

**Minutes of the 23rd Meeting of the  
International Liaison Committee on Resuscitation  
Dyna Room First Floor  
Stavanger Forum  
Sunday 14<sup>th</sup> May 2006 08:00**

**Delegates Present:**

Bill Montgomery (co-chair)  
Jerry Nolan (co chair)  
Pip Mason (Secretary)  
David Zideman (Treasurer)  
Mike Bell  
Dominique Biarent  
Jack Billi  
Leo Bossaert  
Alan Caen  
Ashraf Coovadia  
Charles Deakin  
Swee Han Lim  
Tony Handley  
Mary Fran Hazinski  
Bob Hickey  
Ian Jacobs  
Walter Kloeck  
Rudi Koster  
Peter Morley  
Vinay Nadkarni  
Michael Sayre  
Bob O'Connor  
Kazuo Okada  
Michael Shuster  
Ian Stiell

**Apologies:**

Sergio Timmerman

**Observers Present:**

Bernd Bottiger  
Jenny Dennett  
Brian Eigel  
Judith Finn  
Tetsuo Hatanaka  
Koen Monsieurs  
Jeffrey Perlman  
Mike Parr  
Jerry Potts  
Steven Prudhomme  
Tanya Semenko  
Sam Richmond  
David Rogers

Bill Montgomery welcomed everyone to the meeting and thanked the ERC for hosting it.

### **Minutes of the previous meeting**

Jack Billi questioned whether the 2/3 majority cited in article 11 was correct. Peter Morley confirmed that it was correct.

The Minutes were accepted as a true and correct record of the 22<sup>nd</sup> ILCOR meeting.

Moved Jack Billi

Seconded Peter Morley

### **Resuscitation Council of Asia Proposal:** Jerry Nolan

Jerry N explained that Japan had previously applied to become a member of ILCOR but had been turned down on the grounds that applications would normally have to come from regional organisations. Representatives from Japan, Taiwan, Korea and Singapore have since established the Resuscitation Council of Asia (RCA) and this organisation has submitted an application to join ILCOR.

Dr Okada, later joined by Dr Swee Han Lim, presented the proposal from Resuscitation Council of Asia. Tony Handley asked if there were plans for adding other councils to the RCA in the future. Malaysia and Indonesia may be interested in setting up a Council together. Malaysia has a Resuscitation Council but it is not particularly active; they may wish to join the RCA at a later date. Tony asked about Hong Kong – it does not have a council at the moment. Leo asked Dr Okada to describe the region that the RCA planned to represent?

Peter pointed out that the Constitution asks for evidence of by laws, education material, guidelines etc and asked how much of this information had been provided. Dr Okada indicated that each council had their own web page Singapore has the BLS material completed and the other councils are working towards this. All minutes of their meetings will be written in English

Following the presentation the two RCA representatives left the room and a lengthy discussion followed.

Jerry N pointed out that some documents were circulated about the application two weeks ago, and that the RCA had worked hard to fulfil the criteria including the creation of a constitution which was reviewed by Drs. Nolan and Montgomery. Peter suggested that if the information that had not yet been completed was relatively minor this could be dealt with.

David felt that they have submitted more documentation than some of the current councils. Leo agreed and suggested that in future all councils should submit an annual report to ILCOR to inform the general Assembly of what is happening within their group.

Jack Billi moved we accept the membership application of the RCA to join ILCOR

Seconded by Michael Shuster

Peter pointed out that Asia is a big area with many diverse cultures. What do we expect of them? Mike Bell said AHA has had a conflict of interest as they have had commercial dealings to generate revenue. China probably will not join the RCA. China might approach ILCOR independently. Peter asked about Sri Lanka, Thailand etc - what process would there be for these countries? Jerry N said it is likely that they would be broken into regions within Asia.

### **Decisions:**

Ian asked how many delegates RCA should be entitled to.

Moved Ian Jacobs moved that the number of delegates for RCA be 3

Seconded Charles Deakin

Vote unanimous 3 delegates

David agreed to send a letter to them to confirm their acceptance and to indicate the number of delegates they were entitled to. Jerry N asked the RCA representatives to return to the meeting and announced that they had been admitted as members. Drs Okada and Lim thanked everyone.

### **Attendees at ILCOR Meetings Delegates/ Observers.**

What are the implications of having the large number of observers attending the ILCOR meeting? Over the years the number of observers at times has outnumbered the delegates, which then becomes unwieldy. It makes it extremely difficult to conduct a meeting plus it is very costly with accommodation, and meals etc

Other questions were asked such as the following.

Should we have observers at all and, if so, how many?

Do we split the meeting and have only official delegates first and then a specified number of observers?

Should there be a formula depending on the number of delegates for each council?

Walter Kloeck suggested that in future observers should have specified reasons for attending, e.g., they may have a particular area of expertise.

Leo thought it would be more practical to invite a fixed number of observers in proportion to the number of official delegate – perhaps in a 3:1 ratio, e.g., ERC and AHA may have 2 observers and the others one observer. Peter queried why observers are at the ILCOR meeting in the first place? If the council believes they should come for some reason then that should be acceptable. Individuals could be invited to attend just for a specific agenda item.

Mike B pointed out that if we progress to 2010 there are going to be critical people that must attend. Bob H felt that some councils needed business people present. Bob H said that the AHA had to substitute a delegate in order to have Mike B present at the Stavanger meeting.

Leo suggested that for business meetings we should have delegates only. Then have the observers attend later. As an example, these could be the task force meetings.

Bill asked if dividing this meeting was acceptable to all delegates.

Peter indicated that none of the ILCOR delegates could make financial decisions during an ILCOR meeting without seeking the input of their respective boards.

Ian Jacobs moved that observers that equated to 1/3 of delegates for each council could attend the whole meeting. Seconded Bob H but added that the co chairs reserve the right reserve the right to invite people if necessary.

Vinay Nadkarni suggested that the business part of the meeting could be helpful to an observer if they were in the process of being considered as a delegate. Tony felt it was important that ILCOR reserves the right to have delegates only. There is nothing to stop the co chairs inviting someone for a particular part.

Mary Fran suggested we need a solution that is permissive but slightly restrictive. The margin between delegates and observers is going to be muddy as time goes by. Mary Fran suggested we say under normal conditions delegates only attend the ILCOR business meeting and observers may attend as deemed necessary.

Leo suggested the business meeting should only be for the 29 delegates. Mary Fran reminded the meeting we need additional people for the 2010. It was pointed out that 2010 is separate to the ILCOR business meeting.

Ian Jacobs moved that the ILCOR agenda be for delegates only.

Seconded Tony Handley

Vote 1 abstain and 1 against.

Jack Billi moved that each Council be allowed to identify observers up to 1/3 of their number of delegates. The observers will attend all meetings other than the business meetings at the Council's expense.

Seconded Tony Handley

Vote unanimous

David pointed out we might invite observers to open meetings to discuss technical issues. Then we have ILCOR meetings such as the 2010 and the Executive decides how many people need to be there. That means we have the right people for the right meetings. Peter said according to the Constitution Executive meetings are for the Executive only, General Assembly delegates only; other meetings are those such as 2010 and Councils pick up the tab for their own observers.

Jack Billi moved that an ILCOR delegate can ask that additional participants be invited if appropriate for the business meeting agenda and with the rationale for doing so. The Executive committee will make the decision and notify the appropriate person.

Seconded Tony Handley

Vote: unanimous

## **Elections**

### **Co-Chair**

Pip Mason announced that Jerry Nolan had been nominated for the position of Co chair unopposed. Jerry was therefore confirmed as Co-Chair

### **Secretary.**

Pip announced that there were two nominations for the position of Secretary. Ian Jacobs (ANZCOR) and Michael Shuster (HSFC).

Both nominees were asked to leave the room and a secret ballot was held.

Jerry N announced that Ian Jacobs was successful in becoming the Secretary of ILCOR. Jerry thanked Pip for her excellent work as secretary over the years and Michael Schuster for running for election. .

Observers joined the meeting at this point.

### **Constitution: Leo Bossaert**

Leo reported that ILCOR is now legally constituted. The document that was signed in New Jersey was published in the official Belgium newspaper and approval has been received that we now exist. The agreement has been signed by the King of Belgium. The portfolio includes the statutes, signed by the ILCOR members, the by-laws and the local by-laws. It includes a clause that states if there is any dispute between the Flemish and English version, it is the original English version that stands.

Costs involved are minor: just the notary and 1600 Euros. There needs to be some discussion about the costs for the work done in the future. There will be some book keeping work and the tax issues. Do we require insurance? Belgium law strongly advises this. The standard fee is 3-4,000 Euros. Leo reported that everything went well in getting International Incorporation for ILCOR. Jerry N thanked Leo for all his hard work and opened it up for discussion and questions.

Bill suggested we move onto the cost issues. Each council has to pay a prorated share. This means an invoice will be sent to the organizations. Peter suggested that the RCA is not included in the cost for the Incorporation as they were not part of the document

Walter suggested the cost is allocated the same way as the logo. This was 1/8<sup>th</sup> and 2/8<sup>th</sup> (AHA and ERC).

David asked if we would consider a membership prorated fee which could be used as a base to fund such items and any other items that arise in the future. David pointed out that we do not currently have a bank account as the organizations have yet to agree to this. Belgium law requires we have a bank account. David would like to open an account, held in Belgium, with all finances carried out in Euros. The account would need to have David as one of the signatories and a Belgium signatory. Jerry suggested we look at the contributions to the account in the first place. Split the costs for work done already and then what needs to be done in the future including tax related issues. We also need to have some working equipment, insurance and 5% secretarial support. The total would come to around 7-8,000 euros per year. On top of that there are special projects etc that need to have separate budgets. If we look at publications then they are seen as separate budgets. David suggested this was confusing. ERC should cover the basic costs until ILCOR has some money.

Jack asked if it was possible for a quick budget to be prepared to advance this. This could be up on the screen after lunch and then discussed. Bill suggested we agree to insurance but this would have to be unanimous. The member organizations would need to be named as additional insurers. This is required by law in Belgium. We need to find out who is covered and for what. This has a major impact on the size of the policy. Jerry N thought the insurance was to cover liability e.g., statements by ILCOR delegates. But should it also cover injury etc. Pip pointed out that this was generally covered under travel policy for individual delegates. Leo suggested that the options will be looked, including the costs, and circulated to members within the next 2 months.

Leo also pointed out that since we are registered in Belgium it is advisable to have a contact person in Belgium. Leo would be prepared to do this  
David Zideman moved that Leo Bossaert be the contact person  
Seconded Pip Mason  
Vote unanimous

**International AED Signage:** Rudi Koster

Rudi reported that he had asked each country if they had a standard logo and what it looked like. Most countries said no except for various countries in Europe all of whom have regulations. Rudi showed some logos that are currently available. The European logos are all very similar. Rudi suggested we decide on a logo and that it be according to the European regulations as they are the only ones who do have a regulation. Mike B pointed out that the USA tried to go down this path, but it was abandoned as they could not get agreement. Peter asked is it to get a higher degree of recognition and is this worth pursuing? Jerry Potts indicated that in Europe it might not be a problem and supported ILCOR pursuing this issue. Belgium has moved on a logo but it is not yet finished so it is still possible for this to be similar around the world. Jerry N felt there was nothing to lose in terms of pursuing this, however, getting a decision might be difficult. Rudi suggested the logo needs to be clear and simple. Colour does not matter so long as it is clear and succinct. Walter agreed and thought that organizations that don't have one could adopt the standardized logo. Most logos around the world have the heart with the lightning bolt through it. Jerry P said that where there is no regulatory body we could consider asking manufacturers to support this. Peter asked if the USA has to have red - the answer was no. We need to make sure an RCA representative joins the group to look at this. Vinay suggested we need to move away from abbreviations such as AED. The small working group will look at this.

**Logo Copyright:** Leo Bossaert

Leo reported that we can protect the logo. If someone wants to use the logo they must ask to do so. This will cost around 2000 euros for Europe only. For each of the other countries a separate protection must be sought, there needs to be some careful thought around this. It is important this is done otherwise our logo could be used inappropriately. Jack said in the USA registering is one thing but you also have to monitor this. Currently the logo is part of the notary. Because of cost considerations, action on this item was deferred.

**MET teams:** Vinay Nadkarni

Vinay asked whether ILCOR should produce an Utstein paper on MET teams? A draft paper has been developed but not yet circulated. It would be published in Circulation and Resuscitation, subject to approval from ILCOR. Once the paper reaches a good draft, it will be circulated with a strict timeline for the return of comments. Mike Parr reported the draft is nearly ready for circulation. The task force chairs would not necessarily represent a wide enough circulation. It needs to go to all delegates. Walter suggested once the final document is drawn up it should be circulated to all 29 delegates and then signed off. Comments need to be sent back through the Chairs. Vinay proposed the first draft be circulated within a week to all delegates for comments. Comments should go back through their chairs and then sent to the writers.

**The Gaps Draft:** Vinay Nadkarni.

Vinay reported that at C2005 we identified the gaps in the science so that we could move forward for the next review. Vinay has merged some of the gaps that were common throughout the task forces. The manuscript is almost ready for more widespread circulation. The document has gone only to the Editorial Board so far. The document now needs input from all delegates. Walter suggested the document is circulated to the 29 delegates and the comments come back to the chairs. Jerry N asked if any there were any objections to this process.

Mike S stated that most of the organizations do not have any involvement in First Aid and asked whether this section would be separated off. Mary Fran suggested that this be dealt with as it was for 2005, i.e., first aid to be included in the Circulation version but not in Resuscitation. Leo asked if this document will be an ILCOR document and what the title would be?

Bob H asked if the identified gaps were to be prioritised. Vinay expected this would be asked for in the feedback. Judith Finn suggested that it be circulated but pointed out that all the gaps had already been identified during the 2005 process. By sending it out now we might effectively be starting all over again. Bob O'Connor suggested we call for research to be done in the areas we struggled with in 2005 in readiness for 2010.

Jerry N then summarized the discussion. The gaps paper will be circulated when completed. All feedback will go back to the chairs and then to the Editorial Board

The document will mimic the 2005 consensus publication with stroke and first aid included only in the Circulation version.

**Utstein Conference Feedback:** David Zideman

David reported that 350,000 NK had been received from the Laerdal Foundation to hold this meeting. The meeting was limited to 35 delegates. Delegates were selected according to the topics for discussion. The topics were presented on the last day of the ERC congress. The findings are up for discussion through the smaller Utstein task force groups. There will be a preliminary document within one year which will then be submitted to this meeting before publication.

### **Cochrane Reviews:** Ian Jacobs

Ian reported that so far we had been involved in the cardiac, injury and anaesthesia groups. Ian circulates documents to ask people if they are prepared to be involved in the reviews. We now need to look at the 2005 worksheets, identify key topics and hopefully turn them into systematic reviews. It is important that we approach the authors of the hot topics that we would like to turn into systematic reviews

Jack raised the issue of the worksheet used for C2005 and suggested we make changes to the design of the worksheet and maybe try to have a sheet that is more generic and publishable.

### **C2005 Discussion**

Feedback:

Peter said we first need to agree whether it is worth taking this process forward.

### **Worksheets**

Everyone agreed that the worksheets need to change. We cannot ask individuals to go through this lengthy process without at least the potential of a peer-reviewed publication at the end of it.

Jeff Perlman agreed there were difficulties with the worksheet whereby they were often completed by people who were very involved in the process then sent to others who were not involved. So somehow we need to make sure everyone involved understands the expectations, time lines etc. Many did not understand the process. Jerry N said we need to reassess who develops the worksheets and who does the training for them. Those who did not understand the worksheets needed an enormous amount of help. Ideally, the worksheet author should not have to collect all the literature; this should be done for them. Rudi suggested that two authors should collaborate and produce just one worksheet.

Potential involvement of the industry before guideline publication is a very difficult and sensitive issue. Perhaps they could have been informed earlier about the changes to defibrillation, enabling them to address the technical issues required to make AEDs compliant before publication of the CoSTR document. Mike B said that the AHA had tried to find a way of doing this but that advice from lawyers was that unless there was an absolute guarantee that all defibrillator manufacturers could be fully informed there was a significant risk of legal action.

Mary Fran suggested we might be able to involve industry if we started the process soon enough. Mary Fran also pointed out that we need to determine the precise output that we wanted from the consensus process (this was not done until very late in the 2005 process). We could then decide whether to involve industry before publication.

Ian agreed and said it comes back to what do we want at the end of the process. If it is a scientific document then we leave industry out, but if it is a guidelines document then we should communicate with the industry so they have some time to prepare.

Peter asked whether we should review or replace the existing worksheets. Also, the conflict of interest issue needs to be sorted out. We also should consider who does the worksheets, which components of the worksheets need to be adopted, and we also need to look at the structure of the worksheet. We also need to decide where and how they are to be published. The filtering process needs to be improved. We are better prepared this time round compared to last time but we must take advantage of this. The style of the worksheets focussed on treatment but did not work well for non-treatment topics

Bob H suggested the time for public comment should be longer. Perhaps worksheets could replace the CoSTR document in the future as they are richer in detail. Tony felt that there was a problem with the questions: they were either too specific or too general. Tony suggested that rather than each task force working independently, all the task forces need to work together to decide on a better process. Charles agreed - he indicated that in the ALS group reviewers had changed titles because they did not like what was given to them and this was a big problem.

Peter agreed that the process for developing the questions is extremely important, but questions need to be developed this time with an early review around the way the questions are asked.

Jerry P suggested that the proposed questions could be posted on the web for public feedback. The existing 2005 worksheets going to stay on the website for the time being.

### **ILCOR Budget**

David presented the budget that he had developed looking at a membership fee and a delegate fee.

Leo agreed with David's draft as it brings everything together. However, it does not include other expenses e.g., meetings, catering, venues, accommodation, etc or expenses for social events.

David explained the draft is just a basic framework to get ILCOR up and running. Jack suggested we agree to this framework as a starting point. We have to recognize that there will be other expenses but we need to move forward. Mike B agreed this is a good place to start. Walter asked that we do not make a final decision on budget as developed by David at this meeting as he would have to take this back to his local committee for discussion.

Mary Fran asked whether there should be a standard membership fee for everyone. Dr Swee Han Lim agreed that there should be membership fees but this should be reduced for the smaller organizations. Ian supported an initial one time membership fee.

Walter pointed out that the RCSA does not charge for any resources or have a membership fee therefore there may be big implications for them.

Mary Fran suggested that it be kept to 1000 euros and the smaller councils could petition for an exemption or a reduction if necessary.

Leo said in Europe expenses are readjusted according to inflation.

The model is acceptable but it comes down to the amount of money paid by the organizations. Representatives need to go back and get confirmation from their respective committees. Peter said this should not be an executive decision.

Peter Morley moved that the model be approved for a one time membership fee of 1000 Euro per council and a per delegate fee annually of 300 Euro. Individuals should seek their Council's approval and feedback to the Executive Committee.

Seconded Jack Billi

Jack Billi moved that any Council can apply to the Executive Committee for help if this financial model poses a problem.

Seconded Peter Morley

Vote: Leo Bossaert and Walter Kloeck abstained.



### Planning for Next Conference

Bill discussed the process for planning the 2010. Jack suggested an advisory group be put together to do this. Vinay and Bill are the Co-Chairs.

Vinay acknowledged Tania Semenko's work on putting together the comparison chart to start the process off.

Bill said a half time appointment can be made to manage the process etc. Leo said some discussions had been held about improving the worksheet review process. One of the options is that much of the preparation work could be done before the experts start working on the worksheets. Therefore, by having one or two people doing the preparation first would be very helpful. The ERC has looked into resources and at the last board meeting it was decided that it had the potential to fund part of this process. We could therefore give some consideration to having a half time evidence evaluation expert (triple E) from the AHA and maybe something similar from ERC so the people could work together. They would work with the worksheet experts. Bob H asked if this role was to reconstruct the current worksheets or was the role to replace the reviewers of the worksheets. We need to have a transparent process so that we can work more efficiently and effectively. We cannot rely on the worksheet people to do all the work. Bob H pointed out he would not be happy having someone else doing his literature review.

Dave Rogers believed that with an improved filter mechanism the worksheet people would be able to do their job well and by the time Peter received the worksheets they would be completed to a high standard.

Bob O'Connor agreed the structure of the worksheet was not particularly efficient - the questions need to be less cumbersome. The person in the new role should look at gathering the evidence, and considering the infrastructure and method which may not even involve the worksheets initially. Judith agreed it is difficult to hand over literature research to another person. Cochrane can do the research, but it is a complex system. However, it does capture as much of the literature as possible. This does save time for those who do not know how to do a search.

Bob H and Mike B asked if anyone was interested in this position to please let them know. Leo asked if this will be an ILCOR process. Bill confirmed it will be an ILCOR process but it will be an AHA paid ½ time position with the individual reporting to the AHA senior science manager. Bob H indicated that any recommendations made would be referred back to ILCOR. This was a group established to get the process started but it will probably be disestablished as things progressed. Ian raised the issue of having just one Evidence Evaluation Expert. What would happen if that one person fell by the wayside? We need to have something in place to ensure that the process continues. This role needs to be someone who can commit at least half time, not a person who is already committed in another position.

Bob H suggested that this person could be in charge of making the worksheets more user friendly, involving the appropriate people to make the amendments. The worksheet would then come back to ILCOR. Peter M agreed with all the discussions. The individual would do the ground work but would not take responsibility for the decision making. Tony asked whether this process was heading towards a CoSTR document or towards international guidelines. Tony did not believe it was possible to produce international guidelines, based mainly on experience from 2005.

Mary Fran thought this would generate a lot of discussion and may take a while to sort out. The reason we need a ½ time person instead of two ¼ time positions is that the ¼ people would not be relieved of their current position, this work would just be added to their current role and the employer might take the money. Jack agreed it is very complex. Do we write the job description, circulate it and give serious consideration as to who could take on the role. Bill confirmed a job description was already available. The selection committee should come from ILCOR. Jack asked whether the role required an experienced health professional or a good staff person who can put the nuts and bolts together. Bill suggested this would be identified in the job description. Vinay suggested the selection committee should be the executive including both Co-Chairs, and they should make the decision.

Jerry N asked about the timeline re the decision on whether ILCOR produces an international guideline or a CoSTR document. If the process is to start now, we need to know what the end product is to be. Walter suggested that as all the guidelines are similar this time round we should be able to produce international guidelines. Charles did not agree with Walter. Whilst on the face of it things may seem similar they are not. Tony agreed that there are significant differences between the guidelines. To turn science into guidelines it needs a lot of additional work and should be done by the councils.

Mary Fran suggested that as this discussion may take a while we should finish the agenda items and return to this topic for further discussion later. Bill pointed out the decision could be made via a telephone conference. Leo reminded the group that the science has to be done first. We should aim to make this decision at the next ILCOR meeting. Sam Richmond suggested that we can agree on the science but what it means in terms of the treatment recommendations has to be discussed.

Peter reminded the meeting that for some councils, their only revenue is from the guidelines they develop and this would have a significant effect on them. ARC for example would fold if this happened. There will still need to be local translations. Mary Fran said that there are things that can be done together and we did end up with commonalities and it helped to have input from a wide group of people. There are benefits from getting together and discussing how to implement the science and not all doing the same things.

Bob H pointed out that some of the differences happened after the document had been finished in New Jersey. Bob H believed we should attempt to be as close as possible to international guidelines. The reason there are differences is they are based on evidence but this was not thought through well enough. If we can't reach a consensus we must pull back and accept that there will be differences.

Jerry N pointed out that we have very few differences so therefore maybe we did achieve the best product possible. Maybe there needs to be more collaboration. Vinay said we achieved consensus but we did not always have enough data and we did not look at the implications this would have when we came to developing the guidelines

### **Reference Management Software Programmes: Tanya Semenko**

Tanya gave a presentation re the reference management Software programme and whether we need something new. Endnote 7 is not big enough as we have more than 16,000 references in the library. Endnote 7 had to be broken down into 3 libraries. Tanya outlined the problems we had last time round. Tanya discussed the options available to ILCOR for the future. There was considerable discussion regarding this.

Tanya thought that if we have time to wait we should do so and go with the new Endnote on line product. However, if the decision has to be made now we should go with Reference Works as it is quite flexible. But, you do have to be online to work with Reference Works and this would be a challenging. However, Ref Works would be quite good for the worksheet authors. It is important that Tanya is able to protect our current database. Documents created using Endnote 7 can be read in Endnote 9. Jenny Dennett commented that, as a worksheet author, receiving Endnote was a huge advantage and a reward for participating.

The decision was made to wait. Mike B said there is a budget issue but we need to make sure we are doing the right thing. When the new Endnote product comes out on line we test it and then see what happens. Mary Fran suggested we thank Tanya for all her work. Tanya said they are happy to work with us and produce a product that meets our needs. Perhaps AHA should indicate to the Endnote people that ILCOR is waiting to use the new product and encourage them to meet our needs. Jerry N and Bill will write a letter on behalf of ILCOR.

Jerry N pointed out we are not going to complete the agenda so we will ask Walter to talk about the next meeting

### **ILCOR Meeting South Africa 2007**

Walter gave a short presentation on the venue for the next ILCOR meeting this will be held in South Africa at Sun City Resort and Convention Centre March 11-13<sup>th</sup> March 2007.

There were several questions for Walter relating to costs for accommodation and travel to Sun City.

Bob H moved that the next ILCOR meeting be held in South Africa 11-13<sup>th</sup> March

Seconded Ian Jacobs

Vote unanimous.

The South African meeting will be a 2 day meeting. Vinay asked if the task force chairs were going to carry on with their role through to the next meeting. There may need to be a change in leadership bringing in new members etc. Mary Fran said for now that the task force chairs should continue their responsibilities so long as there is an understanding that this may not continue but keeps things moving in the meantime.

### **ERC Conference Planning 2008**

Leo asked whether the ERC conference in Gent could be useful as part of the planning process towards 2010 as happened in Budapest in 2004. Bob H suggested we need to define things a bit more. Should we have an intermediate step? We currently have the standing task forces and the current chairs will be asked to continue in the meantime. Walter suggested the Paediatric task force has neonates as a sub group, BLS has interdisciplinary, and ALS has ACS as a sub group. It may make the system easier.

Judith felt this could work as there was a lot of overlap particularly with group functioned well on its own. Mike B asked if there would be any advantage in having education as a separate task force. Peter M pointed out that was a very important decision and should not be made in a hurry. Ian suggested that current task force chairs prepare a one page document on where they would like to see things go in 2010 because the decision needs to be made soon. Mary Fran asked what to do with defibrillation? Where does it sit? Jack felt that as the improvements are refined we will deal with overlaps etc. Jerry will discuss with Bill and talk to the task force chairs and circulate the decision.

David felt the task forces need to be in place by 2006.

There being no other business the meeting closed at 4pm.

PAGE

PAGE 2