



## Ethics Committee Minutes

**Wednesday 13th September 2017, Florence, Italy**

**Chair:** Nina Davis

**Members:** Elise De, Cristina Naranjo Ortiz, Tamara Dickinson, Alvaro Bedoya-Ronga, Ryuji Sakakibara, Martha Spencer, Heidi Moosdorff-Steinhauser, Ruwan Fernando

**Apologies:** Chris Chatterton

**Also in Attendance:** Avicia Burchill, David Castro-Diaz

Welcome and introduction of new members

### **1. Discuss pre-Florence forum discussion**

The November minutes were approved but ND felt there should be another set of minutes from another call. AB will follow up. There were no comments with regards to the committee report or the terms of reference.

HM confirmed she was happy to renew.

**ACTION POINT:** Office to find notes from the Sunday spring teleconference as missing from minutes to be approved.

### **2. Location and times of ethics award abstracts**

AB-R noted the aim of the ethics award in that it should highlight the cultural differences within the ICS. The idea was to raise the ethical discussion amongst the community. ND: We wrote sample case studies so that applicants could see examples. The whole idea was to write a case study or abstract about an ethical dilemma and how it was managed, then present it. HM felt that it was not clear enough to see the examples. AB said you could see the link when you were going through the abstract submission process, but there needs to be more advertising on a personal level to make people aware. All agreed that giving the award should highlight it more. ND: The scientific committee should be made more aware of the awards. ED explained that all 3 ethics submissions this year were declined by the Scientific Committee, so she intervened. There was no awareness on the part of the Scientific Committee of these types of abstracts being solicited. RF stated they that the abstracts do not fit the standard format and that the ethics committee should review them and highlight those that meet the criteria for the award.

**ACTION POINT:** On deadline abstract day highlight to Scientific Chair to give ethic submissions to ethics committee to review.

ED stated that she thinks the committee should send an enquiry to the Scientific Committee now to explain the ethics abstracts, and to make it clear that that we want to review them. A discussion was held about the new abstracts reviewing system being developed and it was



agreed that swift action was needed if the ethics committee wanted to ask for the ethics category to be scored differently.

**ACTION POINT:** Office to circulate abstract scoring system and proposals asap.

**ACTION POINT:** Office to ensure that ethics abstract presentations not at the same time as ethics workshop, meeting or other activities.

**ACTION POINT:** ND to contact the scientific chairs for 2018 and explain the ethics awards process.

MS asked if they were going to be case studies. ND explained that they don't need to be and she did both case and non-case study examples. AB-R stated that maybe a case report wouldn't be considered for scientific merit but would be evaluated for the quality and relevance of the ethics topic/discussion. ND: maybe educational merit would be a better scoring system as it teaches something to us. ND also thought that if someone did come up with a good abstract idea that we could use it for one of our projects. A discussion was held about scoring/reviewing the presentations as they are different presentations, i.e., eposter vs. podium and also about biases against non-native speakers. It was agreed that the reviewers would meet post sessions and make decision about winner, trying to be as objective as possible.

### **3. Reminder re workshop**

ND reminded people that the ethics committee workshop was running later that day. CN/HM and TD are being moderators but there is a lot to talk about. The concept is an interactive workshop about FGM and all procedures that affect the body i.e. gender reassignment and designer surgery.

### **4. Microsite update – Heidi Moossdorff**

HM explained that not much had been done on the microsite, but the idea is to make it an educational resource. RF sent the RCOG position on FGM as well as the EAU guidelines on live surgeries. Additionally, we will have the lecture on ethics of live surgeries by David Castro-Diaz if it is recorded. Other ideas to add to the microsite are to link to the Ethics posters/winners, eNews articles, etc. It was also discussed about making it possible for members to submit comments about ethics issues via a forum but how best to monitor it needs consideration.

**ACTION POINT:** HM to works with office to develop ethics committee micro-site.

### **5. Projects for next year**

ND felt that it would be useful to have continued teleconferences.

**ACTION POINT:** Office to action early to mid-November teleconference call



A discussion was held about the possibility of having a debate lecture at ICS 2018. Ideas were the value of urodynamics in the elderly. Chris Chatterton had suggested barriers to care and the stigma of obtaining medical care for people with incontinence issues. MS agreed and brought up the issue of care givers being the ones who push for incontinence care in the elderly when the older person isn't bothered or doesn't want treatment. ND: care of the frail elderly is a very timely topic. RF: could expand this have a geriatrician/physical therapist and the ethics of treating elderly patients for pelvic floor dysfunction. A discussion was held as to whether it should be a Round Table or a workshop. A workshop was suggested with the title of **"Management of Pelvic Floor Disorders in the Elderly"**. This is to be a case-based workshop in which the moderators will have cases prepared to present, but participants may also bring difficult cases to the workshop for general discussion.

#### **6. New protocol for workshop evaluations**

AB explained that the workshop evaluation by committee members has always happened but now the members stay for the duration of the workshop.

#### **7. SOPs for EC activities (judging ethics abstracts, annual business cycle)**

ND stated that now that she understands more about the committee, it is important to have an SOP to have deadlines and activities that need to be done. Especially with regards to the ethics award it will require some coordination. Then new people will know the deadlines is etc.

**ACTION POINT:** ND to write SOP for ethics committee.

#### **8. AOB**

ED presented her ideas about ways in which the ICS might work with industry. The first is putting industry videos on the website for educational purposes and in exchange receiving an income for this. Secondly is having a course where industry attending to learn about topics that the ICS is presenting. Thirdly the concept of a shark tank/dragons den whereby industry listen to presentations and decide whether to support the research. ED thought that there may be a role for the ethics committee interacting with this. It was agreed that the ethics committee should participate in the discussion if the Trustees decide to pursue any of the options, and also to look at any videos prior to be placed on the website.

ED explained to the committee that she was anxious about not putting the Ethics Committee on as an author on the FGM white paper. All agreed that this was not an issue. It was discussed that there should be a white paper about ethical issues in geriatric care and it was agreed to consider this.

**ACTION POINT:** Office to circulate SOP for white papers and committee to pursue generating one on ethical issues in the care of geriatric patients.



## **Ethics Committee Agenda**

**Wednesday 13th September 2017,**

**Venue: Fortezza da Basso**

**Room: n6 Palazzina Lorenese**

**Time: 07:00-08:30**

**Chair:** Nina Davis

**Members:** Elise De, Cristina Naranjo Ortiz, Tamara Dickinson, Alvaro Bedoya-Ronga, Ryuji Sakakibara, Martha Spencer, Heidi Moosdorff-Steinhauser, Ruwan Fernando

**Apologies:** Chris Chatterton

**Also in Attendance:** Jenny Ellis, David Castro-Diaz

1. Welcome and introduction of new members
2. Committee picture
3. Discuss pre-Florence [forum](#) discussion;
  - November teleconference minutes (attached)
  - Committee Report (attached)
  - SOP's
  - TOR (attached)
  - TOO (attached)
4. Location and times of ethics award abstracts
  - assignments for judging
  - criteria for judging
  - need for protocol
  - method for collating evaluations
  - question of whether or not to maintain award
5. Reminder re workshop – ALL MEMBERS TO TRY TO ATTEND
6. Microsite update – Heidi Moosedorff
  - addition of lecture on ethics of live surgeries (David Castro-Diaz)

7. Projects for next year

- debate and/or workshop
- white paper or other project
- other ethics-related activities

8. New protocol for workshop evaluations

9. SOPs for EC activities (judging ethics abstracts, annual business cycle)

10. Establish times for conference calls – November/January/May/?July

11. AOB

**Adjourn**

**ICS ETHICS COMMITTEE TELECONFERENCE MINUTES**  
**13 November 2016**

**Attendees:** Nina Davis (chair), Elise De, Cristina Naranjo Ortiz, Ruwan Fernando, Alvaro Bedoya-Ronga, Heidi Moosdorff-Steinhauser, David Castro-Diaz (ex officio)

**Apologies:** Tamara Dickinson, Martha Spencer, Chris Chatterton, Ryuji Sakakibara

**In attendance:** Avicia Burchill

**1. Ethics Abstract Award**

AB was kind enough to provide an historical summary of the Ethics Abstract Award. Last year, there were no suitable abstract submissions for the award. Therefore, this year, we plan to advertise widely, especially soliciting from Early Career members and trainees. Attached to the agenda for the teleconference is a reference and associated abstract to be used as an example for applicants. Unfortunately, it could not easily be adapted to the current template for abstract submissions. Therefore, Avicia and Jenny conceived a proposal which was presented to the committee:

*Remove the competition from the abstract submission programme but run it alongside within the workshop programme. You can ask people to submit their interesting studies, in the format/template that you have already outlined (not using the abstract template), and then the committee can pick the best cases for presentation and those people can be invited to present at the ethics workshop and a prize given to the best presenter/case study etc. We suggest that you give everyone 5 minutes to present and 5 minutes discussion. Case studies are linked more to workshops, so this would fit well but maybe you would need to reduce the award prize to reflect this change as it wouldn't be an abstract award.*

*Also and as you are aware, the Board are looking for all committees to produce relevant content (reports, guidelines etc.) So in order to accommodate this strategic aim, the committee could review all of the submitted case studies and discuss areas where guidelines are required. The committee can then produce guidelines or a white papers to address these areas that are lacking ethical guidance.*

*We are thinking this suggestion of putting the case studies through the workshop would:*

- 1) Resolve the issue of fitting the case studies to the abstract submission process.*
- 2) Allow for longer advertising. We do something similar with the early career session and we advertise for a longer period and get good responses.*
- 3) Allow people to get exposure in a presentation style atmosphere.*
- 4) Still allow some kind of competition.*
- 5) Spark ideas for future scholarly output.*

AB mentioned that the Early Career Session was added in Barcelona and would be a good forum for the Ethics presentations. Another option would be to use the ethics case studies as

the basis for a workshop and to generate ideas for a future white paper. The award would therefore need to be modified. There would also be more time for submission, as the case studies could be submitted throughout the year. Participants could be given a certificate of presentation.

RF pointed out that the proposal seems practical, but we need Alvaro's input. [NOTE: Alvaro did join the meeting later and in discussion afterward, he indicated a desire to continue to head this initiative.]

AB suggested that should there not be enough abstract submissions the committee could review at the beginning of April once abstract submission has closed. If there are not sufficient submissions to create a small poster session then the committee could consider at that stage to amend the workshop programme and call people to submit their case studies. ED confirmed that the education committee can be flexible with accepting their workshop if it was not entirely complete.

AB mentioned that the Trustees had suggested that the EC members all submit abstracts to increase the numbers. Currently, the Scientific Committee accepts about 300 abstracts for presentation based on cumulative scores, and any abstracts submitted for the Ethics Award would have to gain a score high enough to be chosen. She also suggested that more than one example of a, ethics abstract would be useful for those planning submissions.

ND then summarized the 3 potential forums for presentation of ethics abstracts

- a. Incorporated into an ePoster session as originally discussed
- b. Serve as the basis for a workshop
- c. Be presented as part of the Early Career Forum

Action items:

-ND or ABR to work on abstract format/abstract examples. AB would like to have completed this week.

-AB to send out the current abstract template to the members

## 2. Workshop for Florence Meeting, ICS 2017

ND solicited ideas from members for the annual workshop which part of the remit of the committee. She briefly summarized the attendee reviews from this year's workshop. The evaluations largely clustered between "Good" and "Superb" – most were "Very Good".

ED pointed out that these were very favorable responses and that the Education Committee is looking to revise the evaluations to allow more constructive feedback to the workshop leaders.

ED also pointed out that the workshop should provide ideas for a white paper on an ethics topic. RF suggested a workshop on the ethics of presenting live surgeries as will be done for the first time in Florence. ND then asked whether or not there should be a debate as well as a workshop as had been done previously. She asked AB if the results of the Programme Committee poll were collated yet. If so, the EC would be interested in reviewing them so as to align their activities with the desires of the membership. ED pointed out that the question of FGM vs. cosmetic genital procedures could make an interesting debate topic. ND then reviewed the schedule for workshop submissions. Ideas should be fleshed out by January 4th and all materials should be completed (handout) by about March 1. AB pointed out that there is some

leeway in submitting the completed materials for the workshop. Since the EC workshop is a free workshop, there is no preregistration, so prompt submission is not as critical.

Action items:

- AB or Jenny to provide the results of the Programme Committee's poll when available
- Entire EC to consider workshop and possible debate topics for ICS 2017. These will need to be agreed upon and submitted to the Programme Committee by January 4, 2017.

### 3. White Paper on FGM

ED sent out revised version of the paper yesterday. Awaiting input from RF and CNO and any EC members who are interested in contributing, hopefully by the end of next week. ED also included a synopsis of the Trustees' comments for reference. Of particular note was the Trustees' desire to make the paper relevant to the ICS by highlighting urologic outcomes. ED did a literature review and found only a few references that were of poor quality. She solicited articles to distribute. RF said that, on preliminary review, a strength of the white paper was that it highlights the ethical aspects of the problem.

Action items:

- CNO and RF and any other interested EC members are to review the Trustees' comments and the current version of the white paper and provide comments to ED by the end of the week (November 18th). Also, any pertinent references should be provided.

### 4. Ethics of Live Surgery

ND reported that a proposal had been made that the EC should have a role in making sure patients' rights were protected during the live surgery which will be presented for the first time at the Florence meeting. ND asked, since the ICS sponsors workshops all over the world, some of which involve surgeries, if there was a standard operating procedure or any guidelines regarding the recruitment and presentation of patients. ND asked if the EC should provide a document. HMS wondered if this wouldn't be too much like policing the live surgery activity, ABR inquired about possible conflicts of interest such as not cancelling a surgery if there was a problem with the patient because of the need to provide the promised educational event. There then followed a great deal of discussion of how to protect patients. CNO mentioned having provisions to ensure respect for patients' privacy. RF brought up issues of indemnity and asked if we should obtain a separate consent for media-related activities. ABR commented that patient's autonomy must be respected in such situations, but based on cultural norms, this may not be the practice in certain countries. RF then found an EAU document with guidelines from the EU Live Surgery Committee. He will make this available to the EC.

Action items:

- RF to provide the EAU guidelines for live surgeries and other materials
- Entire EC to review materials about live surgeries and decide how best to incorporate this in EC activities or what role, if any, the EC should have in monitoring this portion of the annual programme.



#### 5. Project with the SSC

Marcus Drake of the SSC, before he stepped down, raised the question of whether changing terminology could compromise patient care and asked the EC to look at this issue. ND pointed out that, in the US, it is a potential problem because insurance reimbursement is often tied to specific codes. This is likely not as problematic elsewhere.

#### Action item:

-ND to investigate the possibility that changes in terminology may adversely affect patient care and present relevant information to the EC as a possible subject for a white paper or other activity.

#### 6. New business

ND reminded members that HMS had kindly agreed to monitor the EC microsite and work with the ICS office, specifically Dominic, to make necessary changes. HMS agreed as long as she gets the imprimatur of the EC for any changes. ND indicated that this is appropriate but that HMS should feel empowered to take the initiative to make improvements.

EC members were reminded that communication should be through forums as much as possible to facilitate communication.

The next teleconference is tentatively planned for early January 2017.

## ETHICS COMMITTEE ANNUAL REPORT 2017

Please note: This document will be updated after a teleconference and forum in August, 2017.

### 1. EC Committee Membership

After stabilisation of the committee last year with the addition of 4 members to reach what was felt to be an optimum member total (10, including the Chair), the position of Chair was up for election this year. Nina Davis was re-elected. EC membership now stands as follows:

Nina S. Davis (US)	Chair/Urologist
Alvaro Bedoya-Rongo (UK)	Urogynaecologist
Elise De (US)	Urologist
Ruwan Fernando (UK)	Urogynaecologist
Cristina Naranjo-Ortiz (Spain)	Physiotherapist
Heidi Moossdorff-Steinhauser (NL)	Physiotherapist
Ryuji Sakakibara (Japan)	Neurourologist
Chris Chatterton (UK)	Scientist/Ethicist
Martha Spencer (CAN)	Geriatrician
Tamara Dickinson (US)	Nurse Practitioner

We are also grateful for the contributions of David Castro-Diaz as ex officio member from the Board of Trustees.

### 2. Activities/Achievements

- The ICS 2016 EC free workshop (Core Curriculum), **Ethical Issues in Professional and Research Practice: An Intermediate Level Workshop** enjoyed spirited participation and received generally strong ratings from attendees. The cases and summaries of the key points were to serve to direct discussion among the participants. Our intent was to create an effective and enjoyable learning activity, but, also, to prompt discussion that would lead to topics for presentation in future ethics forums.

- Based on the success of last year's workshop, this year's contribution is an advanced workshop entitled **The Ethics of Female Genital Mutilation (FGM) and Other Urogenital Interventions: An Interactive Workshop**. This workshop will be given Wednesday afternoon, 13 September. The session will be moderated by **Cristina Naranjo-Ortiz** who will discuss the sociological and cultural background of FGM. **Ruwan Fernando** will direct discussion about the legal and ethical ramifications of FGM; and **Tamara Dickinson** will compare and contrast the ethical issues surrounding male infant circumcision, intersex surgery and genital plastic surgery. We look forward to a lively exchange.
- As our second major project during the past year, the EC successfully put forth a proposal to the Trustees to create a new award, the **Best Ethics Poster Award** which carries a £500 prize. The proposal came from **Alvaro Bedoya-Rongo** and was enthusiastically supported by the entire EC. In spite of efforts to publicize the new award on the abstract application site, in the ICS e-News, and elsewhere, no appropriate abstracts were submitted for the Tokyo meeting, so no award was given last year. This year PR efforts started early on several fronts beginning with a mention by **Kari Tikkinen** at the Early Career Session. Also, sample abstracts were written as examples and linked to the process for submission of abstracts in the Ethics category. Finally, several articles were written for the ICS e-News to encourage submissions, especially by trainees and early career members. The response was modest, but a solid start for a new award category. It is anticipated that the award will be given this year, and it is hoped that the number and quality of the submissions will increase in each successive year.
- Members of the EC were asked by General Secretary Mourad to monitor the live surgery activities being held for the first time at ICS 2018. It is anticipated that this will be

an ongoing activity for the EC as it aligns nicely with our TOR.

- The EC is grateful for the efforts of **Heidi Moossdorff-Steinhauser** who has significantly expanded the EC microsite. She has upgraded the photographs and added educational content such as the lecture by Suzy Elneil on the ethics of fistula management presented at last year's workshop.
- The EC continued to "cross-pollinate" with the Publications Committee by supplying the ICS e-News with articles presenting timely ethics-related content.

### **3. Future Projects and Activities**

- The EC will continue to provide a workshop, debate, or other educational activity for next year's Annual Meeting.
- The EC will develop materials with ethics-related content as its contribution to the ICS Core Curriculum. A needs assessment may be the best way to ensure that EC efforts are directed toward producing materials deemed of benefit to the Society. We will work with the ICS Office to query the membership.
- The EC will continue to ensure the integrity of the academic activities of the ICS..
- Based on the sessions presented at ICS 2018, consideration should be given to developing an SOP for EC monitoring of live surgical activities at the ICS annual meetings.
- The EC will continue to expand its microsite with educational content so that it will also serve as an informational resource for membership.

#### **4. Budget Request**

The EC budget request for 2017-18 has been appended to this report.

**5. Thanks to the ICS Office for their ongoing support, responsiveness to our needs and professionalism.**

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in dark ink, appearing to read 'Nina S. Davis'. The signature is stylized with a large, sweeping 'N' and 'D'.

Nina S. Davis, M.D., FACS

<b>2016-2017 BUDGET REQUEST - ICS ETHICS COMMITTEE</b>				
<b>Budget Item Request</b>	<b>Cost</b>	<b>Justification</b>	<b>Alignment to ICS strategy</b>	<b>Objectives (should be specific and measurable)</b>
<i>Conference calls, 3/year for up to 10 individuals including co-opted member(s), ICS Staff and Dr. Castro-Diaz, Trustee member</i>	<b>£500</b>	<i>The conference calls are integral to conducting the business of the committee including communication of important information, sharing and expanding upon ideas regarding projects such as composing white papers or organising workshops/activities for the ICS Annual Meeting, as well as discussing issues of concern to the committee.</i>	<i>-Ongoing EC monitoring of COI compliance ensures that the integrity of the organization is maintained</i> <i>-A programme currently in the planning stages will attract the interest and participation of early career members and others who might not ordinarily present at the meeting</i> <i>-Produce consensus and policy papers that will advance the academic objectives of the ICS and enhance its standing in establishing global policy</i>	<b><i>-Maintain the highest level of academic integrity through monitoring of COI reporting and assessing commercial bias in the ICS-sponsored programmes</i></b> <b><i>-Publish 1-2 white papers or reviews/year on ethical topics of global concern, e.g., the ethics of live surgery</i></b> <b><i>-Provide an annual workshop to the scientific programme for the ICS Annual Meeting</i></b> <b><i>-Contribute a unique activity of interest to the general membership dealing with one or more “hot topics” in global ethics including debates that may be conducted as part of a workshop or as a stand-alone presentation at the Annual Meeting.</i></b>
<i>Best Ethics Poster Award at the Annual Meeting</i>	<b>£500</b>	<i>As approved by the Trustees. The cost would be applied to annual meeting budget.</i>	<i>Encourages submissions by trainees and early-career attendees</i>	<b><i>-Increased number of submissions under the Ethics category</i></b> <b><i>-Increased number of submissions by trainees and early-career professionals</i></b>
<b>Total Cost</b>	<b>£1,000</b>			

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in dark ink, appearing to read 'N. Davis', with a stylized flourish at the end.

Nina S. Davis, M.D., FACS  
Chair, ICS Ethics Committee

	<b>2016-2017 BUDGET REQUEST - ICS ETHICS COMMITTEE</b>			
<b>Budget Item Request</b>	<b>Cost</b>	<b>Justification</b>	<b>Alignment to ICS strategy</b>	<b>Objectives (should be specific and measurable)</b>
<i>Conference calls, 3/year for up to 10 individuals including co-opted member(s), ICS Staff and Dr. Castro-Diaz, Trustee member</i>	<b>£500</b>	<i>The conference calls are integral to conducting the business of the committee including communication of important information, sharing and expanding upon ideas regarding projects such as composing white papers or organising workshops/activities for the ICS Annual Meeting, as well as discussing issues of concern to the committee.</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Ongoing EC monitoring of COI compliance ensures that the integrity of the organization is maintained</li> <li>-A programme currently in the planning stages will attract the interest and participation of early career members and others who might not ordinarily present at the meeting</li> <li>-Produce consensus and policy papers that will advance the academic objectives of the ICS and enhance its standing in establishing global policy</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>-Maintain the highest level of academic integrity through monitoring of COI reporting and assessing commercial bias in the ICS-sponsored programmes</b></li> <li><b>-Publish 1-2 white papers or reviews/year on ethical topics of global concern, e.g., the ethics of live surgery</b></li> <li><b>-Provide an annual workshop to the scientific programme for the ICS Annual Meeting</b></li> <li><b>-Contribute a unique activity of interest to the general membership dealing with one or more “hot topics” in global ethics including debates that may be conducted as part of a workshop or as a stand-alone presentation at the Annual Meeting.</b></li> </ul>
<i>Best Ethics Poster Award at the Annual Meeting</i>	<b>£500</b>	<i>As approved by the Trustees. The cost would be applied to annual meeting budget.</i>	<i>Encourages submissions by trainees and early-career attendees</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>-Increased number of submissions under the Ethics category</b></li> <li><b>-Increased number of submissions by trainees and early-career professionals</b></li> </ul>
<b>Total Cost</b>	<b>£1,000</b>			

Respectfully submitted,



Nina S. Davis, M.D., FACS

Chair, ICS Ethics Committee



## ICS Ethics Committee Terms of Reference

1.

**PURPOSE:** To establish and maintain proper conduct of the ICS in matters of ethical consideration

### 2. FUNCTIONS:

1. Develop policies to ensure that all research presented to the Society is carried out in compliance with international ethical standards for the conduct of human and animal research. These policies will then be presented to the Board of Trustees for approval and implementation. Establish, update, monitor and enforce disclosure policy regarding conflicts of interest as they apply to ICS members, officers and meeting participants
2. Organise an educational workshop and one or more other programmes dealing with ethical issues relevant to the interests of ICS members. These are to be presented at the annual scientific meeting.
3. Develop position papers on ethical matters on behalf of the ICS
4. Serve as a resource for resolution of ethical questions raised by the Board of Trustees or by the ICS membership
5. Serve as a liaison between the membership and the Board of Trustees to convey views and opinions regarding ethical issues that may arise.
6. Undertake such additional matters as may from time to time be **required** of the committee by the General Secretary and Board of Trustees.

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

### 4. COMPOSITION:

Total Members	Method of Appointment	Name	Term of Office
General Secretary/ Board Liaison rep	Ex officio	<a href="#">See Membership Page</a>	3 years
Chair:	Elected. A member must sign his/her agreement to stand. This nomination is signed by nominator and seconder, all being current ICS members. The nominee for Chair would be a current or recent member (past 5 years) of the Ethics Committee. If no one is nominated the ICS Nominations committee may suggest a suitable candidate. Nominations received by 1st March for current members all other applications by 1st April.	<a href="#">See Membership Page</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.	<a href="#">See Membership Page</a>	3 years, renewable once by Chair/committee approval.

	<p>The optimum representation is 10 Committee members formed preferably from the following:</p> <p>2 gynaecologists 2 urologists 1 geriatrician 2 physiotherapists 2 scientists 1 nurse</p>		Further terms could be approved in exceptional circumstances and by referral to the ICS Trustees.
Subcommittees (if any)	Ad hoc		
Updated January 2016			

- 5. MEETINGS:** One face-to-face meeting during the Annual Scientific meeting. Other meetings throughout the year by teleconference, as required, and by email/online forum.
- 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.

For Terms of Office Information please see [Membership Page](#)

### Ethics Committee Terms of Office

Member	Role	Term Start	Term End	Term Yrs	Elected	Term details	Additional Information
Nina Davis	Chair	23-Oct-14	03-Sep-20	6	Y	6 year term will finish in 2020- CANNOT BE RE-ELECTED	
Ruwan Fernando	Committee member	23-Oct-14	14-Sep-20	6	N	6 year term will finish in 2020- cannot renew	Renewing
Alvaro Bedoya Ronga	Committee member	23-Oct-14	14-Sep-20	6	N	6 year term will finish in 2020- cannot renew	Chased 20/10/16, renewing
Elise De	Committee member	23-Oct-14	14-Sep-20	6	N	6 year term will finish in 2020- cannot renew	Renewing
Heidi Moosdorff-Steinhauser	Committee member	08-Oct-15	30-Aug-18	3	N	3 year term will finish in 2018- can renew	
Cristina Naranjo Ortiz	Committee member	29-Aug-13	05-Sep-19	6	N	6 year term will finish in 2019. Cannot renew	
Chris Chatterton	Committee member	16-Sep-16	05-Sep-19	3	N	3 year term will finish in 2019- can Renew	
Martha Spencer	Committee member	16-Sep-16	05-Sep-19	3	N	3 year term will finish in 2019- can Renew	
Ryuji Sakakibara	Committee member	16-Sep-16	05-Sep-19	3	N	3 year term will finish in 2019- can Renew	
Tamara Dickinson	Committee member	16-Sep-16	05-Sep-19	3	N	3 year term will finish in 2019- can Renew	
David Castro-Diaz	Ex-officio	25-Feb-15	14-Sep-17	2	N	Ex-officio	

Quorate No=3

### Nominations 2018

Key	
Colour	Meaning
	Stepping down in Florence
	Stepping down in Philadelphia
	Elect position- will need to re-apply
	Will need to confirm if renewing, positions will need to be advertised after Florence
	New member/position