and I think this should be a central point of discussion at NIH’s upcoming workshop on primate research.</p>
--	----------------	----------------------------------	--	--

RESPONSEID_65539895_4 b0eedbb3b46e6be- B8C6E112-5056-9439- 7ED27ACCCDB85BCB	09:59.8	Nora Johnson, MBA, MS, PsyD	(Submitter left answer blank)	I am pleased that the NIH is convening a workshop on primate research. I would like to ask that the workshop organizers consider including an agenda item related to the retirement of nonhuman primates to sanctuaries after they have been used in research. I find it troubling that in nearly all protocols involving primates the animals are euthanized—even in cases where the animals' tissues will not be harvested for analysis following the experiments. It seems that euthanasia is carried out as a matter of expedience, without consideration to the fact that the primates involved could be retired to a sanctuary. At sanctuaries, monkeys would be permitted to enjoy the rest of their days living in socially and environmentally enriched environments, just being monkeys. While relocating nonhuman primates to sanctuaries after they have served in research is the ethically appropriate action in cases where there is no scientific justification for euthanizing the animals at the termination of the experiments, this approach also benefits the morale of laboratory staff and researchers. I suggest grant proposals include funds for the eventual retirement of monkeys and that the NIH develops policies ensuring that costs for retiring monkeys to sanctuaries are included in allocated grants. Kerwin, A. M. (2006). Overcoming the barriers to the retirement of old and New World monkeys from research facilities. Journal of Applied Animal Welfare Science, 9(4), 337-347.
--	---------	--------------------------------	---------------------------------	---

<p>RESPONSEID_65378654_6 cea4d72b83f22dd- 84E652D0-5056-9439- 7ED892A3CD501FD9</p>	<p>11:22.8</p>	<p>John Pawlowski, MD, PhD</p>	<p>BIDMC Shapiro Simulation and Skills Center, Harvard Medical School</p>	<p>I am pleased and proud that the Office of Science Policy in the National Institutes of Health is organizing this workshop. As a lecturer at Harvard Medical School and Co-Director of the Shapiro Simulation and Skills Center, I am well-versed in the educational challenges in preparing medical students to be doctors. I am also familiar with the features of whole-body mannequin simulation, which has successfully replaced animal-based training in many aspects of medical education. From the teaching of clinical tasks to the training of complex problem-solving in medicine, I have found simulators to be superior to animals in every way. Simulators reveal human anatomy and provide human voices for feedback. Simulators are easy to arrange and have a host of useful and also unusual features. For example, simulators can represent lung diseases, mimic heart problems and show skin disorders that are difficult if not impossible to replicate in animals. These simulation machines can be used repeatedly and can be used to reinforce good clinical behaviors- thus demonstrating their durability and utility in the progressive nature of medical training. I heartily endorse the use of simulation in medical education and suggest that the NIH support such educational activities and research. Respectfully yours, John Pawlowski, MD, PhD</p>
--	----------------	------------------------------------	---	---

<p>RESPONSEID_65214820_4 0aac7a5a6ea90be- 359F0605-5056-9439- 7E37F0713342F0F7</p>	<p>00:21.0</p>	<p>Narda G. Robinson, DO, DVM, MS, FAAMA</p>	<p>Colorado State University, College of Veterinary Medicine and Biomedical Sciences</p>	<p>A 2003 survey of nearly 400 rhesus macaques at Harvard’s New England Regional Primate Research Center infamously documented that 89 percent of monkeys held at the facility exhibited at least one abnormal behavior, ranging from active whole-body and self-directed stereotypies to self-injurious behavior (1). This is not surprising given that macaques used in research are frequently housed alone and are almost always deprived of sufficient space, access to outdoor spaces, opportunities for exercise, or opportunities to make meaningful choices about what happens to them. While the ethical implications of treating our primate cousins in such an abysmal manner should be resoundingly clear to anyone, it has also been documented that such conditions of privation are associated with physiological abnormalities, including depressed immune function and higher incidence of coronary atherosclerosis (2, 3). Such abnormalities can confound data gleaned from the research and impede extrapolation to humans. 1. Lutz, C., Well, A., & Novak, M. (2003). Stereotypic and self-injurious behavior in rhesus macaques: a survey and retrospective analysis of environment and early experience. <i>American Journal of Primatology</i>, 60(1), 1-15. 2. Schapiro, S. J., Nehete, P. N., Perlman, J. E., & Sastry, K. J. (1997). Social housing condition affects cell-mediated immune responses in adult rhesus macaques. <i>American Journal of Primatology</i>, 42, 147. 3. Seelig, D. (2007). A tail of 2 monkeys: Social housing for nonhuman primates in the research laboratory setting. <i>Journal of Applied Animal Welfare Science</i>, 10, 21–30.</p>
---	----------------	--	--	--

RESPONSEID_64919543_a b3b910e1acfd9b- 9CB9C35F-5056-9439- 7E56F031C4F0E6AD	12:42.8	Lawrence A Hansen M. D.	Professor, Neurosciences and Pathology, UCSD School of Medicine	Scientific discoveries documenting the cognitive and emotional capacities of non-human primates, coupled with logic and ethics, dictate an end to physically invasive or psychologically traumatizing research performed on non-human primates. We now know, as reasonably as can know of other humans, that these animals experience not only pain but shock, fear, foreboding , trauma, anxiety, stress, anticipation, and terror. The fact that they are a different species of primate than we are is a morally irrelevant distinction, like race, nationality, skin color or sexual orientation. No one can rationally ethically justify differential moral treatment on the basis of such morally irrelevant differences, since it is sentience, the capacity to experience pain and suffering, that matters. Those who which to continue experimenting on non-human primates cannot have it both ways ethically and scientifically. If non-human primates are so similar to humans psychologically that trauma to them translates into clinically relevant insights into human trauma, then ethic demands that we treat them with the same ethical constraints we impose upon human research. And if they are so different from human primates that it is deemed permissible to inflict pain and suffering upon them, then the resulting data would not be of relevance to human suffering, and such experimentation is unjustified by hypothetical human benefit. And besides, to paraphrase what Lincoln said about slavery, pure and simple, if cruelty to animals is not wrong, then nothing is wrong.
---	---------	----------------------------	---	---

RESPONSEID_64775479_b cfa525a049d5dc6- 5D17C07F-5056-9439- 7E476C0EDD76D4FC	05:13.7	Dr. Lori Marino	neuroscientist and former faculty at Emory University	4. As was noted in the “NIH-Wide Strategic Plan,” there is a need for powerful, human-relevant innovations to replace animal models, which “often fail to provide good ways to mimic disease or predict how drugs will work in humans.” To this end, a robust system for training young investigators in non-animal research methodologies is critical. It is heartening to see that the NIH is making strides in moving away from animal models toward more reliable methods. Investments should also be made at the level of individual institutions that receive NIH support. NIH’s workshop on primate research should include discussions on how limited resources might be shifted away from the use of primates and toward training a new generation of researchers in non-animal methods, establishing laboratories and centers of excellence with expertise in non-animal methods, and growing a culture where using nonhuman primates is not viewed as a “default” approach in attempting to address human health problems.
--	---------	-----------------	--	---

<p>RESPONSEID_64364912_3 2ef84668748245e- C4360108-5056-9439- 7E30247DA8DBBE96</p>	<p>50:15.5</p>	<p>Theodora Capaldo, Ed.D.</p>	<p>New England Anti-Vivisection Society, Boston, MA</p>	<p>Oversight of protocols involving nonhuman primates should weigh the cumulative lifetime physical and psychological harms done to the primates—including anxiety or fear; nausea; fatigue; inability to walk; an induced pathological condition such as an infectious disease; functional disability such as loss of a limb; maternal, social, and other deprivations; induction of an abnormal mental state; and a lingering, or even painless, death—against any realistic benefits expected from the proposed work. Numerous studies have documented that the cumulative effect of repeated procedures—even seemingly innocuous procedures such as blood draws—has a profound effect on the psychological suffering of primates. There is also extensive evidence available that shows that repeated subjection of nonhuman primates to stimuli such as hunger, thirst, and force-based training has a negative psychological impact on the primates. Long-term effects of early-life stresses, such as social isolation, maternal deprivation, and fear-potentiated startle reflex in macaques and squirrel monkeys, are well documented and should also be factored into the analysis weighing cumulative harms against benefits. Critically, calculation of expected benefits should be based on scientific evidence and not on speculative hopes. For space considerations, I have not included citations for the statements made in this comment, but I would be happy to supply those citations upon request.</p>
--	----------------	------------------------------------	---	--

RESPONSEID_64330084_e 3c56d26eaa4108c- BB02A1FA-5056-9439- 7E7A261D6B06B6AA	32:55.6	james h yahr, M.D.,F.A.C.S.	(Submitter left answer blank)	Proposed protocols involving nonhuman primates should be carefully reviewed to assess whether data gleaned from the work will reliably translate to humans. By employing systematic reviews to identify, appraise, and synthesize all available evidence, researchers can assess the likelihood that animal data will translate to humans (1). Multiple systematic reviews have documented the inapplicability of data from nonhuman animals for numerous areas of investigation to humans—prompting recommendations that systematic reviews be conducted before approval is granted for animal use (2, 3, 4). Indeed, the Netherlands now requires a systematic review as part of grant applications (5). NIH should implement a similar approach for NIH-supported projects involving nonhuman primates to promote high-quality science while reducing waste. 1. Hooijmans, C. R., Leenaars, M., & Ritskes-Hoitinga, M. (2010). A gold standard publication checklist to improve the quality of animal studies, to fully integrate the Three Rs, and to make systematic reviews more feasible. 2. Pound, P., & Bracken, M. B. (2014). Is animal research sufficiently evidence based to be a cornerstone of biomedical research. <i>BMJ</i> , 348, g3387. 3. Bailey, J. (2014). Monkey-based research on human disease: the implications of genetic differences. <i>Alternatives to laboratory animals: ATLA</i> , 42, 287-317. 4. Akhtar, A. Z., Pippin, J. J., & Sandusky, C. B. (2008). Animal models in spinal cord injury: a review. <i>Reviews in the Neurosciences</i> , 19(1), 47-60. 5. de Leeuw, W. (2015). Synthesis of Evidence: Working Together on Systematic Reviews of Animal Studies. <i>Altex</i> , 32(2), 149
--	---------	--------------------------------	---------------------------------	--

RESPONSEID_62378878_3 eae48d91c5fa0c4-571F70F5-5056-9439-7EA7CD846954EEED	35:29.9	Nanci Alexander	Animal Rights Foundation of Florida	<p>We were pleased to learn about the upcoming workshop to discuss the use of non-human primates in NIH-funded research. We would like to recommend the following experts to be added to the list of workshop participants. We believe that each would provide important perspectives to the workshop. 1. David Wendler, Ph.D., Senior Investigator, Head, Section on Research Ethics, Department of Bioethics, NIH 2. David DeGrazia, Ph.D., Senior Research Fellow, Department of Bioethics, NIH 3. Peter Singer, Ira W. DeCamp Professor of Bioethics in the University Center for Human Values, Princeton University 4. Nathan Nobis, Ph.D., Associate Professor, Department of Philosophy & Religion, Morehouse College 5. Lori Marino, Ph.D., Executive Director, Kimmela Center for Animal Advocacy 6. Hope Ferdowsian, M.D., M.P.H., Assistant Clinical Professor of Medicine, George Washington University 7. Kari Bagnall, Director, Jungle Friends Primate Sanctuary (Gainesville, FL); Bagnall has years of hands-on experience with New World monkeys, and has rehomed many former lab monkeys. Thank you for your consideration!</p>
RESPONSEID_61326544_8 56d8f81a671afeb-B6933CC7-5056-9439-7E9F5B724F1E0478	52:57.4	Amber Canavan	<i>(Submitter left answer blank)</i>	<p>I would like to see these workshops address the physiological and mental similarities between the species of monkeys being used in NIH funded studies, and chimpanzees. If chimpanzees are both too similar and too dissimilar to use in experimentation, then non-human primates must be too.</p>

<p>RESPONSEID_60672730_9 aueb654c22c6d61- C36478CE-5056-9439- 7EC4F74C78C9371D</p>	<p>39:46.2</p>	<p>Jay Schwartz</p>	<p>(Submitter left answer blank)</p>	<p>Under the oversight of the IACUC and funding agencies like the NIH, researchers are required to maximize animal welfare as much as possible within the constraints of their research. While this is admirable, it is insufficient from an animal welfare perspective. Some research simply cannot be done without using methods that cause so much avoidable suffering among the subjects that they are, in my view, unjustifiable, regardless of the knowledge produced. Social isolation is an example of such a method. Almost all anthropoid primates (monkeys and apes) are naturally social. Behavioral and psychological research has demonstrated the importance of social contact (e.g. grooming) in these primates' daily lives, and the disastrous psychological consequences of prolonged social isolation. It is clear that monkeys and apes experience social isolation similarly to humans; given that in humans solitary confinement is considered an extreme punishment, even torture by some, social isolation of these primates for research purposes is unacceptable. We must identify means of conducting our research without isolating anthropoid primates from their conspecifics - and, I believe, cease research for which that is not an option.</p>
<p>RESPONSEID_59416769_9 8e1faf6787aed53- 414736B7-5056-9439- 7EC7D369855C2B4B</p>	<p>12:40.2</p>	<p>Liz Simon</p>	<p>(Submitter left answer blank)</p>	<p>What is NIH's direction on the use of NHP for understanding biomedical consequences of HIV/SIV infection and ART therapy. This includes metabolic dysregulation such as insulin resistance, lipodystrophy, loss of muscle mass and mechanisms leading to it.</p>

RESPONSEID_59357825_7 b3125b4eb5e5dda- 2500FAF2-5056-9439- 7E92C29469BA0E57	54:21.9	Paul Czoty	(Submitter left answer blank)	Greetings. I would be very interested in attending the workshop. I think the goals are not only admirable but critically important to ensure the public's support of biomedical research with monkeys. I've used nonhuman primates for over 20 years in my research and can speak to their importance in developing treatments for diseases that represent costly public health problems like addiction. If the size of the workshop is limited, I would be happy to suggest experts who can speak to the goals of the workshop. Feel free to email or call 336-713-7112. Thanks.
RESPONSEID_59298424_4 0f17e33c1be43ae- 13113CF3-5056-9439- 7E7166C515D08662	26:14.1	Kate Saylor	NIH OSP	This is a test comment.