

MINUTES OF THE COUNCIL MEETING OF THE NASGBI

10.30 AM Friday 1st February 2008

Portex Room, AAGBI, Portland Place, London

Present Basil Matta (President), Nigel Huggins, Mike Nathanson, Martin Smith, Praveen Manthri, Ian Tweedie, Margery MacNab, John Andrzejowski, Plat Razis

1 Apologies Samantha Shinde

2 The minutes of the Council meeting of 9th November 2007 were agreed as a true representation

3 There were no declaration of interest

4 Matters Arising

Plat Razis updated on ideas regarding the ongoing sponsorship of the Society and its ASM's. He drew attention to the Intensive Care Society who have three levels of industrial sponsorship with the provision of links from the ICS website. The 3 levels of sponsorship provide progressively more specific access to relevant pages of the sponsor's website and may also allow reduced fees for stands at the ASM.

Council recognised this as being a worthwhile exercise to embark upon and Praveen Manthri confirmed that our website could provide this facility. Fees for the levels of sponsorship would need to be set according to industry interest.

Basil Matta suggested that companies may wish, within their sponsorship package, to have links to publications which endorse their products. Further, other Specialist Societies at AAGBI may wish to have links to / from our site (free of charge) which may be of mutual speciality relevance and hence result in more industrial interest.

Margery MacNab suggested we consider sponsorship of keynote speakers at the ASM; Nigel Huggins replied that the 2008 ASM was indeed doing this and also inviting sponsorship of individual scientific sessions at a rate of 50% of having a presence with a stand.

Agreed – Plat Razis to investigate possible PR proposals/avenues and report to council in 6 months.

5 Treasurers Report

5.1 Mike Nathanson reported that the 2007 budget closed largely as predicted. The 2008 budget would suffer from the closure of the bank account which accepts the outdated Society standing orders as there are still 95 members paying this way. As a result of this and the increased annual running costs of the Society, consequent upon a Council of 10 members, he proposed recommending an increase of the annual membership fee from £15 to £25. This will be put to the membership at the AGN in May this year and hence the DD run will be held until after this meeting. Attempts will continue to be made to convert the SO members to DD payment and Nigel Huggins will use the ASM to try to promote this conversion.

5.2 The budget proposal for 2008 was approved by Council. Running costs for the year are anticipated to be £6500 against income of £6000 (subs and ASM profit share). Nigel Huggins suggested that in future years, if the Council did take on the organisation of the ASM, then the profit share to the local volunteers would become a nominal amount to cover the costs of sourcing a suitable venue and hence the profit to the society would increase dramatically. It was agreed that the Society would pay any shortfalls of study leave payments for Council Members to attend the Council meeting held during the ASM in future years (commencing 2008). This would be limited to shortfalls in payment of travel (as per the Society's Council protocol) and one night's accommodation.

5.3 It was unanimously agreed that members requesting a refund of double subscriptions paid in previous years could be refunded as long as a DD was in place. Suggestion was made that refunds could be in the form of credits against future years subscriptions rather than cash refunds; this suggestion was not resolved.

5.4 A new service level agreement with the AAGBI has been signed for 12 months for Specialist Society support via Busola.

5.5 Mike Nathanson queried whether the 2006 Companies Act would have any bearing on the new NASGBI Constitution and running of the Society. It was agreed that he should seek initial information from the Hon Sec of the AAGBI, who gave a presentation on this subject at the last Specialist Society's meeting. Further advice may need to come from paid legal / financial sources.

6 Council Members Duties

6.1 Nigel Huggins had emailed suggested duties apportioned to members as alluded to in March 2006. This email was sent from a third party computer and hence no original copy is held. Members were asked to search their in-boxes for a copy of this email.

6.2 Mike Nathanson suggested that following on from this, specific projects should be funded by the Society, from income, and should perhaps be put to the Membership at the AGM for agreement. It was suggested that the annual February Council meeting (being the one before the AGM) should largely be put aside to decide upon these projects.

7 NCCU Net

7.1 Ian Tweedie reported back on the latest meeting and progress of NCCUNet of which the last meeting was held in Nottingham in November 2007. The structure of the Network was addressed and David Menon (Cambridge) volunteered to take the lead role for audit. Paddy Yeomans (Nottingham), the data collection lead; Ian Tweedie (Liverpool) and Roger Lightfoot (Southampton) would represent the Northern and Southern regional units respectively for setting up data collection protocols. Chris Kearns (Oxford) volunteered Treasurer's duties. The next meeting is to be held in Oxford on 26th February and all interested stakeholders (including Neuroanaesthetists / Neurointensivists from all Neuro Units) are invited.

7.2 Martin Smith reported that the grant application for NCCNet to the National Institute of Health Research had been successful at the first stage. This was encouraging but did not necessarily mean that it would be successful at the final consideration. Furthermore, costs

will have to be borne by participating Units for data collection Clerks who are likely to be required even though the dataset will not be as exhaustive as ICNARC.

7.3 Much discussion was exchanged on the role of NASGBI in potential contributions to the funding of the project. NH suggested that Chris Kearns along with IT representing the Society, should identify the set up and ongoing costs and then seek subscriptions from appropriate parties – clinical in the first instance. BM stated, with agreement from Council, that NCCNet needs to be formalised before financial support will be forthcoming. NH suggested that a “chicken and egg” scenario could ensue and that it may be appropriate for the NASGBI to support (in kind, but not financially) the concept of NCCNet as Neuroanaesthesia (Neuro Critical Care) as a whole will be the single biggest participant. This umbrella might then allow funding to be more like to be forthcoming from supporting parties (eg NIRH). BM was not keen for NASGBI to be come involved with set up logistics but would be keen to give support once it has found its own financial and logistical feet. Overall it was agreed that NASGBI should wait and see how self support develops and what the outcome of the grant application is. John Andrzejowski added that being a major supporter of NCCNet might well serve as an added attraction for Membership of the NASGBI by those involved with Neuro Critical Care.

8 Training and Fellowship Posts

Samanthana Shinde sent apologies to the meeting and so this minute would be carried forward to a future meeting.

8.1 In essence Council wished there to be a section on the web site which listed Centres that offered Neuroanaesthesia / Neuro Critical Care Fellowships along with contact names in the centre. This would allow interested Trainees to express an interest to the lead for these posts in the different Centres.

8.2 Council also wished to review the training recommendations for advanced Trainees interested in a career in Neuroanaesthesia. NH expressed the view that consideration of numbers of cases was inappropriate; these could be done well or poorly and was a bad indicator of appropriateness for the speciality. He further added that any consideration of minimum numbers of cases as a form of ability and assessment was ill advised. MS felt that from the RCoA point of view the numbers process was satisfactory, rightly or wrongly, and that NASGBI would almost certainly not be able to alter the presumption at this stage. PR added that with shift working now in place, new targets should be considered. Council agreed that a review of recommendations was appropriate for advanced Trainees and that SS should be asked to look at appropriate changes. BM suggested that it would also be useful to do a regional audit of Junior vs Senior (not advanced) Trainee's exposure to Neuroanaesthesia. SS could seek to do this via the Linkmen.

9 Website

9.1 NH reported that the links relevant to the ASM 2008 are all live and working correctly and he thanked PM for facilitating this. He added that Council meeting minutes would appear on the website once they had been agreed and signed by the President and the Secretary at the following Council meeting.

9.2 JA would seek out appropriate educational abstracts, papers or articles to pass to PM to put web links to these sites or to publish them subject to copyright terms. PR to seek trade support as previously minuted for ultimate web links and sponsorship of the Society.

9.3 PM reported that he had purchased an appropriate laptop computer for Council (web) business. He requested that he be informed of all new members and their email addresses so that he could add them to the membership database and apportion a membership number and password to them for web site member access. NH reminded Council that we had planned to seek support at the AGM for the majority of future communications to be electronic (barring statutory written communication according to our Constitution or law) and that this would be put to the Membership at the AGM.

10 Linkman meeting

This minute was held over due to SS's apologies

11 Audits by Members

JA gave a presentation based on a Council membership survey that he had conducted of 3 on line audit packages in order to ascertain if one in particular was better than the other two and would be appropriate in cost and ease for standardising audits by members. The 3 packages – Zoomerang, Survey Monkey and Survey Galaxy were all suitable packages. However, from a costing and multiuser viewpoint, the British package of Survey Galaxy appeared to be the most suited – however there would be a charge of (currently) £26 per audit / survey. It was felt that this might also concentrate minds on the quality of the intended questionnaire if authors had to pay this fee. It was agreed that despite buying the right to a survey, it did not necessarily mean that it would be accepted for presentation at an NASGBI ASM.

Council agreed that JA should take this (Galaxy) option forward and get more precise details from the package administrators as to real costs and terms of use. They also reaffirmed that a Full Consultant Member of the NASGBI should be a supervising author of any questionnaire carried out in this way. JA added that whilst the Galaxy package was easy to set up for a questionnaire, he would find it difficult to find time to do this for each questionnaire wishing to be carried out and that the individual investigators should do this work. He would give advice on setting up where requested. MMacN suggested that an application form for questionnaires should be available on the website for completion and forwarding to JA. Council agreed that MMacN should draft such a form and forward it to JA for discussion and then it would be forwarded to Council for approval / further modification and thence onward to PM for inclusion on the website.

12 ACCEA

12.1 MS reported. Important aspects within the rules of a nominating body were that all Members must be informed of the time frame of the process for the particular nominating body. He had sought clarification on the suitability of electronic communication and ACCEA had confirmed that they were satisfied with this method. This should be reported at the AGM and would encourage members to file an accurate and lasting email address with the Society. He suggested a time frame which started in July with calls for nominations, which should be subsequently submitted to the Society by the end of October. The deadlines must be absolute and applicants should ensure their citations are submitted along with their applications in

good time for the NASGBI sub-committee to consider their support. An annual report has to be filed to ACCEA regarding applications made, whether supported or not, to a nominating body.

12.2 The quality of applications and citations coming through the NASGBI had been very variable and he suggested that future applicants would be advised to seek advice from knowledgeable parties as to the content and style of citations. He reminded Council that whilst support from any area is important as long as it is relevant, the triangulation of support of the employing Trust / AAGBI and or RCA and other nominating bodies such as the Specialist Societies is essential to success.

12.3 Council wished MS to continue his role in leading the NASGBI review panel.

13 AGM Birmingham 2008

NH reported that the AGM would be held at the Marriott Forest of Arden Hotel during the course of the ASM, as is usual, after the end of the scientific session on Thursday 8th May 2008 this would be followed by the Linkman meeting with both sessions to finish by 18.00. He suggested that a President's drinks reception could then be held for half an hour as a benefit of membership. Agenda items would be sought from Council Officers and Members in due course.

14 ASM Birmingham 2008

14.1 NH reported that the logistics are all in place and that he and 4 other departmental members are working tirelessly to try to ensure a successful meeting. He reiterated that he felt it essential that if the template proved successful, Council would be strongly advised to make the ASM a Council organised and funded event with advice from a local centre in determining suitable venue options.

14.2 MN reported that the AAGBI had offered to take on an organisational role for future meetings including the underwriting of the financial risk although it was universally recognised that all previous meetings had shown a profit for the Society. Council asked MN to communicate with the Hon Treasurer and the Events Committee Chairmen of the AAGBI to ascertain the financial benefit or cost to the NASGBI of the AAGBI underwriting the finances and complying with our request of venue and content. NH felt that there would be little if any financial income to the Society for this service based upon his knowledge of independent company charges for such a service and the pricing strategy of the AAGBI. He felt that the consequent costs of attendance would be prohibitive and in the climate of declining industrial sponsorship the meeting might well fail and this would not bode well for future ASM's. Nonetheless, MN to explore costings.

14.3 MMacN suggested that input to the content of the programme could remain at a local level. NH said that this should still be with Council approval / veto / suggestion. Council agreed this strategy under the new template.

15 Abstracts – JNA and other options

BM stated that the Society pay for abstracts to be published in the JNA and that subscription to this journal was discounted for members of the NASGBI. NH suggested that if other

options for publications of our ASM abstracts are considered, then this should logically be in a UK journal; the Vascular Anaesthesia Society have just published their ASM abstracts in Anaesthesia. MS clarified that the association with the JNA was a longstanding one and that it helped to enhance the association between SNACC and the NASGBI and that unless a significantly financially better deal was available, the Society would be best advised to remain with the current arrangements. Council agreed this. BM agreed to seek costings from BJA, EJA, Anaesthesia and Analgesia, and Anaesthesia for publication of our ASM abstracts.

16 Any other business

16.1 NH suggested a re-wording of the Society application form to include a sentence along the lines of “I agree to abide by the rules and regulations of the Society”. This should cover the Society in the event of a Member complaining that they had not received an electronic communication following a change of email address not communicated to the Society by the member. The Society rules should stipulate that Members are responsible for ensuring that a current, valid email address is associated with their entry on the Membership register to facilitate electronic communication.

16.2 PM raised a suggestion of a Scottish Regional Study Day 6 months adrift from the ASM. He would bring a suggested template for such a day to the next Council meeting after discussion with his Colleagues in the Scottish Centres.

16.3 IT asked for support from those with previous experience for organisational advice for Liverpool 2009 ASM. NH advised that much of this will come from Council. He and his Colleagues should at this stage seek suitable venue options for consideration by an “ASM sub committee” . The venue should offer easy access by air, rail and car and have competitively priced car parking; it should have suitably affordable accommodation, preferably on site to encourage on site residence which helps gel the meeting. Council sub committee will advise on suggested content for the template of the meeting and also on the costings of attendance in conjunction with anticipated Trade support. Consideration must be made of the ABPI regulations when choosing and advertising the venue.

16.4 MN reported that the AAGBI ASM in 2008 had specialist Q&A sessions programmed and that one such session relating to Neuro cases coincided with the update session being presented by the NASGBI. He would draft a letter for BM to write to the AAGBI events sub committee enquiring as to whether this could be moved to facilitate input from NASGBI members, particularly those presenting at the ASM.

16.5 The issue of travel grants was raised to agree a future strategy. It was agreed that there should be a maximum of 4 granted per year of up to £750 each. Successful applicants would be advised that it was conditional upon them presenting their experience at the next ASM. PM to publish these regulations along with a revised application form on the web site. Applications should state all other areas of support applied to and the outcome of that application when known and applications should be submitted no less than 12 weeks before the intended date of departure. Supported by Council.

17 Date of next meeting

Friday 4th July 2008; Portex Room, AAGBI, London; 10.30

Following – Friday October 3rd 2008; 10.30 AM; AAGBI; location to be advised.

Dr Basil Matta
President NASGBI

Dr Nigel Huggins
Honorary Secretary NASGBI

1st February 2008