



ICS Ethics Committee meeting Agenda

Sunday 14th October 2012,

Venue: China National Convention Center (CNCC), Beijing

Room: 406

Time: 11.00-12.45

Known Attending: Edward Stanford (Chair), Nina Davis, Tom Rosenbaum, Mary H. Palmer

Known Apologies: Andrew Farkas, Suzanne Hagen, Safwat Tosson, Mitesh Parekh, Karl-Dietrich Sievert

In Attendance: Avicia Burchill

Please note that a member of the Board of Trustees will be popping into your meeting to discuss the forthcoming ICS strategic planning process.

- | | |
|---|-------------|
| 1. Committee picture to be taken | 11.00-11.05 |
| 2. Approval of Glasgow meeting minutes

(attached) | 11.05-11.10 |
| 3. Terms of office (attached) | 11.10-11.15 |
| 4. Terms of Reference (attached) | 11.15-11.20 |
| 5. Funding of speakers/participants at annual
meeting | 11.20-11.30 |
| 6. Disclosure slide- process and
implementation review | 11.30-11.45 |
| 7. Transvaginal mesh for female POP | 11.45-12.45 |

surgery

- Legal perspective from US and different countries
- Canvassing for patients by law firms
- Do studies show adequate safety to date?
- Is the FDA correct in mandating further studies?
- Is so, what studies are needed?
- Are there similar actions occurring in other countries? Australia? Europe?
- What are the ethical issues in proper informed consent re: mesh for POP or incontinence?
- What are the ethical considerations in reporting research at the annual meeting in regards to mesh?
- In general, what are the ethical

considerations regarding mesh for POP
or incontinence and does the ICS want
to have the Ethics Committee weigh
in?

- | | |
|---|-------------|
| 8. What does the committee feel our role
(committee and society) is in this
matter? | 12.10-12.15 |
| 9. Introduction of new technologies into
lesser developed countries- previously
discussed should be considered again. | 12.15-12.35 |
| 10. Budget Plan 2013 | 12.35-12.40 |
| 11. AOB | 12.40-12.45 |



ICS Ethics Committee meeting Agenda

**12:00 – 14:00, Monday 29th August 2011, The Crowne Plaza,
Meeting room 1, Glasgow, UK**

Known Attending: Edward Stanford (Chair), Karl-Dietrick Sievert, Tom Rosenbaum, Margaret Sherburn, Andrew Farkas

Known Apologies: Clare Fowler, Ian Pearce

In Attendance: Kirsty Sims

12. Approval of Toronto meeting minutes

13. Terms of office. Recruitment of new members

14. Terms of Reference

15. Changes to process of declaration of conflict of interests for speakers - plans to monitor effectiveness at 2011

16. Discussion about Ethics presentation at ICS 2012

17. Discuss the FDA patient awareness statement. Prepare comments to the ICS membership through the Board.

18. Introduction of 1st world medicine/technologies and their introduction into 3rd world settings.

19. AOB

Ethic Committee Meeting Minutes
12:00 – 14:00, Monday 29th August 2011, The Crowne Plaza,
Meeting room 2, Glasgow, UK

Attendees:

Edward Stanford (ES), Nina Davis (ND), Andrew Farkas (AF) Suzanne Hagen (SH), Karl-Dietrich Sievert (EDS) and Safwat Tosson (ST).

Apologises:

Clare Fowler (CF), Mary Palmer (MP), Mitesh Parekh (MP), Ian Pearce (IP), Tom Rosenbaum, (TR), and Margaret Sherburn (MS)

In attendance: Kirsty Sims (KS)

ES Introduction

Clare will not be attending this meeting as she will not be coming to Glasgow until later in the week.

Board of trustees have suggested that we maintain the number of current members – but this should be reviewed in accordance with attendance to of member.

IP,MP and MS are due to complete their current terms in September 2011 – we need to establish if IP and MP are renewing their terms, in accordance with the TOR that members may renew once. Once decided we will report back to the board to confirm numbers.

Suggestion that the members are not fixed and perhaps ad-hoc members can be brought in from other committees or legal representation comprises an element to the committee.

Issue over rules of 3 year terms – this committee should have longevity and it is important for past history and knowledge to be carried forward and not to simply be lost once the ‘renewed’ term has ended.

This committee should encompass a ‘broad mix’ of skills and expertise and should be more than just ‘turning up’ to the annual committee meeting.

ES puts forward the question – “do you want to keep a mixture of skills/discipline?”

General consensus is ‘yes’, a vote is carried out and all present members are in favour.

ACTION – ES to go to board to ask to maintain the list of members and approach the membership to find a physiotherapy rep to replace MS. Whilst current list is to be maintained, committee should recruit one more member (in addition to MS replacement).

ACTION – Position of members who may/may not renew needs to be clarified and permission from the Board is to be sought in order to extend the number of committee members. Also, clarity is required over the position of GS. It is not appropriate to have the GS as voting member of the Ethics Committee, if the committee are responsible to the GS – ES to raise this point.

The minutes from the meeting in Toronto 2010 are approved.

ES refers to his slides to discuss through the points of his agenda, beginning with the 'duties of members', quoting the aims of the committee..."the ethics committee shall – see TOR....."

Whist discussing these points, AF voices concerns over the Board not approaching the committee for consultation on issues. At this point, ES states that he has been asked to attend a 'disciplinary' meeting on Wednesday 31st September. ES re-iterates AF's point by saying that the Board should have come to the committee first – but this circumstance did not allow for that and "it's a start!"

With regards the committee communicating during the year – ST mentions the committee should investigate the use of Skype to facilitate group discussions.

ACTION - ES to investigate budget for communication and any other avenues/request funding if necessary.

At the request of the Board of Trustees, ES has 'promised' that the committee would 'come up with a topic' for a workshop to be held in 2012 in Beijing. The format of which would ideally an hour to two hour open session, where there would be no charge for admission and speakers would be invited to talk about the chosen subject.

Ideas for discussion topic:-

"1st world medicine in 3rd World Countries"

"Discussion - stem cell research and findings – investigation of stem cells advances in research"

Committee are leaning more towards the stem route, proposing that invited speakers should be both European and Chinese. However, the standard of English, particularly of the Chinese speakers should be very high and easy to understand.

Should the committee try to get this published after?

Speakers mentioned to approach are Mike Chancellor (funded research for stem cell) and Tony Atalla (involved with technology and industry – however is currently involved with industry and links have not been declared. This has been highly publicised, so may not be viable?

ACTION - KDS to investigate suitable speakers, and AF to assist with finding/approaching speakers

ES also requests that KDS puts together a proposed agenda along with the speaker list.

ACTION - Agenda and list should be collated and reviewed by November, in order to invite speakers and submit workshop application.

Further discussion on this topic broadens the scope of the topic - could cover 'new technologies in the developing world', address the 'Chinese' delegates directly – with reference to the Kio – technology re-routing. The results are currently not consistent, but a possible avenue to explore.

Tissue engineering/stem cell – possible discussion on the ethical implication of 'harvesting'

Should this be joint with IUGA?

ES - Should this be a panel discussion? Proposed two speakers introduce the different topics, followed by open discussion – with the format being that first part would be ‘educational’ and informative with prompted discussion after.

The introduction should demonstrate ‘where we are now’ and ‘how we arrived there’ – thus providing and understanding of the whole process.

This prompts the thought to possibly invite Margret Damasar, as a speaker.

At this stage the aim is for a ‘panel discussion’ however, if the agenda is comprehensive, a ‘workshop’ will be requested (Tuesday or Wednesday sessions ideally).

The conversation now turns to general committee ‘accessibility.’ There should be a route for general members/practitioners to reach the Ethics Committee to ask for advice.

An email is suggested. KS suggests a generic email address that the office can filter first, such as ethics@icsoffice.org. This will enable any ethical issues to be brought to the whole committee – possible via the ‘forum’ section of the website.

In certain scenarios, outside consultation will be sought to aide with deliberations.

ES “if something come to ‘us’ we need to be sure we take legal advice, via ICS. No advice should be returned until the query has gone through the committee, the Executive Committee, the Board of Trustees and ICS appointed solicitors”.

ACTION – KS to discuss with Dominic Turner the implementation of this address box.

Disclosures

The committee should complete ‘full’ disclosures, which are honest. If there proves to be a conflict, a ‘closed door’ meeting will be held to discuss this within the committee.

Slide disclosures – covers slides are being used during the 2011 meeting (for the first time) and are a ‘working document’, as they do not act as a ‘full disclosure’ and are only specific to that particular presented abstract. This slide is completed at the ‘speaker ready room’ when slides are submitted for presentation.

The chairman of the session is to ask for disclosures on the stand if this slide is not completed prior to presentation, and if the speaker fails to comply they will be asked to declare or not present. After the meeting, a report of disclosures completed in advance, on the stand etc will be presented the B of T.

SH and ST to go to ‘speaker ready room’ to see how the slides are added and understand the process.

Suggestion that next year, you will be unable to upload your slides unless the disclosure slide is completed before hand.

ACTION – Discuss with ICS IT Department how we can ensure this. ICS and Kenes will need to find a process for this.

This leads onto the fact that no disclosure takes place for posters. A suggestion that a smaller, scaled down version of the slide is used and attached the poster. This allows for complete transparency and should then be incorporated in the 'poster' guidelines for next year.

ACTION – finalise a 'poster' disclosure 'ticket' for inclusion in 2012 guideline material. Template should be downloaded from website?

The 'funding' section of the current slide need to be clarified, as it currently only contains information about funding 'to attend' - this box is ambiguous and open to interpretation.

The slide will be left for 2011, and only ask for 'attendance funding'

ACTION – Clarify slide content for 2012

Canvassing

It is important to note that canvassing for votes was a 'trial' for 2011, so the result for vote at the AGM will be interesting.

AF mentions his concerns over the ICS office providing personal contact details to facilitate canvassing. AF mentions that as he disagrees with canvassing, and therefore did not vote for candidates who had done so, even if that person had previously been the preferred choice.

ND – Seconded AF sentiments, and is against canvassing. "I feel that the candidates should get their message out via their personal statements. This is the most professional way to influence colleagues."

KS explains that the ICS office did not contravene our European data protection laws which govern us as a 'data storer'. No personal details were provided via the office. However, if members details are marked as 'public' on the individual membership record, there is nothing to stop a candidate from going through every record (a pain staking process), in order to gain addresses for a mail shot.

ST – Did not canvass himself, because I think it is wrong.

ES suggests that a piece should be written for the ICS newsletter to explain to members that the ICS office and ICS as a society, was not involved in providing personal details to re-assure the membership who may have similar concerns the AF.

Dependant on the AGM vote results – if canvassing is approved, the suggestion of allowing a 'personal statement' where members can read about the candidates before placing their vote, will be put forward.

Even if vote is unsuccessful, the production of a personal statement should still be implemented to inform voting membership.

If the result of the vote is 'no' a 'fall back' plan of what would happen if canvassing was discovered would need to be implemented with the result being the candidate is dismissed from the ticket.

If canvassing is still occurring, in light of the 'no' vote, the committee will wait for the issue to be brought to them before taking further action.

ACTION – Implement the above if vote is successful and investigation into the 'ethics' of canvassing needs to be addressed.

AOB

ES added the FDA enquiry to the agenda, just to prompt any discussion. ES is to testify to the FDA enquiry later in September.

For the purpose of clarity – CF remains chair for the duration of the 2011 meeting, and her term officially ends at the AGM, on Thursday 1st September. ES is the 'interim chair' and will assume the position at the AGM.

ES describes 'an embarrassing situation' that took place when he asked to attend the trustee meeting to present on behalf of the committee. This prompted the discovery that the trustee meeting is in fact a 'closed' meeting and such ES will write to Board to explain his grievance and question the ethical responsibilities of the board to hold an 'open' meeting. Should it be clarified that meeting is indeed closed, ES will 'push' to ensure the meeting is as open and transparent as possible.

The position of 'deputy' chair needs to be discussed and then appointed. As not all members are present ES will email all members to request volunteers.

ST, AF and KDS all show initial interest during the meeting.

Summary of action points

- ES to go to board to ask to maintain the list of members and approach the membership to find a physiotherapy rep to replace MS. Whilst current list is to be maintained, committee should recruit one more member (in addition to MS replacement).
- Position of members who may/may not renew needs to be clarified and permission from the Board is to be sought in order to extend the number of committee members. Also, clarity is required over the position of GS. It is not appropriate to have the GS as voting member of the Ethics Committee, if the committee are responsible to the GS – ES to raise this point.
- ES to investigate budget for communication and any other avenues/request funding if necessary
- KDS to investigate suitable speakers, and AF to assist with finding/approaching speakers
- Agenda and list should be collated and reviewed by November, in order to invite speakers and submit workshop application.
- KS to discuss with Dominic Turner the implementation of this address box.
- Discuss with ICS IT Department how we can ensure this. ICS and Kenes will need to find a process for this.
- Finalise a poster disclosure for inclusion in 2012 guideline material. Template to download from website?

- Implement the necessary changes, after the canvassing vote has taken place and investigation into the 'ethics' of canvassing needs to be addressed.
- Appoint deputy chair

ICS Ethics Committee Terms of reference

1. PURPOSE: To maintain proper conduct of ICS in matters of ethical consideration.

2. FUNCTIONS:

- i. Develop a fair, disclosure policy regarding “conflicts of interest” for ICS members, officers, and meeting participants.
- ii. Develop policies to ensure that all research presented to the society is carried out in compliance with basic international ethical standards for the conduct of human and animal research
- iii. Develop position papers on ethical matters as required from time to time by the ICS Board of Trustees and Chair of ICS
- iv. Provide advice from time to time on specific ethical questions as requested by the ICS Board of Trustees and General Secretary
- v. Organize an annual educational program on ethical issues relevant to the interests of the ICS in conjunction with each year’s annual scientific meeting
- vi. Serve as a conduit for conveying the views and opinions on ethical issues from the membership of the ICS Board of Trustees and Chair of ICS, and vice-versa.
- vii. Undertake such additional matters as may from time to time be required of the Committee by the ICS Board of Trustees and Chair of ICS

3. RESPONSIBLE TO: ICS Board of Trustees and ICS General Secretary

4. COMPOSITION:

Total Members	Method of Appointment	Name	Term of Office
General Secretary	Ex officio	See Appendix A	3 years
Chair:	Elected. A member must sign his/her agreement to stand. This nomination is signed by nominator and seconder, all being ICS members. The Chair would normally have served as a committee member, either current or in the past. Nominations received by April 1st as advertised. Voting regulations as stated.	See Appendix A	Term of office: 3 years, renewable once by formal election
Membership	All members of ICS committees must be active ICS members (paid for current membership year) (By-law 2.3.2) 9 members each with 3 year term of office, 3 retiring each year ensuring a regular rotation through the committee.	See Appendix A	3 years, renewable once by Chair/committ ee approval. Further terms could be approved in exceptional circumstances

			and by referral to the ICS Trustees.
Subcommittees (if any)	None		
Updated June 2012			

5. MEETINGS: One face-to-face meeting during the Annual Scientific meeting; Other deliberations normally by email.

6. QUORUM: One third of committee membership plus one. For example, a committee of ten will have a quorum of four members.

7. MINUTES: Minutes are recorded at each meeting and posted on the ICS and CPC website in accordance to 2009 ICS Bylaw 6.1-6.4).

8. REPORTING & ROLES: The Chair is responsible to the Board of Trustees, and to the members of the ICS at the AGM. The Chair must table a report at the AGM and be available to answer comments from members. The Report will be available to members 6 weeks ahead of the AGM so members can come prepared. The Chair should not read out the Report at the AGM but draw attention to important areas. If important issues should arise during the year, the Chair must advise the General Secretary, without delay.

Appendix A

Ethics Committee terms of office

Role	Member	Term Start	Term End	Term Yrs	Elected	Term details
Chair	Edward Stanford	1/09/2011	30/10/14	3	Y	Initial 3 year term ends 2014- Can renew by formal election
Committee member	Nina Davis	1/09/11	30/10/14	3	N	First 3 year term ends 2014- can renew once
Committee member	Andrew Farkas	02/10/09	19/10/12	3	N	First 3 year term ends 2012- can renew once
Committee member	Suzanne Hagen	02/10/09	19/10/12	3	N	First 3 year term ends 2012- can renew once
Committee member	Mary Happel Palmer	24/10/08	30/10/14	6	N	Second 3 year term ends 2014- CANNOT renew
Committee member	Mitesh Parekh	26/08/10	29/08/13	3	N	First 3 year term ends 2013- can renew once
Committee member	Tom Rosenbaum	02/10/09	19/10/12	3	N	First 3 year term ends 2012- can renew once
Committee member	Margaret Joy Sherburn	24/10/08	30/10/2014	6	N	Second 3 year term ends 2014- CANNOT renew
Committee member	Karl-Dietrich Sievert	02/10/09	19/10/12	3	N	First 3 year term ends 2012- can renew once
Committee member	Safwat Tosson	02/10/09	19/10/12	3	N	First 3 year term ends 2012- can renew once