



## **ICS Ethics Committee Meeting Minutes**

**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, Margaret Sherburn

**In Attendance:** Avicia Burchill, Jacques Corcos, Ajay Singla, Sender Herschorn

### **1. Committee picture to be taken**

SH explained that the board have agreed to prepare a 5 year strategic plan to see where the ICS is going. JC did a 3 year plan and was able to get the organisation to follow that plan the ICS has benefited from it. Now it time to do something more encompassing. Now the trustees are going to be the steering committee and have identified a number of areas of focus. A questionnaire will go to the membership and once feedback received. Governance/Committee structure/annual scientific meeting/Education & research/revenue generation. With the Beijing meeting the amount of industry money is down and we are facing a deficit for the meeting – luckily we will not face the loss but we are not going to take a profit. In years going forward is it right for us to be tied to the ASM for income generation? Can we provide education and research in another ways as part of our main mission? We will have this planning process and we are inviting the committee chairs to the 11<sup>th</sup> January maybe in Chicago. We have hired Compass a UK based company to help with the process and they have excellent experience. We interviewed a number of candidates. The first meeting will be in January and then another in March and then a document by June to be ready for Barcelona in June. Its aggressive but we need it to make sure we are healthy into the future. ES the Asian meeting for IUGA were not profitable. SH the idea came before Beijing but it's the industry who are not able to assist as much as possible We have to make sure our mandates are fulfilled.

ES asked where can the other revenues comes from. SH this is what the strategy should be finding out and looking into industry budgets. TR is the ICS able to do the research. SH we give £50K out in grants each year. MP as the organization thinks about the future we need to think about the membership and we need to think about getting new younger members and the ICS brand can be stronger re research. Also reaching out to those in information sciences to form databases.

### **2. Approval of Glasgow meeting minutes**

The minutes were reviewed.

MP proposed

TB second

Motion all in favour – minutes approved

### 3. Terms of office

ES How many do we need for this committee. We can bring in ad hoc member  
Need to replace Margaret Sherburn as standing down with immediate effect. Andrew, Suzanne, Tom, Karl-Dietrich and Safwat all wish to renew.

**ACTION POINT:** AB to contact Mitesh Parekh and find out whether they wish to renew after Barcelona.

*Post Script Note: Mitesh confirm his wish to remain on the committee after Barcelona*

**ACTION POINT:** Expression of interest for a Physiotherapy representative.

ES feels that Clare did not do anything in her last year and the committee direction was not clear. We hoped that we would be given some sort of task so the last 12 months there has been no activity. JC asked whether anyone checks the disclosures of the workshops for example. ES the disclosure process for the scientific process was sorted but we don't check the workshops. JC questioned is the fact that you disclose it – is that enough? TB this issue was touched on before in the previous Ethics Committee and it created big issues and we settled the waters and moved forward. But in an ideal word we need full disclosure, how much is full i.e. how much do you get paid. ES 2 years ago we put together the abstract re the disclosure. JC questioned whether is it enough and stated that he did not think so. ES I disagree with that until we did this no other societies were doing this and now everyone else does. AS explained that at AUA that they do a random check to the slides. TB asked how to they check? AS explained that they check against your disclosure that you previously submitted and compare. ES explained that AUGS ask whether you get over a certain financial limit. JC does anyone check whether this has been free of commercial bias. Maybe the committee should be telling us to be –how far to disclose and how far to check them. AB explained that the workshop are checked for product bias before the workshop is run but its not asked in the evaluations. ES we focused on scientific presentations and we did not concentrate on workshops. What is going to be enough – ES stated that he personally thinks that if you disclose that is enough. JC agreed but its not written down.

ES it should be written in the session chair guidelines that if there is no disclosure then there should be no presentation

MP maybe we should ask the delegates whether there was commercial bias and it may trigger an audit.

ES summarized the discussion: we should communicate to the chairs that disclosure is essential. It is supposed to be taken care of when they go to speaker ready room. Need to formalize the workshop disclosure. Add it to the evaluation. Plus each speaker needs to use the disclosure slide. If a bias appears then education committee should review and give feedback.

Nina Davis entered the meeting

ES how we monitor this years disclosure. MP a report back from the office and a check. JC left.

ACTION POINT: AB to check session presentations guidelines. *Post script note: there are no session chair guidelines in place and the office was not advised that no disclosure meant no presentation. However session chair guidelines were implemented at the Beijing meeting and the Chairs were asked to indicate on the score sheet where the presenter did not provide the disclosure. The office will provide feedback to the committee on the results of this audit. However going forward it therefore needs to be made clear to session chairs that if the presenter does not provide the disclosure slide they are not allowed to present the work. This also needs updating on the abstract submission guidelines.*

#### **4. Terms of Reference**

Reviewed no changes.

#### **5. Funding of speakers/participants at annual meeting**

ES explained there were two issues – we put forward a workshop which was going to be lunch symposium which turned into a workshop incorrectly. It led to issues of funding for speakers. Need to formalize funding and need for absolute clarity. KD recommended some Chinese speakers and that he would do contact. Through miscommunication ES had to forced to cancel the workshop.

When ES asked whether the ICS can fund a speaker for the Chinese speakers it was explained not unless they were not ICS members and this was confirmed by Dan Snowdon and Sender Herschorn. The annual meeting guidelines confirmed this. ES then found out that the board approved KD funding. ES asked SH for clarity.

SH responded - I cant answer for what happened in the past. The board is empowered to make these kind of decisions and the treasurer is able to do this – the problem here is that the two issues of the workshop and funding are linked because it happens to be same person. But the decision was made that this was a special circumstance. ES responded we need to follow the rules and if there are changes to the rules then there should some transparency. You should not fund one without funding all. SH we were unable to find someone to speak and he could not get funding and that is why it was considered. MP I agree that there should be transparency and it should be just announced to the membership. Its just a perception. TB maybe it should be mentioned at the AGM. ES in a corporate setting there would be a compliance officer but at what stage should the ethics committee should be involved. AS there is no need to tell the Ethics Committee. TR It matters when its of scientific relevance. SH there is no commercial input here. The scientific committee felt it so important and it just so happens that the person involved is also a member of the ethics committee. It feels like you are saying that the board has behaved inappropriately and I have issue with that. AS if the remit of ethics committee are to ensure that the bylaws are followed – are they to police and in what capacity.

ES if this is a compliance and bylaw issue then what role does the ethics committee have.

TB would you be happy to be transparent about the funding. SH I would be happy to make an announcement and the membership would be happy about this aswell. ES apologized if SH had a negative feeling about it – its not personal. Having lived through the past its not that we are being negative its just we need to bring it to everyones attention – there has been full disclosure and I cant imagine it being done better. The EC need to be able to raise issues.

AB suggested a addendum to the annual meeting guidelines to cover special circumstances and to ensure its disclosed to the membership

**6. Disclosure slide- process and implementation review – discussed above**

**7. Transvaginal mesh for female POP surgery**

ES feels that we need to raise issues we don't want to submit a workshop but rather have a discussion forum at lunch time. If it's a free workshop this could be fine. TB the purpose is to promote ethic principles. ES we are mandated to follow guidelines – and that is to produce a workshop or something similar.

A discussion about whether to do a workshop or whether it could be something else.

ES went through the list of potential topics.

AB outlined the process of getting something into the programme.

**AOB**

A further meeting will be held during the meeting week to discuss other items not discussed at meeting