

**22nd Meeting of the
International Liaison Committee on Resuscitation
Hyatt Regency on Hudson Hotel
Jersey City New York
Wednesday 20th April 2005
Minutes**

Delegates Present:

Jerry Nolan (co chair), Bill Montgomery (co-chair) Pip Mason (Secretary), David Zideman (Treasurer), Walter Kloeck Tony handley, Michael Sayre, Bob O'Connor, Leo Bossaert, Michael Shuster, Peter Morley, Ian Jacobs, Jack Billi, Bob Hickey, Jeffrey Perlman, Vinay Nadkarni, Charles Deakin

Observers Present:

Mike bell, Mary Fran Hazinski

Bill welcomed everyone to the meeting

Mike Bell and Charles Deakin who had not been present at the Editorial Board meeting introduced themselves and were asked to declare any conflicts of interest.

Bill then thanked the AHA for hosting the meeting.

Apologies

Sergio Timerman (short period of participation by telephone)

Minutes of Previous Meeting:

Walter requested that this being the 21st meeting of ILCOR be added to the minutes and this meeting would be the 22nd

Matters arising From the Minutes

Ewy/Sanders Editorial

Jack Billi reported that this article is now being reviewed

Resuscitation Council of Asia: Bill Montgomery

Bill reported he had written to Dr Okado twice to get an update on progress in the establishment of this organization and application for membership. So far there has been no response.

International AED Signage:

Leo informed the committee that Rudi Koster is investigating the possibility of having a universal symbol. Rudi has written to several Council's on this topic. Walter added that Rudi had no specific design in mind. Those countries that already have AED signage appear to be using a similar design.

Tony pointed out that the UK Resuscitation Council is looking at this, but Rudi is keen to get endorsement from ILCOR for an international sign where AED's are placed. It would make sense to have an international sign. Walter suggested this topic be carried over to the Stavanger meeting in 2006 when Rudi will be present.

CoSTR Document: Jerry Nolan

Jerry Nolan reported that good progress had been made on the CoSTR document.

Jerry reminded members of the Editorial Board that the CoSTR document should be virtually finished by the end of these two days. The manuscript then needs to be submitted for peer review and submitted to *Resuscitation and Circulation* at the same time by 1st May.

Bill pointed out the absence of Sergio Timerman meant we do not meet the requirements of the current Constitution which states one member from each member organization must be present for a quorum. However Bill negotiated with Sergio to be present for part of the meeting by telephone when a vote on the By-laws was required.

Walter asked if Bill or Jerry could explain the difference between the *History of ILCOR* document and the *Ten Years*

Before Corporation document. Walter also asked if it would be possible to have a few photos throughout the document that relate to the ILCOR meetings to demonstrate collaboration. Walter asked if anyone has photos could they please send them to him.

Walter also asked about the editorials. Jerry replied that the four editorials include the following: conflict of interest, key topics, the history of ILCOR and the worksheet process.

Jerry pointed out that if photos were included in the *History of ILCOR* it would be a lengthy document. However this will be published in Resuscitation along with the International Collaboration document. Circulation will just publish the International Collaboration document.

Peter Morley raised the fact that an enormous amount of work had been done by the worksheet authors but that the end product is very short. Peter proposed that some topics be included in some articles eg drugs in cardiac arrest. We would need to explore a way of doing this collaboratively. Peter asked whether people thought this was a good idea. After some discussion Jerry suggested we think about it overnight.

Guideline Sharing: Jack Billi

Jack Billi suggested this was a good idea but that maybe people should develop their drafts first and then compare to see how close they are. Councils may wish to share them at this time. There should not be many differences; The AHA has a short turn around to get all their guidelines ready for publication. The drafts are completed and they would be happy to share so long as those who view the documents abide by the non-disclosure policy. Sharing may be possible and help other Councils if deadlines were around June or July. However AHA has a deadline of May 1st.

Peter suggested it might not need to be the entire document perhaps just the areas of contention. Could there be a spread sheet to flag potential differences early on. Mary Fran agreed it would be good to share information in case something stands out as being totally different. This group represents a wealth of experience, so something like this could act as a mutual check. Jerry thought that most people would like to take away the AHA document to help draft statements. It would also help to identify conflicts.

Ian Jacobs said the Australian Resuscitation Council would be drafting their policy statements at the end of the year and published next year and suggested that inconsistencies could be identified tomorrow.

Vinay Nadkarni suggested compression: ventilation ratio and one shock etc maybe contentious. Should there be a short publication which states the main differences once the guidelines have been published. This could be done in conjunction with the universal algorithm. Jerry asked whether the AHA has actually gone through the algorithm with a manikin as some problems have been identified e.g., the one-shock strategy.

Bob O'Connor pointed out the first parts of the universal algorithm are the same for all rescuers. Then it goes into IV line etc. Jerry brought up LMA masks; these are widely used in the UK now. A lot of people are not trained to intubate in UK hospitals.

Constitution Review and By-laws: David Zideman

One of the primary drivers was to incorporate ILCOR before submission of the ILCOR publication. This has been done in Belgium as it was considered to be a relatively easy process. The current Constitution has serious flaws especially now that ILCOR is publishing documents. We need to be cognisant of being sued. Despite the fact that Pip and Walter had done some work on the constitution it needed to have further changes.

ILCOR does not have to be incorporated; however, it would be beneficial as we would then become a legal entity. Because incorporation needs to be done in a national/international way it had to be reformatted. The existing Constitution is obsolete. The By-laws replace the Constitution and these are worded to meet requirements for Belgian law. Leo pointed out that at the last meeting in January, ILCOR had two documents: the Constitution and the incorporated document. It became apparent that we only needed one document.

Walter pointed out that the new document has really just been reformatted. Sergio joined the meeting by phone at this point. David went through the document explaining every article. David then asked Councils' representatives to sign the document

Jack proposed that the Mission Statement moved from the Constitution needs to be changed; he has some suggestions for improvement. Bob Hickey asked whether the common goal was to save lives or whether it was to reduce death and disability. Mike Bell suggested the focus should be on saving lives.

Ian Jacobs suggested using the term *resuscitation* rather than BLS, ALS and PLS as these lines are becoming very blurred now. After some discussion the mission statement was finalised. Peter Morley raised the issue about updating information. How often would this be done? The ARC provides guideline updates every six months.

Objectives:

Everyone was happy with the objectives

Membership:

ILCOR does not privilege one organization over another.

Region:

Jerry suggested the word region should be clarified. Jerry asked if a country that meets all the criteria approached ILCOR to become a member what would the answer be. Region is not a good word. Walter pointed out that region is implied. A country cannot become a member without the agreement of the General Assembly.

Michael Shuster. Should we take out geographic region? Ian pointed out that having criteria for membership will not protect us from a single country applying.

Peter Morley suggested we leave it in until there is a problem and then come up with a way to address the issue. WHO uses region e.g., the region Europe.

Jerry said Japan has gone through the process of establishing the Resuscitation Council of Asia to meet ILCOR's admission criteria; what happens if China wants to join? Jack believes we have set a high standard and that it is not the criteria that allows membership; it requires a 2/3 majority decision. Mathew Mattes suggested leaving region in as it gives us what we do and don't want to accept. We cannot be forced to take anyone we don't want.

Bill explained to Sergio on the phone about the word region. Bill asked Sergio if he agreed with the term region. Sergio was asked if he wanted to nominate someone to vote on his behalf. Sergio nominated Bill

The decision was made to keep the term region.

Article 5

Walter suggested in 5c word 'both' should be removed. Agreed

Article 6:

Expulsion/resignation has to be included and is quite strict. There is an appeal mechanism.

Article 7:

Subscriptions. A member would not be expelled but could lose delegate right

Article 9:

Structure: These 4 points needed to be addressed. Ralph included these in the document. What does the highest power entail they have all had to be included. They do fit requirements for a basic organization. Jack suggested IV needs to be clarified. This would need to go back to Ralph and there will be an answer tomorrow.

Mike Bell asked what was meant by Statutes. Does that mean the law of Belgium? Mathew Mattes replied that the Statutes set out what is required by law. Most organizations more than meet the Statutes. These are the articles for ILCOR. Mark Mattes suggested that as the Constitution was now obsolete the word constitution should be deleted and replaced with the words *Articles of Incorporation*.

Article 10:

General Assembly.

One meeting annually and we need to add face to face or telephone, or an electronic meeting.

Ninety calendar days of notification before a scheduled meeting. This information is supplied to all the organizations and the delegates within it.

Co chairs do not vote unless there is a tie.

Article 11:

Meetings of General Assembly

Ian Jacobs asked if we are we going for a simple majority. That is a change from the previous document and is everyone happy with that? Bob Hickey expressed concern that a country may end up not being represented. This could be a problem if decisions are made that impact on that country. Jack suggested if an organization cannot be present for some reason then they waive the right and appoint a suitable representative on their behalf, e.g., appoint a proxy. Brian Eigel asked if a council did not want to come, could it prevent this group from meeting or making a decision? Each member organization must be represented either in person or by phone. David pointed

out this could become a problem as it could prevent an important decision being made.

There was long debate over the wording around simple majority at this point. Decision was made that it would be a simple majority of the total number of ILCOR General Assembly delegate's i.e. at least 2/3 of the member organizations.

Therefore add a simple majority of the total number of delegates comprising at least 2/3

Jack suggested if something cannot be decided in the Executive the issue should be brought to the General Assembly.

Conflict of Interest. These people should be absent during the vote unless requested to remain and have no vote on the matter.

Executive Officers

Two Co-chairs with a term of office of 3 years followed by a further 3 years if they wish.

Charles Deakin asked whether this would be difficult with guideline changes being every five years and Executive membership changing every three years. Will this be confusing? Walter suggested a term of office is usually 3 years and there should be an opportunity to be re-elected. David agreed there needs to be an end time. Bob Hickey suggested it would not be advantageous to have people going near the end of the guidelines. Leo suggested the term of office should start from the founding of ILCOR. Therefore one could say the new terms start with the new Constitution. However, David pointed out that we had a Constitution before, so we cannot do that.

Article 12:

Executive Committee

Comprises 10 people

Meetings will be quarterly. There was a feeling that quarterly was too often. Mary Fran suggested we include a minimum in the document and suggested at least once a year for the Executive.

Article 17:

Resignations There are tight time restrictions on this because we do not want to hold up ILCOR business while sorting this out.

Article 18

Officers' responsibilities. Agreed

Article 19:

Representation Agreed

Article 20:

Task Forces Agreed

Walter asked whether there will be a term of office for Task Force chairs. It was suggested that this be left open and that it can be removed by the General Assembly if necessary. Bob Hickey agreed with Walter that there should be term limitations. David is happy to put in a time limitation in the by-laws.

Leo asked whether there should be Co chairs for task forces. We have that at the moment. David is happy to put in a time limitation in the by-laws.

Article 21:

Funds and Accounts Agreed

This article explains how the Honorary Secretary will set up accounts. Leo reminded David that the accounts etc must comply with Belgian law.

Article 22

Miscellaneous

Change *Constitution to Articles of Incorporation*

Next Steps:

Leo explained that all those official delegates present at this meeting will sign the document. Then it has to be

translated and registered with the Notary, which will take several weeks. Once all this has been done, ILCOR can function as a legal entity.

The final document, which will be in one language, will be sent by FedEx to the Chairs of the individual organisations for signing. Mike Bell reminded Leo that the final document must go through legal council in the AHA and may need to go back to individual councils. Once the final document is signed that will be it, however because the document has changed in format substantially from the original Mike is required to take it back.

David agreed to make the changes overnight and bring it back to the delegates in the morning for signing.

As we are required to include in the minutes that the document has been accepted and signed, we need to look at the by-laws.

Walter pointed out that when membership was established there were three task forces. Now there are six task forces therefore should we have greater membership? David said that will not change this document and it is not the right time to discuss numbers. Bob Hickey agreed that Walter's point was a good one and it should be on the agenda for the next meeting.

Use of Title and Logo

This is important; it must be stated when, where and who can use it.

Mark Mattes pointed out that once ILCOR is a legal entity we need to protect the logo and name. These will be copyrighted at some stage once the documents are completed.

Individuals are not able to represent ILCOR without consulting the General Assembly. This also needs to be stated. Bob Hickey also suggested that we include any small business stuff cannot be done without the approval of an Executive Officer.

Liability Clause

This needs to be included so that ILCOR is not liable for money, injuries etc. Mike asked if ILCOR is going to provide insurance for the Executive Committee and officers. This will cost money and we do not have any. Jack suggested that we accept the liability clause. When lawyers look at it there may need to be some minor changes in the wording.

Bob Hickey asked that we add to the next agenda the topic of Task Forces.

David pointed out the Bye-Laws document does not need to be signed.

David asked for a vote.

Articles of Incorporation

Motion:

That the Articles of Incorporation document be accepted in principle

Moved: Jack Billi

Seconded: Bob O'Connor.

By-laws

Motion:

That the By-laws document be accepted in principle

Moved: Tony Handley

Second: Ian Jacobs.

Walter asked for a vote of thanks to Ralph for his work on this document

Questionnaire on Guidelines Process and Conference: Bill Montgomery

Bill spoke to the Executive summary. There was a 35% return rate. Bill asked that everyone read the document. The statistics are there for everyone to see.

Bill pointed out the question referring to the length of the conference: 64% thought it was about right. Bill asked for any further feedback about the conference.

Charles suggested the poster sessions feedback was lost from the ALS sessions. Unless the comments came back quickly the comments were lost. Michael Shuster was thanked for his work on the poster sessions.

Peter Morley emphasized the fact that the worksheet reviewers were disillusioned with the process and did not know what was going to happen after the conference. We need to think seriously about how we best utilize their work.

Bob Hickey asked if the specific task force comments could be pulled out as this would be very helpful for the chairs. Bill was unsure as to whether we had that detail. The comments mainly related to the posters.

Jack pointed out an abstract had been accepted for the conflict of interest document which will be presented at a conference later in the year.

Bill summarized the number of worksheets. 17 countries represented.

281 participated in the review

276 topics were reviewed.

46% of the reviewers were international authors.

Bill discussed the 2010 Consensus Process Advisory Group (CPAG). AHA has established this to look at the process. The group comprises three AHA people and three ILCOR people.

MET Advisory Statement: Jerry Nolan

Jerry reported that it had been suggested at the last meeting that we develop a proposal to have an Utstein template on medical emergency teams (METs). The AHA would have to seek approval to get this through the system. This concept has been accepted and will be developed further. Vinay agreed with Jerry that we should look toward the next ILCOR meeting re developing MET Advisory statements. A matrix needs to be developed but there has not been time to do this as yet. However, it could be done at the next meeting in May in Norway. There are two people working on organizing an approach and will have monthly telephone conferences to do this?

David Zideman spoke about the conference in Stavanger and having an Utstein style meeting. One proposal is to take the education document from the last Utstein ILCOR meeting and use the following formula $\text{med science} \times \text{educational efficiency} \times \text{local organization} = \text{survival}$. People can look at this in terms of their country's survival statistics. Everyone would then be using the same formula. If ILCOR delegates agree to this idea then a proposal will need to be submitted to the Laerdal Foundation for funding by 1st May 2005.

Bob Hickey asked whether we should be looking at BLS and CPR at the Utstein Conference in 2006. Jack agreed with Bob. Looking at barriers to CPR in different countries could be very valuable. It would challenge us on where we are with community CPR at the moment. This could still be done with the model David suggested.

Jerry asked how much time would be dedicated to developing the Utstein MET template. David believed the MET document could be finished and endorsed at Utstein. The local implementation would need to be discussed. However this is a different process to what has happened in the past. Usually we start with a blank sheet. Is it appropriate for ILCOR to come in late on a process that David has already planned? Vinay said the proposal would be to involve ILCOR from the beginning. ILCOR could achieve an Utstein document by developing it by internet and/or international teleconference. The face-to-face meeting would be to iron anything out. ILCOR's involvement needs to be more than just a rubber stamp. It would be very ambitious to do MET and CPR at one meeting. How long will the ILCOR meeting be? The ERC meeting is 10-13th May 2005. Will it be before or after the ERC conference?

Long discussion followed over meeting dates, times etc. Bob Hickey felt that the MET document should be dealt with by experts not the whole ILCOR group. Could the MET group meet at the same time as those working with David's document?

David's proposal is that if we want to run with this idea then we can look at various factors e.g., MET, community CPR so that he can apply for funding. Judith suggested standardized CPR outcomes of quality of life. Jerry felt this would certainly apply to David's formula. Bob asked how we decide as to how much emphasis we put on the links that David is developing. Arno pointed out we are not very clear about what is survival. Apart from quality of life, we need to come up with better measures as to what is survival etc. What interventions do we need to look at, e.g., did they get bystander CPR, were they in VF, were they discharged from hospital, etc. Jerry asked whether the proposal has to come back to ILCOR before it is submitted. There are time restraints for this. David asked for volunteers to help with the proposal.

MET Advisory Statement Proposal

Motion: That a MET Advisory Statement be developed

Moved: Vinay Nadkarni

Seconded: Walter Kloeck

Proposal

That an application to hold an Utstein meeting in conjunction with the ERC conference in May 2006, and that the scope be developed by a small group led by David Zideman with representation from each organization.

Moved: Jack Billi

Seconded; Michael Shuster

Co Chair Election Succession Plan: Bill Montgomery

It was pointed out that Jerry Nolan's term is up this fall but because ILCOR will not be meeting this will be pushed back to May 2006. Pip Mason's term will also be pushed back to 2007.

Fall Meeting: Walter Kloeck

Walter proposed initially that the fall meeting be held in South Africa on the 9th & 10th October 2006. The venue would be Sun City north of Johannesburg. This is an international conference venue. There are four different hotel complexes. The complex is a botanical extravaganza.

The question was asked whether this fall meeting should be the start of the new process. This would involve more people and more expense as it would need to bring in worksheet authors etc. Ian suggested that maybe the new process could be decided upon at the fall ILCOR meeting. Bob pointed out the fall is difficult to schedule meetings. We need to make a decision as to whether we have one meeting in 2006 or 2007. But the meeting must be held in South Africa not the USA. There have been two meetings this year in USA.

The suggestion was made that we do not have a meeting in 2006 after Stavanger and have a meeting in South Africa in early 2007 instead of October 2006.

Peter asked do we need a meeting in 2006. Should we schedule a meeting for the 6th-9th April 2007? Ian agreed and suggested that unless we have an agenda it is very expensive. We should look at attaching ILCOR meetings to a conference and we should also start looking at using technology for meetings. Jerry agreed that teleconferences have been working well.

It was decided that a meeting later in 2006 should be left open. David suggested that this decision be left to the Executive.

Cochrane Review: Ian Jacobs

Ian reported there have been about six protocols lodged with Cochrane related to Resuscitation. However these have not yet been sent around, as everyone has been so busy. Ian asked how we could turn some of our worksheet reviews into Cochrane systematic reviews. It was suggested this could be discussed at the Stavanger meeting.

First Aid: Jerry Nolan

Jerry reported that Ralph Shenefelt had approached him expressing concern that ILCOR did not have a First Aid taskforce. Jerry had no idea about the politics and asked for Ralph to send a letter. Mike Bell agreed we should look at what to do about First Aid in the future. Ralph has been a member of the First Aid Advisory Board. This board left it open that this was the beginning of a continuous process for the review of First Aid. It was felt that Ralph was looking to be able to say he was part of ILCOR which is not possible.

Jerry pointed out that if ILCOR was to start a task force on First Aid we would not be using people outside the ILCOR group. Jack suggested that co chairs respond saying ILCOR does not have First Aid as an official topic. However if ILCOR was to develop the topic of First Aid it will be drafted by ILCOR using his and others expertise.

General Business:

There being no further business the meeting closed at 10:10pm

Next Meeting

Stavanger Norway 14th May 2006.

Venue to be advised.