

MINUTES of the INTERIM COUNCIL MEETING

of the Canadian Society of Otolaryngology-Head & Neck Surgery

held on **NOVEMBER 5, 2016** at the Sheraton Gateway Hotel, Toronto Pearson Airport

TORONTO, ON

The interim Council meeting of the Society was brought to order at 09:00 by the President, Dr. Mark Taylor.

THOSE IN ATTENDANCE

Dr. S. M. Taylor, President

Dr. F. Kozak, 2nd VP

Dr. J. Yoo, Treasurer

Dr. E. Wright, 1st VP / Co-editor

Dr. T. Uwiera, Secretary

Dr. P. Spafford, Past President

BY INVITATION

Dr. H. Seikaly, Co-editor

Dr. G. Osler, CPD Committee Chair

Ms. D. Humphrey, National Office

Dr. W. Matthews, Representative to the RCPSC (via conference call)

Dr. B. Westerberg, IFOS / COHNS Fund President (via conference call)

Dr. Taylor welcomed everyone to the interim council meeting. He thanked the Society for the honor of being President.

1. MINUTES OF THE LAST MEETING

Dr. Taylor presented minutes from the last council and annual business meetings.

MOTION #1

It was moved by Dr. Daniel seconded by Dr. Wright

THAT THE MINUTES OF THE LAST COUNCIL MEETING AND ANNUAL BUSINESS MEETING BE ACCEPTED. CARRIED

2. BUSINESS ARISING FROM THE MINUTES

It was noted that the business arising from the last minutes would be deferred to the appropriate item on the agenda.

3. REPORT OF THE PRESIDENT

Dr. Taylor noted that his message had been circulated with the agenda and was the same as that included in the Fall Newsletter. He spoke about the upcoming meeting in Saskatoon, noting that his guest of honour would be Dr. Simon Kirby of St. John's, NL. He spoke briefly about Dr. Kirby and how he had overcome a severe health event, recovered, and retrained as a pathologist. A discussion followed. Dr. Yoo stated that Dr. Kirby was an inspiring speaker. It was suggested that his bio be published in the Society's winter newsletter. Dr. Taylor stated that he would write something up with Dr. Kirby's permission.

3a. 2016 Annual Meeting Sponsorship

Drs. Taylor talked about this year's industry visits. He noted that he, Dr. Peter Spafford, Dr. Erin Wright and Donna Humphrey attended. They had visited four companies, Merck, Medtronic, Karl Storz and Ethicon. He reported that they had a good meeting with Merck and discussed their HPV vaccine. He stated that he felt they were likely to be a platinum supporter. Further, there was discussion about a current ad campaign put out in some movie theatres via the OBGYN association regarding HPV vaccine and cervical cancer. The contact at Merck informed them that the company had an educational fund that the Society could apply to if they wished to do something similar. It would be an effective way to promote preventative health as well as the Society and specialty. A brief discussion followed.

Dr. Taylor talked about their meetings with Medtronic and Karl Storz, both of which were very positive. He noted that they had also met with Ethicon and that he thought they might go platinum because they were trying to tie together energy and their maxillofacial plating systems and had an association with one of the planned guest speakers, Dr. Greg Farwell. Dr. Taylor reported that they did confirm their support for 2017 of the COHNS Fund's Canadian Fellowship grant. Unfortunately, they were not able to meet with Takeda but they planned to have a conference call with them in the next couple of weeks. In addition, Dr. Taylor informed members that they had met with Sanofi-Genzyme on Friday evening. They were a silver sponsor in the past and might be persuaded to move up to gold support. It was also mentioned that a representative from Smith and Nephew planned to visit Dr. Taylor in January 2017.

There was a discussion about Karl Storz's proposed FEES course for the Saturday immediate prior to the start of the AGM in Saskatoon. It was suggested that the SLP's be invited to attend. The idea of a whether to charge them a fee, even if it

were a nominal one, was considered. It was agreed that they should register but that a fee not be charged. The idea of teams was also considered. It was agreed that members had priority for this course.

There was a general discussion about how to manage the platinum sponsorships and how to use the Saturday in the most effective way. Dr. Osler reported that currently 2 events were tentatively scheduled for the Saturday – FEES (sponsored by Storz) as well as a CMPA section 2 & 3 credit course. She stated that this could have a sponsor attached but they would have to be completely hands off/at arm’s length. The two course could run concurrently. That would give space for a 3rd sponsored event (perhaps Ethicon) if required.

Dr. Taylor briefly spoke about the other sponsors Medtronic, Takeda, Smith & Nephew plus 3 other potential leads, Listen Up, Oticon and MedEL. It was suggested that Olympus also be contacted. It was agreed that members present would talk to their respective representatives about AGM sponsorship. There was a general discussion about the various “ear” companies and how best to entice them to be a sponsor. There was also a general discussion about how many platinum sponsors could be realistically managed at the AGM. It was proposed that the industry visits be extended to 1 ½ days.

3b. 2017 Scientific Program

Members reviewed Dr. Rotenberg’s report. There was a discussion about the drop in the number of rhinology submissions to the AGM. Dr. Wright stated that he assumed most were presenting their work at US meetings. Dr. Kozak discussed pediatric submissions (low). There was a discussion about amending the rule that restricts people from submitting work that had previously been presented at other OHNS meetings. It was agreed that the Poliquin competition submissions would not be included in this amendment. The implications of changing this rule were considered. Dr. Taylor stated that he would speak with Dr. Rotenberg about the matter. It was agreed that it could not be changed for this year but should be considered for the Quebec City meeting.

There was a discussion about the number of guest speakers at the AGM. In Charlottetown, there had been four individuals. It was agreed that this was too many. Dr. Taylor gave some background information on who chooses the speakers. He stated that he felt there should be no more than three, two of which should be chosen by the President and the other chosen by the Scientific Program chair. A discussion followed.

MOTION #2

It was moved by Dr. Kozak, seconded by Dr. Spafford

THAT A RECOMMENDATION BE MADE TO COUNCIL THAT 2 GUEST SPEAKERS BE CHOSEN BY THE PRESIDENT AND 1 CHOSEN BY THE SCIENTIFIC PROGRAM CHAIR. CARRIED

There was a discussion about the Lifetime Achievement Award, noting that this was the responsibility of the President, as opposed to the “Celebrating Our Own” individuals who were chosen by the Scientific Program chair.

There was also debate about payment for the ongoing work done by Dr. Kohlert regarding the AGM app / call for papers submission portal. That is, whether a stipend should again be given and what that amount should be. The issue of ownership of the app was considered. It was agreed that it would be best if the rights to the app be transferred to the Society.

MOTION #3

It was moved by Dr. Kozak, seconded by Dr. Yoo

THAT DR. KOHLERT BE PAID A \$5,000 STIPEND FOR THE HIS WORK REGARDING THE AGM APP AND ABSTRACT SUBMISSIONS PORTAL, UP TO BUT NOT INCLUDING THE SASKATOON MEETING. CARRIED (1 ABSTENTION)

After further debate, Dr. Taylor agreed to contact Dr. Kohlert to discuss the ownership of the app and abstract submission portal. He noted that he would report back to council. Consideration was given to contracting an independent agency to takeover this work in the near future. Dr. Seikaly stated that he would request that whoever takes this over include abstract citation. He stated that this would be a bonus to have citable abstracts. A discussion followed.

It was also noted that the *best articles of the year* workshop had not been accepted for the Charlottetown meeting for some reason. It was agreed that this was a very popular workshop and excellent value for general otolaryngologists.

3c. Social Program

Dr. Spafford reviewed the social program scheduled for the Saskatoon meeting. He noted that the convention hotel was the Sheraton Cavalier. Attached to it was a boutique hotel called the James which was rated one of the top 10 hotels in Canada. The room rates were excellent value. He noted that there were a sizable number of lower cost hotels in the area as well. Dr. Spafford stated that the Sheraton was not able to accommodate the required meeting space so that a shuttle bus service would be available for those who did not wish to walk to the TCU Place, (convention centre; approximate 8-minute walk from the hotel). He noted that the TCU place was an excellent venue for the meeting. He reviewed the difference social events that they were being

arranged including pilates beside the river each morning, running on a designated route, a house boat tour and lunch for the spouses, the welcoming reception in the Bessborough Gardens across the street from the Sheraton and the President's banquet. It was noted that the council dinner would be held at his golf course. A brief discussion followed about a possible keynote speaker.

MOTION #4

It was moved by Dr. Kozak, seconded by Dr. Uwiera

THAT THE REPORTS OF THE PRESIDENT, SCIENTIFIC PROGRAM CHAIR AND THE LOCAL ARRANGEMENTS CHAIR BE ACCEPTED. CARRIED

4. REPORT OF THE TREASURER

Dr. Yoo highlighted items from his report. He noted that the Society remained in a similar financial position as last year. He stated that overall spending had been higher due to the sponsorship of the LearnENT app (\$30,000) as well as the need to set aside funding for the IFOS bid. He reported that revenues generated from the AGM and membership fees were about the same as last year, commenting on the fact that the AGM relied on corporate donations to remain solvent.

Dr. Yoo stated that there was approximately \$250,000 in the Society's reserve fund which was set aside as a "rainy day" account in an easily accessible GIC. Unfortunately, because it was important to be able to access these funds quickly should the need arise, currently, there existed no good financial product that paid much interest (0.6% - 0.7%).

He stated that the financial statements had been circulated with his report and given that money had to be set aside for the IFOS bid and the LearnENT app, he would recommend that \$20,000 be donated to the Fund this year.

Dr. Yoo asked to discuss a couple of items with the Executive. He explained that the accountant highlighted the fact that there could be a potential liability re AGM donations with respect to GST/HST. He explained that because the donors received tangible benefit for their contribution, CRA might insist that these contributions were not tax exempt. He stated that the Society could carry on as usual or they could explain the situation to the sponsors and start applying GST/HST to their contributions. Dr. Yoo asked for direction from the Executive. A discussion followed. It was suggested that perhaps several of the companies be approached discreetly and asked whether it would influence their decision to become a sponsor if the Society had to charge GST/HST on their donations. Dr. Yoo stated that he has had dealing with a company that did not-for-profit taxes and he could solicit their opinion about this issue. It was agreed that an expert opinion was needed. Dr. Spafford stated that if he had a good friend who was a tax lawyer and would most likely be willing to look at this if he had all the details. Dr. Yoo stated that he would be happy for him to do so and would send him the exact question(s) that had to be answered.

Dr. Yoo also spoke about the GST/HST that was currently paid on the membership fees. He stated that it might be worthwhile to try and reduce the 30% membership benefit trigger so that this tax need not be applied. He stated that it could be done away with if the Society did not pay for members to publish in the Journal. This would be an opportunity to make an extra 13% on the fees each year. A lengthy discussion followed. Various possibilities were considered. It was suggested that if the editors could ascertain how much they required to publish the members' articles, they could prorate that amount over the total number of members via the dues. It was also suggested that they investigate whether the Fund could cover the cost of publishing. Consideration was also given to continuing to pay the tax on membership but look for more membership benefits such as discounts on travel, car rentals, hotel accommodations, etc.

MOTION #5

It was moved by Dr. Uwiera, seconded by Dr. Wright

THAT THE REPORT OF THE TREASURER BE ACCEPTED. CARRIED

5. REPORT OF THE PAST PRESIDENT

Dr. Spafford stated he did not have much to report. He briefly talked about the Charlottetown meeting and the success of the Saturday afternoon sessions. He stated that they hoped to use the same format again in Saskatoon.

6. REPORT OF THE SECRETARY

Dr. Uwiera presented her report to the Executive. She reviewed the membership statistics making note of those members removed for non-payment of dues. She explained that if a member did not pay his/her dues for two years, they were removed from the database in year three. It was noted that last year a document had been circulated and posted on the website outlining the top ten reasons to be a member. She informed the Executive that the Regional Representatives had been tasked with seeking out and talking to all the people in their province who were either on the delinquent list or were no longer members to find out why they did not wish to be a member of the Society. Dr. Uwiera stated that most individuals contacted stated that they saw no value in membership. However, six of the people on the 'removed' list had decided to rejoin the Society. Dr. Uwiera agreed that covering the cost of publishing in the Journal was a benefit, but that only a small number of members took advantage of it. She stated that having broader based benefits would be more useful. She also discussed the concept of raising the fee for non-members to attend the AGM. It was suggested that if the fee discrepancy became too large individuals would not attend which would mean that they

would not understand what they were missing. It was suggested that a better educational component on the website might be a good incentive to be a member. It was also suggested that short presentations be made at the various provincial meetings explaining why an individual should become a member of the CSOHNS. Dr. Osler stated that she would speak with the 2 Manitobans on the list about re-joining. There was a discussion about the registration fee discrepancy. Dr. Uwiera stated that this had been discussed last year. Dr. Wright noted that he would like to see the gap widened to match the membership fee + the cost of attending the registration. It was agreed that a new category for international attendee could be created. In addition, a process would be put in place to review applications for a subsidy to attend the AGM by individuals from low / middle income countries.

MOTION #6

It was moved by Dr. Wright, seconded by Dr. Seikaly,

THAT A RECOMMENDATION BE MADE TO COUNCIL THAT THE DIFFERENTIAL COST BETWEEN A MEMBER AND NON-MEMBER FEE FOR THE AGM BE EQUIVALENT TO THE COST OF AN ANNUAL MEMBERSHIP PLUS AGM REGISTRATION. THIS WOULD APPLY TO CANADIAN OTOHNS ONLY.

(Annual Membership Fee - \$475; Active Member AGM Fee - \$650; Non-member Canadian AGM Fee - \$1125; Non-member International AGM Fee - \$850; Applications from low / middle income individuals who wish to attend the AGM will be considered by the Society.) **CARRIED**

It was agreed this would be presented to Council in June and implemented in 2018. There was a brief discussion about how this would impact the Quebec City meeting given that a sizable number of Quebecers were not members of the Society.

Dr. Uwiera reviewed the locations of the future annual meetings: 2017 Saskatoon; 2018 Quebec City; 2019 Edmonton; 2020 Fredericton; 2021 Victoria (if IFOS bid not successful); 2022 Montreal; 2023 Halifax. The question of where to go in 2024 was examined. It was noted that the AGM should come back to Ontario. After some debate, it was agreed that Toronto was too expensive and that council look at London, Ontario as a possible location for the 2024 site.

Donna Humphrey's review was conducted. The Executive agreed to a cost of living pay raise and her annual bonus. It was also confirmed that 2 laptop computers along with the appropriate software and technical support required, would be purchased for the office to replace the existing ones which were aging.

MOTION #7

It was moved by Dr. Wright, seconded by Dr. Taylor

THAT THE REPORT OF THE SECRETARY BE ACCEPTED. CARRIED

7. REPORT OF THE CO-EDITORS

Dr. Wright stated that the Journal continued to run smoothly and that there has been no change in the submissions rate since the increased impact factor. He stated that he thought that this would be an appropriate time for at least one of the co-editors to transition out with an aim to stepping down as of June next year. The Journal's development editor at BioMed asked that everything not change at the same time and advocated for a staggered transition. Dr. Seikaly stated that he would stay on for an extra year along with the administrative support. Dr. Taylor commented on the excellent job done by the editors over their tenure. Dr. Wright explained that he felt the co-editor model was key to the running of the publication and would recommend that the co-editor model remain in place. He suggested that an East / West split be considered when looking for the new co-editors.

Dr. Wright talked about the effect on the Journal of the new impact factor. He stated that he felt to receive all the benefits, it was very important that there be no major changes to the Journal over the next 5-year. He thanked the Society and the membership for their support.

Dr. Yoo congratulated both Drs. Wright and Seikaly for their vision, noting that they were leaving the Journal in an excellent position. There was a discussion about how best to manage the transition for each editor. Dr. Wright stated that he felt it required an open call. He noted that a couple of people had already expressed interest in the position. It was suggested that the names should go to Dr. Spafford as chair of the 2017 Nominating committee, with some input to him as to appropriate requirements for a co-editor. However, it should still be up to the nominating committee to select the individual. It was agreed that the call for nominations should be broadly circulated. A discussion followed. Dr. Yoo stated that he felt it was very important to have an actual selection committee formed for this and move the candidates to the Nominating committee via that selection committee. Dr. Kozak agreed with Dr. Yoo noting that this was a very important job given the Journal's current positive standing. A comment was made about the importance of choosing co-editors who were compatible and who could work well together as opposed to using an East / West model as the only criteria. Dr. Wright suggestion that the search be placed under the auspice of the Nominating committee but that it form a separate adhoc subcommittee for this purpose. It was noted that the Nominating committee could act as the adhoc subcommittee if they received all the applications beforehand and had time to properly vet them before the meeting in Saskatoon. It was noted that the Regional Representatives, the Past President (chair) the Secretary and Treasurer were all members of the Nominating committee. Consideration was given to the term length for the co-editors given that there is no specific mention in the rules of the Society in this regard. It was noted that traditionally, the editor served for ten years. Dr. Wright stated that he would like to withdraw his proposal for a separate adhoc subcommittee if the Nominating

committee could vet the applications before their meeting in Saskatoon. The Executive agreed that the search for a new co-editor be managed by the Nominating committee chaired by Dr. Spafford. It was agreed to send out a general advertisement to the membership-at-large soliciting applications for the position as this would give everyone who was interested a chance to apply. Those applications would go to the Nominating committee for review. Dr. Yoo suggested that COACH and the program directors be informed so that they could get the word out. There was also a discussion about the need to stagger the selection of co-editors and that because of this co-editor model, would be a 2-year process.

MOTION #8

It was moved by Dr. Uwiera, seconded by Dr. Kozak

THAT THE REPORT OF THE CO-EDITOR BE ACCEPTED. CARRIED

8. REPORTS OF STANDING OR SPECIAL COMMITTEES

8a. CPD Committee

Dr. Osler reviewed her report. She stated that the committee was now meeting twice per year, once at the AGM and once via teleconference in the Fall. She noted that the change in membership makeup had been a good one in that members now appeared to be more engaged. She talked about the 2017 Saskatoon meeting explaining that she had been working with Dr. Rotenberg to ensure that members attending had the option of earning credit hours in all 3 sections. The meeting itself would be accredited for section 1. With respect to section 2, she stated that she would like to promote use of the personal learning project particularly for the satellite symposia. Even though they are company events, individuals can earn credit hours under personal learning. She stated that she would be willing to promote this to their audiences in Saskatoon. PLP's can also be used during the meeting workshops as well and she would be willing to guide individuals through the process. She spoke about putting together a CMPA workshop to be held on the Saturday afternoon and that it could be sponsored if there was no involvement in the process by the supporting company. She explained that the impetus for this workshop came from an article in the CMPA Perspective magazine where they flagged the specialty as one at higher risk for litigation. She stated that she would be working with them to develop the content. Registrants will receive reading material ahead of time and when they come to the workshop individuals will be placed in small working groups. This format will allow participants to earn section 2 and 3 credits.

Dr. Osler talked about Competency by Design. As well, she stated that the CPD committee would be submitting to the annual meeting a workshop on how to maximize section 2 and section 3 credits. This workshop will highlight some of the assessment tools that the CPD committee has been working on including the development of a number of work-place based assessment tools that evaluate technical and non-technical skills, communication skills, attitudes, behaviours and team-work skills. Dr. Osler noted that assessment was going to become a big part of the accreditation process and this was an attempt to start familiarizing members with the process.

Dr. Osler noted that item 4a of her report reviewed the number of accreditation requests received and granted.

With respect to 4b, Dr. Osler stated that the Society had received an application to accredit an international meeting, the *3rd Vertigo Academy International Meeting* to be held in Mumbai India in 2017. The CPD committee reviewed the request at the Fall teleconference. To everyone's knowledge, the CSO had never accredited an international meeting. She would like guidance from Interim Council on how to proceed. The CPD committee was hesitant to recommend reviewing the application because of unfamiliarity with the meeting, and concerns re accountability and oversight, particularly with respect to the interaction with industry. Past VAI meetings have not been accredited. Dr. Manohar Bance is listed as a member of the Advisory Board, has attended the meeting in the past and has vouched for its scientific content and rigor. He has not noted any conflict or industry influence. Dr. Osler noted that the benefits of doing this included raising the profile of the Society internationally, and the potential for profitability. The application would have to be very carefully vetted to ensure that the Society maintains its reputation with the Royal College. (For example, every presenter would have to submit a conflict of interest disclosure). Dr. Osler noted that Dr. Bance was planning on attending so the Society would have a representative onsite so that feedback could be received from him. He could also ensure that the evaluations were sent to the CSO for review. The CPD committee recommended a fee of between \$5,000 - \$10,000 to do the accreditation. A discussion followed. Members noted that this would be a huge amount of work and asked Dr. Osler whether she and her committee members were interested in doing this. Dr. Osler stated that she would need a decision from Interim Council as their meeting was scheduled for March. She confirmed that she would be happy to do the work. It was recommended that the fee be paid up front in US dollars. It was agreed that one of the most crucial factors was to maintain the Society's reputation. Members asked how many hours of work this would encompass. It was noted that the Royal College would allow it but it was up to the Society to be diligent. After further debate, it was agreed that this would take too much time and effort to complete and recommended not to proceed. A vote confirmed this decision.

Dr. Taylor asked about the Royal College's accreditation cycle. Dr. Osler outlined and discussed the new requirements (400 credits over a 5-year period with 40 credits per year). She stated that there were some straightforward ways to earn credits and that Drs. Chan and Desrosiers have submitted a workshop on this topic to the 2017 annual meeting. It was agreed to put more details onto the Society's website.

Dr. Osler stated that Dr. Connor Sommerfeld, a resident from the University of Alberta, presented a poster at the last National Accreditation Conference in Toronto. She noted that it was well received and that the Royal College was excited to see the Society put forward some of the work it had been doing in this regard.

Dr. Osler noted that the CPD committee had received a request to partner with the Undergraduate Medical Education Group on the LearnENT app. Two CPD committee members, Drs. Adrian Gooi and Maggie Aron, planned to attend the Undergraduate Medical Education conference in Vancouver in November 2016 to discuss the request with Dr. Kevin Fung.

8b. Global Health Committee – Membership in the CNIS

Dr. Osler stated that this came from the last council meeting were the Global Health committee requested \$1,000 from the Society to join the Canadian Network of International Surgery. She explained that the CNIS is a Canadian organization that promotes the international outreach activities of the various Canadian university surgical groups and national specialty societies. It was noted that the discussion had been tabled to this meeting. Dr. Spafford stated that they had discussed whether the money should come from general operations or from the Fund. It was agreed that this was perfect for the Fund. A discussion followed. Dr. Osler stated that it would raise the profile of the Society in CNIS which was very active in outreach. She reviewed this organization's membership. It would also allow any Society member to apply to CNIS with their project to have their expenses managed and thus receive a charitable tax receipt. Dr. Yoo thought that this would be a good benefit for the members. Dr. Spafford stated that he felt they needed to be prudent about memberships in various organization as there were many good groups out there that the other committees would like the Society to join. He asked that a specific term be attached to this. Dr. Osler further suggested that participating members should be required to provide a detailed report on their activities. There was a general discussion.

MOTION #9

It was moved by Dr. Taylor, seconded by Dr. John Yoo

THAT A RECOMMENDATION BE MADE TO THE FUND THAT THEY COVER FOR A PERIOD OF 5-YEARS, THE ANNUAL MEMBERSHIP FEE OF \$1000 FOR THE SOCIETY TO JOIN THE CANADIAN NETWORK OF INTERNATIONAL SURGERY (CNIS). CARRIED

It was agreed to present this motion to Dr. Westerberg when he joins the meeting.

8c. Royal College Representative

Dr. Matthew reported that the status of 12 of the 13 Canadian programs were designated "accredited program, regular survey" with one identified at a lesser level, "accredited program, external review". He noted that regarding that one program, the RC Accreditation Committee had overturned the recommendation of the internal reviewers. It was currently being appealed by the program. He gave some background information on the review process. A discussion followed.

Dr. Matthews noted that the implementation of the CBD curriculum in Otolaryngology – Head and Neck Surgery had been scheduled for July 2017. Most of the issues have been sorted out. He stated that some programs had started "field testing" the new EPA's. A beta version of ePortfolio (the RC online evaluation database) would begin testing by the programs in early November and the initial experience would be reviewed at the final Oto-HNS CBD meeting in Ottawa on November 26th. Dr. Matthews answered some questions about this process.

With respect to the American Board of Otolaryngology and reciprocity, Dr. Matthews reported that there had been no real progress made. He noted that a detailed plan regarding the implementation of CPT codes at Canadian programs would be discussed at the next Specialty Committee meeting on November 25, 2016. A general discussion followed. Dr. Matthews explained that the road block with the ABO was the use of CPT codes for case logging. He explained to the members what this entailed. Dr. Taylor noted that he was familiar with those codes. He explained how he envisioned the programs would use them.

MOTION #10

It was moved by Dr. Uwiera, seconded by Dr. Wright

THAT THE REPORT OF THE ROYAL COLLEGE REPRESENTATIVE BE ACCEPTED. CARRIED

8d. COHNS Fund Report

Dr. Westerberg presented his report via conference call. He asked whether there had been any news from Dr. O'Connell regarding the creation of a bursary award through the Fund. It was noted that there was no news to date. Dr. Taylor stated that Ethicon had confirmed that they would sponsor one fellowship grant in the amount of \$25,000. With respect to Takeda, Dr. Taylor informed members that they planned to have a conference call with Chris Hebert in the near future. He also mentioned that interim council had passed a motion to recommend that the Fund pay for a period of 5-years, the annual membership fee for the Society to

CNIS. Dr. Westerberg stated the he approved the motion. Dr. Yoo stated that the Society would donate \$20,000 to the Fund for 2016.

There was a discussion about whether they should approach the “ear” companies for a fellowship grant should Takeda not renew its commitment for 2017. A discussion followed. Dr. Westerberg stated that he could try reaching out to them. It was noted that there had been 2 or 3 otology / neurotology based fellowships over the past few years (~30%).

8d. IFOS World Congress Report

Dr. Westerberg reported that four IFOS individuals attended the Vancouver site visit in September. He reported on what transpired. There was good representation from the CSO and the weather cooperated with lots of sun. He stated that he met up with them again at their Executive meeting just before a Paris conference and receive a lot of valuable feedback and positive reviews. He noted that the Society had a booth at that conference. He and Rob Irvine, who had come over from Switzerland, helped manage it. In addition, there were two Quebec residents who also were there to help. Their knowledge of French was a definite asset.

Dr. Westerberg informed members that he had been contacted by an Egyptian otolaryngologist who would like the Canadian Society to promote his meeting in Egypt this February. They invited him as a speaker and promised a booth to the Society to promote their IFOS bid. It was his impression that they needed registrants and was hoping he would bring a contingent of Canadians with him. A brief discussion followed. It was noted that Dr. Westerberg was planning to attend as a speaker and that there would be no cost to the CSO associated with this.

Members asked Dr. Westerberg questions about the vote in Paris in June. He stated that he would have 90 minutes at the podium to promote Vancouver. He talked about a few ideas he had on what he would present during those 90 minutes. In answer to a question about the booth at the upcoming Egypt meeting, Dr. Westerberg stated that he would look for someone local to help him on site. Dr. Taylor asked about trying to get the Canadian embassy to host a cocktail party in Paris. He stated that he knew a couple of MP's he could speak to about this. A discussion followed about how best to secure the votes needed to win the bid. There was also a discussion about how best to showcase Vancouver during the 90-minute talk. It was agreed to have several speakers chatting-up the destination (Vancouver), Canadian technology, education, clinical work being done and the competency-based CPD system. It was also suggested to showcase in what areas of the world Canadian otolaryngologist were doing global outreach. It was suggested that a pictorial might be a good visual to use. It was agreed to reach out to the membership to see who planned to attend the Paris meeting and then ask them to help promote the bid onsite.

8e. Research Committee

Dr. Taylor noted that Dr. Bance's report had been circulate with the meeting's agenda. It was briefly reviewed.

11. CORRESPONDENCE AND OTHER BUSINESS

11a. 72nd Annual Meeting, Quebec City

Dr. Wright gave members an update on the arrangements for the 2018 AGM scheduled to be held on June 9 – 12 in Quebec City. He stated that he had done a sight visit last November and June. The venues booked included the Chateau Frontenac and the Quebec Convention Centre. He noted that the convention centre was an 11-minute walk from the Frontenac but that shuttles would be available for the delegates. Dr. Wright stated that the welcoming reception would be held at the Museum of Civilization and the President's banquet at the Chateau Frontenac. The spouses program would most likely be some kind of tour of the local wineries and chocolate factories. He hoped to celebrate the city as well as offer parallel sessions in French. Dr. Wright answered questions from the members.

11b. Ratification of a New Award: Best Overall Research

Dr. Taylor gave some background information and reviewed the information attached to the agenda. It was noted that this was supposed to be an additional prize given during the Poliquin Competition for best overall research in the amount of \$2,500. There was a discussion about the guidelines and the way the prize was funded. The situation in Charlottetown was reviewed. It was agreed that there must be no perception of bias and that the prize must be awarded through the Society and not the Awards Committee. It was noted that the correct way to proceed would be for council to agree they wished to move forward with this prize, including being able to provide continuous funding for it. Although a donation could be accepted, for transparency sake, the award must come from the Society. It was noted that it would be difficult to present this prize in 2017 as it had not been properly approved or announced. The discussion continued and the Executive asked that Dr. Spafford speak to Dr. Harris about all these details.

11c. Modica (Dr. M. Bromwich)

Dr. Taylor spoke to this issue. He stated that Dr. Bromwich was very interested in patient confidentiality and was involved with a technology that ensured confidentiality of patient pictures on iOS devices. He would like to make this technology available to the membership. A discussion followed. It was agreed that it would be more appropriately managed if Dr. Bromwich took an exhibit booth at the meeting or if he submitted a workshop to the scientific program in Saskatoon where proper disclosure would be required. Dr. Taylor stated that he would let Dr. Bromwich know.

There was a discussion about conflict of interest disclosure at the annual meeting. Dr. Osler stated that, as Chair of the CPD committee, she would manage this situation.

11d. It was noted that at the last business meeting in Charlottetown a recommendation came from the floor to include a debate at the next AGM on succession planning for retirement. Dr. Osler spoke to this matter noting that Dr. Rotenberg felt that this was not an appropriate agenda item. She explained that they have planned for two debates in Saskatoon, one on whether there should be a name change for the Society and the other on high-level stewardship of the Canadian healthcare system. It was noted that this item came to the agenda because of a request made by one of the members at the last business meeting.

12. NEW BUSINESS

Dr. Kozak stated that he felt the roles of the 1st VP and 2nd VP were not very well defined. He asked if the Executive felt these positions should have more work to do. A brief discussion followed. It was agreed that this was certainly something to think about. There was also a discussion about the recruitment of members to council and committees. Dr. Kozak stated that he would like a list of all the executive members over the past 25 years to try and determine if there had been any underrepresentation in certain groups / geographic locations, etc. It was noted that there appeared to be a growing number of people who wished to get involve with the Society.

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned.