

## ICS Ethics Committee Meeting Minutes Monday 26<sup>th</sup> August 2013, Barcelona

**Present:** Edward Stanford (Chair), Mary Happel Palmer, Andrew Farkas, Safwat Tosson, Nina Davies, Suzanne Hagen

**Apologies:** Karl-Dietrich Sievert, Mitesh Parekh,

**In attendance;** Cristina Naranjo Ortiz

**In Attendance:** Avicia Burchill

### 1. Committee picture to be taken

### 2. Approval of Beijing meeting minutes (attached)

Motion to approve the Beijing minutes

ND proposed

Seconded MP

All in favour: Carried

### 3. Terms of office

ND confirm that she wishes to renew

ES questioned whether his position was due for renewal in 2014.

**ACTION POINT:** AB to check when ES was formally elected

***Post Script Note:** The AGM minutes of 2011 Glasgow were reviewed. It was confirmed that ES was officially elected by web ballot in 2011. The 2010 AGM minutes were also checked when Clare Fowler was still chair and there was an official call for new ethics chair during that meeting. ES was already on the committee at that stage and but his "new" three year term started fresh in Glasgow. Therefore ES's first term comes to an end on 2014 in Rio.*

ES explained to the committee that Mitesh Parekh and Karl-Dietrich Sievert did not participate this year as Ethics committee members. Based on previous discussions and lack of participation during the year ES put a motion to ask both these members to step down with immediate effect.

All in favour: Carried

**ACTION POINT:** ES to correspond to and ask to Mitesh Parekh and Karl-Dietrich Sievert to step down with immediate effect.

It was agreed not to replace with interim people and to call for Mary H Palmer's position and 2 more positions to replace MP and KDS in April 2014.

ES stated that he has a problem with using the forum. A discussion was held and it was agreed that the forum should be continued to be used over e-mail. However to ensure that everyone is away of the discussions taking place make sure all members get an e-mail to confirm "this is a forum" discussion.

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

A discussion was held about the current structure of the committee. It was discussed to have the current structure and allow ad hoc members to join to ensure experience and specialty can be brought in for specific projects. ICS members can be coopted and are full members of the committee. If non ICS members they would not get a vote.

It was noted that specific representatives are not to be defined within the TOR but they are noted on the website so the committee must remember to "actively seek" certain disciplines as they arise.

SH questioned why the ethics committee members are not at other meetings to hear what is being worked on to bring back to the ethics committee for discussion. AF feels that we have been excluded as people don't want prying eyes. MP perhaps we were pigeon holed with the committees original purposes and that there are other things that can be brought in and can bring value. ES felt at the time the ethics committee was new and people wanted to avoid us and also with the discipline issues would be viewed in a negative way so which is why ES did not approach the subject. Maybe its time to move forward and ask for representation on other committees.

ND feels that representation is important and having a scientist is crucial. A discussion was held about the best representation on the committee.

The final proposal was to have 10 members plus chair of which the following is the preferred representation:-

- 2 gynaecologists,
- 2 urologist,
- 1 geriatrician,
- 1 physiotherapist,
- 1 nurse,
- 1 scientist,
- 1 clinician with a pediatric interest
- 2 others

All in favour

**ACTION POINT: Update terms of reference document to represent proposal for structure**

**ACTION POINT – update the website with correct representations. ND is the geriatrician, Suzanne is not nursing representative, Cristina is physio rep.**

**5. Discussion of ethics presentation for the 2014 meeting**

Discussed below

**6. Discuss preliminary registration for 2013 luncheon- see how receptive the membership has been**

ES thanked ST for organizing. AB explained that almost 50 have registered which is a great number. It was questioned whether the room should be opened to more people as currently shown as sold out.

*Post Script: After the meeting AB noted that the session only recently sold out otherwise it would have been brought to attention of the office. It was arranged for the room size to be increased and shown as not sold out so as to encourage more attendees.*

ES questioned the lunch time symposium and whether it could be run at a time without competition. AB explained that the only time for a non-competitive slot is during the scientific programme as a state of the art/round table slot. MP noted that this is where working with the scientific committee is important. TR suggested that this issue is not escalated just yet but wait to see how the lunch meeting goes and if there is interest that would help the cause.

ES called for forum discussion about new ideas and to get idea. SH suggested The Francis report which AF explained was an investigation into the failing and management of an NHS trust in the UK and the neglect of patients specifically relating to continence.

**ACTION POINT: Start a discussion forum to get ideas for 2014 ethics lunchtime lecture.**

**7. Report on the disciplinary committee**

ES explained that the ethics committee was partially included into one of the disciplinary issues this year and another had been completed. ES explained that it was learning experience and he felt that is something the ethics committee should do rather than an ad hoc committee.

AB explained the disciplinary procedure as per the bylaws now and that the board were currently working on a grievance procedure for inclusion. AF agreed that ethics committee members should be represented on the disciplinary committee. ES feels that ethics committee can help with the internal and external perception of the ICS and to help the society better understand itself.

Discussion was held as to whether the ethics committee should be the disciplinary committee. All were in favour of this point. ND stated that this should be included in the terms of reference if agreed.

**ACTION POINT:** Raise with the Board of Trustees (the articles and bylaws sub-committee) that a representative from the ethics committee should participate in all grievance/disciplinary matters.

A discussion was also held that for purposes of transparency and with all the negative discussions happening within the society there was a benefit to having an ethics committee member involved as an outside observer at the board meetings.

**ACTION POINT:** Request Board that a representative from the ethics committee should be at the physical board meetings and to see the forum discussions. This would be a non-voting member and should be funded attend.

A discussion was held as to whether an ethics committee member should attend the scientific committee meeting and there was support for ethics committee involvement in ethical issues arising during abstract reviewing.

#### **8. Code of conduct discussion**

AB confirmed that the code of conduct had been agreed by the Board of Trustees and is now in force on the website and will be published physically at the AGM.

#### **9. Update on compliance with disclosures**

ES explained that there was full compliance with the disclosure slides except one last year in Beijing. AB explained that the generic slide had now been rolled out to all speakers including workshops and all additional sessions. It was noted that the chairs of the sessions do not disclose. It was also noted that there was no disclosure on non-discussion posters and it was felt that a disclosure statement should be placed on all posters.

**ACTION POINT:** Scientific Committee to be advised that a disclosure statement should be on all physical posters.

#### **10. AOB**