

## **Ethics Committee Teleconference minutes 13<sup>th</sup> December 2015**

**Attending:** Nina Davis (Chair), Alvaro Bedoya-Ronaga, Heidi Moossdorf-Steinhauser, Martha Spencer, Cristina Naranjo-Ortiz, Elise De

**Also in attendance:** Jenny Ellis, Avicia Burchill

**Apologies:** Ruwan Fernando, David Castro-Diaz

ND welcomed the members to the meeting and wished everyone happy holidays.

### **1. TOR**

Only 1 email regarding proposed changes, Alvaro reviewed, no other changes. ABR we discussed in Montreal, thought it was agreed. EC TOR should be definition of the committee, ND not finalised as yet as BoT need to review. JE confirmed that the TOR cannot contravene the bylaws. Members not aware of the updated version, ND confirmed this is on the forum here:

<http://www.ics.org/Documents/Documents.aspx?DocumentID=3235>

This is updated based on Montreal meeting and March teleconference. The office has also advised on changed allowed by BoT. Received email regarding autonomy, thought it was Alvaro but maybe wrong? ABR advised it was a comment in an old discussion. ND need final approval, need quorum to be finalised. ND suggests any committee members have any proposed changes then please add to forum- deadline end of year.

**Action: All committee members to review TOR and provide final feedback by end of year. Office to email around.**

ND adjusted membership on TOR: limit to 10 members and removed paediatric member as limited in ICS. This was replaced by a scientist, would like to add a nurse as well. Welcome to co-opted member Martha Spencer! ND would recommend Martha to apply for the official position in April- office to send information to Martha. Martha then becomes geriatric representative to EC and ND reverts to a urologic member.

**Action: Office to email application form to Martha.**

ND would like members to encourage colleagues to apply for positions. ND will write some information for news to assist in recruitment. ABR thinks this is good. Heidi would like to be on the committee as a PT. though she also carries scientist credentials.

### **3. Contribution to the Scientific Programme**

ND asked who will be in Tokyo? Most members attending, MS not attending. ND: need to put a good proposal towards the programme, ND: Montreal basic ethics course was seen as too basic. ND thinking case based ethics conference, using the feedback from Montreal. Cara Tannenbaum and ND discussed usefulness of urodynamics, CT not a fan. Safwat Tosson advised that there is a move in Europe not to support urodynamics in

urologic and urogynecologic practices. ABR felt that wasn't the case in the UK. ED thinks this should be in main scientific session. Safwat Tosson suggested sending a survey to members about urodynamics across the board. This might be an idea rather than do it as a course.

Workshop suggestions: HMS liked case-based idea. ND: feedback on Montreal, not enough interactive. MS ran a case-based ethics session for internal medicine, and thinks a geriatric session would be good. ND or MS to write up. AB due January 4<sup>th</sup> but we can be a bit more flexible if you need more time e.g. case on geriatrics, no names required straight away. Can have skeleton programme. ND who wants to participate in course? MS happy to do geriatrics, CNO can help but will be busy due to trustee work. ND last year worked as moderator, happy to do this again. ABR not sure how much support I can give, can do GYN case, but feedback requested research/publishing ethics so we should do that. HMS suggested mesh, ND thought this would be good. ND: 4 cases? AB hour and half workshop? ND: yes. ED surgeries, consent, language barriers etc. ND Margot's talk raised a lot of issues, think we could find other real life examples to use- decide later. ND title? Interactive workshop, ED suggested *intermediate* in the title. AB advised that options to select on workshop is basic or advanced, so you need to have intermediate in title. AB suggested click advanced button but put intermediate in title. ND will do as directed.

**Action: Workshop title to include intermediate.**

ND will need committee to agree the wording of the title. ED suggested room set up in a circle, so it's interactive. Need plenty of microphones so people can respond, semi-circle so people can participate. ABD happy to do one mesh clinical case: using mesh going forward as an ethical issue. ED agrees that this would be a good international topic. ND need to have ABR CV- please send.

**Action: ABR send his CV to ND.**

ED suggested we can use the workshop as a basis for a white paper- all thought this would be a good idea.

## **2. Alvaro's Ethics Poster Session**

ND: we would like to contribute to the Annual Scientific Programme. In Montreal, entire EC endorsed ABR's idea for a special ethics poster session. A lot of discussion has already occurred on this topic, especially involving soliciting entries and managing the logistics. AB advised that we need to get going now, Programme Committee is already working on scientific session for Tokyo, so need to make a decision ASAP if you are proposing to the Scientific Committee. It could be that, due to financial and other restrictions, they may restrict/not allow the session to take place. But the office is investigating the

options. It could be core subjects that we have in Tokyo. But could still adjust the system so people can apply for the session.

ND first thing do we want e-poster session or podium session? Think latter would need to wait until more established. ND: Are all posters e-posters? AB indicates that trend is moving toward e-posters only. We have been doing discussing at the poster session, moderators there, people present at different times. These are open discussion e-posters, scores are less than the discussed/podium sessions. AB: e-posters could be included in these sessions, but would need people to submit within ethics category- which people haven't been doing. ABR: isn't this the purpose of introducing this? To incentivise the ethics position, we can advertise as a special award for this year. ABR thinks it would be a moderated session for this award. ND is this possible? AB you need to think about how many applications you are selecting from e.g. 50 submitted you will have a good selection, less than this then the content wouldn't be great. Also Tokyo is of concern as lower numbers, sponsorship is likely to less, every hall every hall costs. In Montreal we were able to have 5/6 parallel programmes. We want to make you aware of these concerns before the Board review, in case they decline your proposal for this request. Other concern, is the need to promote this proposal, concerned not enough lead in time for a session of this size. ND okay, I understand, so I propose that:

- 1) We make clear in communications, what we want to see in abstract- bullet points.
- 2) See what comes, can be absorbed into other sessions
- 3) Give a prize
- 4) Build on this for ensuing years

AB so anyone who puts it under ethics category will automatically be submitted for prize? AB yes. ABR has drafted some information ready. AB think if you want to raise awareness then should be in abstract submission process, so this information available within application process- so over 1000 people see this information. If it was automatically adding into submission process then it would make better awareness of the award.

**Reminder: 1<sup>st</sup> April deadline for workshops.**

ND DT sent a response on how it can be incorporate into the abstract application, without causing too much issue for anyone. ND could the office re-send this information?

**Action: Office to email DT email on awards and abstract system, to committee.**

ND so we will start, won't be too ambitious, to see the interest in the award. ABR can review and select the award. AB scientific committee have their own scoring system for awards, would be good to use this.

**Action: Office to email scientific scoring sheet to committee.**

CNO leaves.

AB suggested attending the scientific committee prizes meeting- lunchtime on last day of the scientific meeting. Would be good for ABR to show them the results of his selection.

ND : How much for prize? AB 500 euro's at the moment. ABR thought this is good. ND that is a lot of money, do you think we would get this? AB well it's the standard amount then I don't see why you wouldn't receive it. ABR with that amount then I think we will have a lot of applications.

AB need to get it on Board-Chair forum for everyone to discuss and then get Board approval ASAP. ABR has the proposal. Should I email to you? AB yes, will read through and get it on forum ASAP. Chris Payne BoT awards rep has seen this and is pro this idea. Would be good to get on the forum for Christmas as people have more time to review and respond online.

**Action: ABR will forward draft proposal to AB.**

ND: should ethics committee be allowed to apply? ABD no shouldn't be allowed.

### **3. White papers:**

ND ED very helpful on this discussion. ED suggested that we publish in NUU, Adrian Wagg supportive of the idea. ND person who write it will get credit for the paper. ND there is an international controversy in the news about an Egyptian doctor who did FGM, the patient died and the doctor was supposed to go to jail but didn't- Could we do FGM? ED has anyone already done this? ND not sure. ED thinks we need to do research into whether there are any papers on this and if not then we can do it. ED happy to be on this paper- thinks we need 2 or 3 people involved. ND happy to also contribute, but need to keep size small. JE suggested Suzy Elneil, ED agreed and thinks she should be on the paper. ND will contact Suzy to discuss.

**Action: ND to contact Suzy Elneil.**

ND: EC also to do a research ethics paper, David Castro-Diaz suggested this topic. But not sure if we should do this as we do have a lot of recent papers in this area. ABR doesn't have any experience in this area. ED think the mesh workshop should be turned into a white paper. ND: but this would be after the workshop? ED I think the work would overlap. HMS think we should do it after, ND agrees. ED thinks this would be better, yes.

JE suggested Chris Chapple's SOA webcast where he discusses mesh- might be good to review. ND agreed, JE will send to committee.

**Action: JE to send Chris Chapple video and mesh papers to Committee.**

ND: Don't need to cover falsifying data etc. – *Science* guidelines for scientific manuscripts have addressed this. ED: outsourcing research to lesser developed countries-due to costs

is a good topic of global interest ND suggested this as number 2 after FGM- all yes. ND good news is white papers are short, so just need to cram a lot of information into the paper. Some good examples of white papers on AUA website.

ND would like to see a separate page on the ICS website. JE advised that this would be possible and we can put them in multiple places so people see it. Group discussed logistics, office advised we need to keep BoT informed of these projects and they give final sign off.

ND will start by contacting Suzy and we can start working on these projects. Glad the committee is small and manageable.

#### **4. New Business**

ND any new business? ED ask members to send us questions/things to consider. JE suggested news articles with polls, social media etc. ED concerned about negative press. AB advised we can do closed forums as this is safest. ND asked whom this would be sent to? AB office would arrange and send responses to the committee.

Other organisation have ethics committees who are lawyers- deal primarily with legal issues, don't deal with nuts and bolts, internal issues. ICS is different than other organisations e.g. Code of Conduct.

ND no other business. Thank you to everyone for participating, we will work on the programme-related projects between now and January and then start on the white papers.

Adjourned 12:32 pm PST