



ICS Board of Trustees Meeting and Conticom-ICS Ltd Directors Meeting Minutes

Sunday 26 August 2018, 12:30 – 17:30

Monday 27 August 2018, 08:00 – 15:00

Meeting space: Marriott Downtown hotel, 4th floor, Meeting room 411-412

Trustees present: Sherif Mourad (Chair/General Secretary), Jerzy Gajewski (Treasurer), David Castro Diaz, Alex Digesu, Mauro Cervigni, Carlos D’Ancona, Marcus Drake, Alex Lin, Cristina Naranjo-Ortiz

ICS office staff: Daniel Snowden (Executive Director/Company Secretary), Dominic Turner (I.T. Director), Avicia Burchill (Projects and Events Manager)

	SUNDAY 26 AUGUST
	<p>Approval of Agenda JG wanted to raise the issue of Hashim’s nocturia paper – DS explained this would be discussed in the course of the agenda.</p> <p><u>Motion to approve agenda</u> MD proposed DC seconded All in favour Motion approved</p>
	<p>Matters arising from Board Minutes, 2-3-February 2018</p> <p><i>Action points outstanding/to be raised:</i></p> <p>400: Have had no response from Jacques Corcos. It was suggested to move this to the Institute Director (Karl-Eric Andersson)</p> <p>409: Discussion was held with regards to honorary membership which arose from the discussion of Ted and Sender earlier this year. It could be to recognise the ICS members and this could be nominated by the board only.</p> <p>ACTION POINT: DS to prepare a proposal to offer honorary membership.</p> <p>417: International Advisory Board. SM felt that the proposal for this group was not mature enough for full consideration. DS agreed and questioned the purpose of such a group given the role of the Board. AD explained that it was a group to be consulted where the board cannot reach a final position. It would be composed of expert opinion leaders and maybe previous board members. AD said that now that we have an ICI steering committee then maybe this is not needed. AD suggested that perhaps we could amend the bylaws to state that we can create a group when required. DS explained that is currently possible.</p> <p>425: MD felt that Peter Rosier’s document is excellent but that the ICS committees are not consistently meeting Peter’s objectives. MD - we should be more explicit that we get the chairs to sign up to the points of the document. MD suggested to add into the SOPs and advise the committee chairs. A question was posed as to how this would be enforced.</p>

ACTION POINT: Reference Peter Rosier's document in all SOPs.

MD raised the issue that functional urology could be increasingly marginalised and we also need to be aware that our trainees perceive what we do as difficult. There is also a lack of senior officials pushing them into functional urology. You can't pass exams if you don't have specific training on LUTS incontinence etc. MD questioned what would make functional urology attractive to new trainees:

- 1) Enhance the status of functional urology as exciting
- 2) ICS as leaders of functional urology

MD felt that in order to make this happen we need to increase ICS brand awareness – i.e. ICS standards. EAU guidelines are pushing the message and that is freely available to all members. ICS have to have an equivalent which could be published and promoted. In that the SSC documents would be in there but the weakness is that they are for those who can understand – trainees will not get them and give up. For example, JG's recent document is excellent but not practical. The standards are something on the shelf but there should be something else to have the core quality driven practical document. The final component of the publication would be the ICI algorithms. If we added to this document each year then this would be a valuable resource. SM asked how are you going to make sure its understandable. MD that is the point about the recent NUU supplement and we need to prepare this as a separate document. AD - the suggestion is to create more of the supplement. AD what about calling it the "Best Practice" – MD felt that it should be referenced as standards as that is ICS. AL agreed was a good idea as the EAU guidelines are updated each year which is good practice.

MD agreed but there are radical changes every 3 or 4 years. DC suggested to split male/female incontinence. SM very likes the idea but perhaps this should wait until the discussions have happened with EAU.

CN entered meeting

SM - we must not oppose the EAU guidelines and explained that there is a meeting planned with Chris Chapple to see how we can collaborate in the LUTS guidelines. SM suggests to await to see where that discussion goes and then re-discuss this. CD asked whether it should be open access. SM it should be open access to make people attractive. DT thinks it's a great idea – pocket reference book really good to have and to point them to identify how to go deeper. Also a career road map would give people the idea. MD questioned whether an app or pocket guide would be best. DT will present the work he has been working with Bernie which would be a basis of this. MD the pocket version must be phone based. DT pdf's are not good for phone devices but there are ways to make it easy to read. MD then we should select the core starting papers to make into core docs.

JG motion to develop an annual ICS Standards document – electronic only.

JG proposed

AD seconded

All in favour

Motion approved

MD questioned how to discuss with the standardisation committee and it was agreed that MD would meet with the chair to discuss further.

	<p>ACTION POINT: Marcus to meet with Bernie to discuss the development and publication of an annual ICS Standards document in electronic format.</p>
	<p><u>Motion to approve of Board Minutes, 2-3 February 2018</u></p> <p>SM proposed AD seconded All in favour Motion approved</p>
	<p>Summary of progress to date on Board actions</p> <p>389 – DS explained that a full and extensive review of the seven PCO bids took place and the three shortlisted bids will be discussed today 402 – DS explained that the Board reinstated the emerging grants – 5 bids and decision was split across two applications 404 – DS confirmed that the annual meeting guidelines were updated so that only 1 funded scientific chair can attend the Education Committee and the future Scientific Committee meetings. 412 – DS confirmed the moved 2020 dates. 413 - DS confirmed at the 2020 meeting will be held in the Rio Hotel and Convention Centre. 414 – DS confirmed that the Regional Meeting Brussels planning well under way 415 – DS confirmed that we now have minimum 80% criteria for meeting bids to proceed 418 – DS confirmed that Monthly reports are now in place between ICS office and NUU 421 – DS confirmed that position clarified on the detrusor underactivity but this was still not published.</p> <p>ACTION POINT: DS to check the position why not published.</p> <p>422 – Supplement now published and printed copies available at meeting 426 – European society of Coloproctology contact still outstanding</p> <p>ACTION POINT: MC will chase Alexis Schizas within 1 month</p>
	<p>Decisions made on Board discussion forum</p> <p><u>Nocturia Paper</u> A discussion was held about the definition of nocturia as per the paper prepare by the working group under Hashim Hashim as chair. SM asked JG to send his comments to Bernie to discuss. JG explained that the definitions are not consistent and there are problems with the definition as confusing between symptom and sign. Plus this is a condition for definition licence of treatment – this could be an issue for the medication if the definition is changed. MD maybe not possible to change definition but need to change the clarification. JG explained that he was happy with the definition but not happy with the definition of the counting the number of times you wake. It was agreed that therefore the explanatory notes need to be clarified.</p> <p>ACTION POINT: JG to talk to Bernie Haylen over the concerns with the Nocturia paper.</p> <p>This agenda item would be continued at tomorrow's meeting</p>

	<p>Preparation for congress organiser presentations</p> <p>DS reminded the Board of the review process in that 7 bids were received which was reduced to 3 and the final 3 were accepted for presentation. DS strongly urged the Board that no decision be made until Friday.</p> <p>A discussion was held over the current performance of Kenes and the Board commented on the proposals.</p>
	<p>Presentations from congress organiser finalists</p> <p><u>AIM GROUP</u></p> <p>Post presentation comments: AD raised concerns that 73% of their meetings were based in Italy. AD also commented that in the bid there was a fixed flat fee of £50K but the brochure says £60K and also asked whether staff costs included were included. AIM explained the £50k was a fixed fee and the £60k was an estimate on registration. They also explained that staff costs are included but as a daily rate – the free rooms are used by the staff. Flights are added to the budget. They also explained that they are expanding and make many meetings international.</p>
	<p>Presentations from congress organiser finalists</p> <p><u>KENES</u></p> <p>Post presentation comments: JG questioned whether Kenes is open to innovation as he had felt that there was resistance. Kenes responded that yes they are open but there needs to be a balance between innovation and budget and that it is about working together to meet the target. Previous “resistance” may have been a need to cut costs – we are not against the changes.</p> <p>JG felt that Kenes are slow to start engagement on the annual meeting and then a sudden rush. Kenes responded they noted this too and this is something to be addressed by the service level agreement.</p> <p>AB asked if there was one thing that you would introduce to ICS meetings without budget issues what would that be. Kenes responded 3 meetings a year or simultaneous meetings via webcasting</p> <p>AD asked whether they would exclude the staff travel and whether willing a dedicated member of staff to ensure service. Kenes said yes they are happy to open that to discussion</p> <p>SM asked who is our major competitor? Kenes responded many of the gynae societies. SM said it is IUGA.</p>
	<p>Presentations from congress organiser finalists</p> <p><u>MCI</u></p> <p>AD asked about VAT reduction in Gothenburg. MCI stated its possible but would need to be confirmed.</p> <p>SM who is our major competitor? MCI responded EAU. SM concerned that MCI work with FIGO. MCI explained that the contract is with the office in Brazil and that they are not yet signed for the next one. SM what about IUGA – are they a competitor? MCI said in part but ICS are more global than IUGA.</p>



	<p>AB asked if there was one thing that you would introduce to ICS meetings without budget issues what would that be.</p> <p>DS asked if they would hold open transparent discussions about fees and suppliers. MCI confirmed no issue.</p>
	<p><u>Board discussion following presentations – IN CAMERA</u></p>

Trustees present: Sherif Mourad (Chair/General Secretary), Jerzy Gajewski (Treasurer), David Castro Diaz, Alex Digesu, Mauro Cervigni, Carlos D’Ancona, Marcus Drake, Alex Lin, Cristina Naranjo-Ortiz

ICS office staff: Daniel Snowdon (Executive Director/Company Secretary), Dominic Turner (I.T. Director), Avicia Burchill (Projects and Events Manager)

	<p>MONDAY 27 AUGUST</p>
	<p>Decisions made on Board discussion forum</p> <p>SUFU discussion – SM explained that SUFU wanted a partnership but perhaps this needs to be considered as currently that is not the ICS position. We want full participation with AUGS but through the ICS committee.</p> <p><u>Motion to approve decisions made on Board discussion forum</u></p> <p>AD proposed</p> <p>SM seconded</p> <p>All in favour</p> <p><i>Motion approved</i></p>
	<p>General Secretary report</p> <p>SM started by saying many thanks to the LOC and the excellent scientific programme. Thanks for the scientific and education committees for developing a compelling meeting. Most committees are doing very well and have stability. The enduring success of the ICS has been extended by the success of the 2017 meeting and wanted to thank the 2017 locals for the numbers and the revenue generated.</p> <p>SM explained that the board has continued with their long term strategy – this has been achieved in many ways and will continue. The institute has continued to develop with the new directors now in place and they will work over the next 3 years. The ICI book was a success and now we have an e-version of the book. SM expressed that he was looking forward to future collaborations with ICI. Still looking to have some ICS Guidelines and this will be discussed with Chris Chapple.</p> <p>Last year we had the first Regional Meeting in Phoenix. It was a small number of delegates but it was still successful and we had excellent feedback. The only issue was the low number this was due to the lack of ICS presence in the US. We have to consider being back in the US and how often to be. Plus many cannot get the visa. This December we will be doing the Brussels plus we have the continued guest lectures and cadaver courses.</p>

	<p>The standardisation committee are performing really well and the urodynamics committee have made several educational modules.</p> <p>Grants and Fellowships were issued this year and 12 members for the conference travel award and the lifetime award was given to Sender.</p> <p>We are also continuing to work effectively with NUU</p>
	<p>Executive Director summary report</p> <p>DS reported on the office's many successful actions since the February board meeting.</p> <p>Looking forward to ICS 2019 the 4 SOA lectures are already confirmed – an ICS record. DS confirmed that the 2020 issues are all resolved and planning has begun with the 2021 team. The office has been dealing with a large number of standardisation reports. The Education committee have been working hard and this necessitated extra budget to meet demand. They also have a learner assessment pilot which ties into core strategy and are developing the Institute and keep a close eye on all educational standards. There have been multiple consensus reports – laser and the recent FDA cosmetic vaginal procedures. DS also explained the development of the joint consensus with EAU and ICI-RS on the diagnosis and treatment of Nocturia- JG questioned whether this ties in with the nocturia terminology paper and DS and MD explained it was. There is a planned Urodynamics consensus project and need to work with EAU to get this to proceed.</p> <p>2017 end of year accounts show our strongest year-end surplus and we have exceeded 3000 members again in 2018. There is continued work with the Institute directors and there is a strategy meeting planned later this week. DS confirmed we are working closely with our industry partners. The planning for the Regional Meeting, second cadaver course and the fistula course now well under way.</p> <p>DS confirmed the goals of late 2018 were to review and learn from the 2018 meeting. Target and promotion for 2019. Also to build and consolidate our membership and scope to increase our affiliates. Other plans will be the actions of the institute directors and the potential move to a PCO. Continued work with the 11 committees and 10 working groups. To continue to strengthen industry relationships. Plus the running of 3 events in the latter half of year.</p>
	<p>I.T. Director summary report</p> <p>DT reported the website statistics and a slight dip in numbers which is perhaps due to less abstract submissions and the year hasn't finished. DT confirmed that the institute website and the widgets now completed. The ICS TV interface has been developed further and showed the ICS TV analytics and explained we will have huge boost after the meeting. Overall growth of the channel continues.</p> <p>DT reported that the number of 2018 abstract reviewers increased as simpler to review. AD its so important that the reviewers pick up papers in which they are experts in. DS explained that viewing the film done by Laurence Stewart was a requirement before selecting abstracts to review to ensure the knowledge area and to allocate papers to their expertise. Each reviewer had to fill out and rate their own knowledge on each category and the advanced algorithm worked out which papers they review. It was noted that there was a lack of imaging experts to review those papers. MD felt that there is a problem as people sub specialise in imagine</p>

	<p>and there do we need new abstract category for imaging i.e. CT imaging MRI imaging ultrasound</p> <p>ACTION POINT: Scientific Committee to review imaging category and consider sub-specialising category.</p> <p>Projects for 2018 Q3 and 4 – ICS forums/wiki migration/glossary ICS SEO and performance initiative i.e. ICS ranking in google. DT explained the google analytics ranking that we are currently position 7, once you are over position 10 then you are not on first page of search results. People are not just searching for ICS – if they search for CCS 2018 then we are 1.4. When you type in IUGA 1.22m when you type in ICS 98.6 as ICS stands for so much more. We have to make our pages attractive to google – they other way is to pay. But this doesn't seem to be a good use of funds so intend to make pages attractive. i.e. changes meta tags and increasing page speed and performance.</p>
	<p><u>Motion to approval of Monday 27th August agenda</u></p> <p>JG proposed</p> <p>AD seconded</p> <p>All in favour</p> <p><i>Motion approved</i></p>
	<p>Finance Report of Treasurer</p> <p>a) <u>Final accounts for ICS 2017, Florence</u> JG confirmed that general surplus of €580,954 is the best since 2005. JG showed total revenues and the expenses. Showed surplus over the years and total €635,335 from Florence.</p> <p>b) <u>ICS and Conticom annual accounts and review to 31 December 2017</u> JG confirmed the year-end accounts signed off. Total surplus £354,956 compared to deficit last year. Fund balances very healthy £1.7m. Investment gain since 2015 very impressive. SM said that we should support educational events with more budget if needed. JG said that we lost a lot on currency exchanges this year but this balances with strong gains in year before.</p> <p>c) <u>Half year finance report for 2018</u> JG reported the half year report slides which generally matched projections.</p> <p>d) <u>Financial projections for 2018 – 2022 and review</u> JG noted that we are projecting a modest loss for 2020 and 2021 and has concerns that the year-end funds are going down. SM - we need to change the way we choose the venues – we have to stick more to Europe. A discussion was held about chair and destination. JG suggest that we look at the February board meeting about how to look at the details of expenditure we can cut costs. A discussion was held over the ideas of location and explore collaboration with other societies and events.</p> <p>e) <u>Investment update</u> JG reported a healthy 4.5% gain.</p> <p>f) <u>Education Committee budget for 2019/2020 courses and review meeting</u> The education committee budget request was presented.</p>

	<p><u>Motion to accept budget request subject to a reduced amount to £5000 for online content creation for each year</u></p> <p>SM proposed CN seconded All in favour <i>Motion approve</i></p>
	<p>ICI 2020 plans and negotiations</p> <p>DS reported the imminent publication of ICI reports and then at least 4 committee papers to come. SM reported that there have been several discussions with regards to the ongoing contract with ICI. SM reported that after difficult discussions we reached an agreement as per the memorandum. There is now a steering committee who will work on the next book. MD asked whether we forego the Rosier procedure for the chairs or whether we make people apply. SM will discuss this on Tuesday.</p>
	<p>ICS Institute: Directors' working plans for 2018/2019</p> <p>DS updated the current position with the Institute and explained there is a meeting with the directors later this week and a plan to have regular updates</p> <p>MC expressed that he was disappointed by his substitution as Director. SM explained there was a process of application and it was very transparent and scored correctly.</p>
	<p>Collaboration with SUFU/AUGS</p> <p>Sherif explained that an MOU was now signed with SUFU. A proposed MOU was extended to AUGS but they did not wish to sign at this time.</p>
	<p>Increasing annual meeting delegate numbers: workshop and abstract acceptances</p> <p>AD outlined the benefits of accepting more abstracts and workshops in that this allows for more attendees to receive funding and join the meeting. DT showed a table which provided that the majority of abstracts were accepted as presented or e-poster presentations.</p> <p>DS and DT noted that a large number of workshops were accepted at ICS 2012, Beijing but this lead to numerous near empty rooms and high additional costs, thus cancelling the advantage of additional delegates. AD asked if Kenes could comment on options</p> <p>ACTION POINT: DS to raise with Kenes if there are viable possibilities for increasing workshop acceptances without drastically increasing costs incurred.</p>
	<p>Letter from IUGA</p> <p>SM showed a letter received from IUGA stating that they were proceeding with a project of guidelines. AD thinks that the letter is a notification of goodwill. MD suggested that the ICI editors need to be aware of this. This can be discussed with the ICI editors.</p>
	<p>Scientific Committee composition/TOR</p> <p>DT explained this was an action point from February Board meeting to ensure the correct composition as there are currently no guaranteed gynaecologists on the committee. The proposal was to remove a non-clinical position and add an gynae. The proposal to remove 1 non-clinical rep was agreed.</p>

	<p>ACTION POINT: Scientific Committee terms of reference to be updated to ensure a Gynae representative. Remove a non-clinical position. Discuss and agree all with Scientific Committee Chair.</p>
	<p>Bids to host ICS 2022 - rotation plan for ICS meetings</p> <p>A discussion was held as to whether to accept US/Canada bids for 2023 considering the potential reported losses for 2020 and 2021. A vote was held and 4 voted to return to Europe & 4 voted US/Canada. SM held the casting vote, but it was agreed to wait until this was discussed with Kenes.</p>
	<p>Brussels regional meeting. Discussion on 2020 meeting in USA</p> <p>CN expressed her concerns that the allied health programme was not appropriate for those professionals wanting to attend this course and perhaps it should be better to exclude or do a course separate for allied health professionals. Also replacement speakers have been offered and the meeting directors have not responded.</p> <p>JG suggested Niagara Falls for the 2019 USA meeting</p>
	<p>ICS cadaver course, September 2018. Plans for future cadaver courses</p> <p>AB presented the programme and provided an update and explained that the course had sold out on Day 1 and half sold for Day 2. It was suggested to continue this course on an annual basis.</p> <p>ACTION POINT: continue ICS cadaver courses in Bristol on an annual basis.</p>
	<p>Kenes update and discussions on ICS 2018 and ICS 2019</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ICS 2018: financial and general review • ICS 2019: registration rates, budget, marketing <p><i>Tamara Wasserman and Avital Rosen from Kenes entered</i></p> <p>A brief discussion was held about organising a course/meeting in New York. Kenes confirmed they would investigate for the Board but noted that the hotel/rooms and AV are not cheap in that location.</p> <p>The statistics were shown for 2018 compared to previous years. TW commented that the number of delegates may have been affected by people submitting multiple abstracts and recommended that there is a limit per person of 3. DT thought it was after people got accepted and then couldn't travel due to visas and the dates.</p> <p><u>Review of 2019</u></p> <p>TW confirmed that in Gothenburg the AV costs will be lower. The convention centre has state of the art facilities. The Social events were discussed. It was suggested that the registration to keep same as 2017. Kenes also recommend that the sponsor packages are reduced.</p> <p>2021 Melbourne – A discussion was held and about the vicinity of FIGO meeting. Kenes again recommended that we postpone the meeting by one year, but it was noted that the benefits from the convention centre and the locals would be potentially lost. There were some</p>

	comments casting doubt on the impact of FIGO on an ICS meeting.
	<p>ICS membership: review and plans for 2018/2019</p> <p>Dan provided the statistics and plans. ICS membership is in a strong position.</p>
	<p>ICS printed magazine and ICS Museum</p> <p>Idea to collect all the publications and projects for the year in December and publish it for members. CN thinks that it would be too expensive, so it was discussed to make this an online only document but with a magazine feel.</p> <p>ACTION POINT: AD & JG to take forward concept of an annual magazine.</p>
	<p>Revision of trustees' TOR</p> <p>AD wanted to make it clear that in the bylaws that if there is lack of interaction or communication from any trustee then the TOR and Bylaws allow for that trustee to be removed from office.</p>
	<p>Fellows' committee</p> <p>AD felt the need to bring new young people together to the meeting and give them more decision making power and provide more social activities. To hold a meeting/invite expert lectures/increase the number of professionals. A discussion was held as AB explained that there are already social activities already for the early career professionals and an expert panel session. Additional sessions had been provided at ICS 2018.</p> <p>ACTION POINT: Discuss concept of Fellows Committee with Education Committee to develop further.</p>
	<p>Meeting for International Society of Urodynamics</p> <p>SM was concerned about this meeting and how it had arrived in the programme. AB explained that the Educational Committee rejected several workshop applications because they did not meet the criteria for a workshop slot but would benefit from meeting space. 4 workshops applications were offered this and 2 took the offer include Peter Rosier. He requested it be advertised and AB apologised if this wasn't allowed. AB confirmed that the Board had approved the concept of offering meeting space. It was discussed that the name of Peter Rosier's meeting should be changed as it was clear from the description that he wanted to do this under the auspices of the ICS.</p>
	<p>Preparation for ICS 2018 meetings: AGM, Board and Committees meeting, industry meetings</p> <p>DS explained the meetings and the list of companies that would be met.</p>
	<p>Board composition review</p> <p>DS explained the possibility of a co-opted member of the board for 2019-2020.</p>
	<p>Any other business</p> <p>DC raised the issue that Marcio Averbek had been declined funding by the ICS to speak at CAU. AB explained that the budget (including the extra budget) had been utilised and</p>



	therefore they had been advised. CAU decided to proceed with the application even though funding was not available. SM noted that applications should be received at least 6 months in advance to avoid such scenarios.
	Date of next Board meeting: 1-2 February 2019, London