

PAEDIATRIC CRITICAL CARE AND SPECIALISED SURGERY IN CHILDREN REVIEW

Expert Stakeholder Panel Meeting

Thursday 6 July 2017, 13:00 - 15:00

Park Plaza London Riverbank

Minutes

Present:

Dr Peter Wilson – Chair	NHS England Women and Children's Programme of Care Co-Chair
Mr Oliver Gee	Chair, Specialised Surgery in Children CRG, NHS England
Dr Peter-Marc Fortune	President, Paediatric Intensive Care Society
Professor Liz Draper	Principal Investigator, Paediatric Intensive Care Audit Network
Fiona Lynch	Nursing Consultant, Evelina Children's Hospital
Professor Neil Marlow	Chair, Neonatal Critical Care CRG, NHS England
Mr Richard Stewart	Chair, Children's Surgical Forum, Royal College of Surgeons
Mrunal Sisodia	National Network of Parent Carer Forums
Dr Mark Davidson	Chair, Paediatric Intensive Care Society ECMO Group
Professor Andrew Wolf	Immediate past president, Association of Paediatric Anaesthetists
Professor Mark Davenport	President, British Association of Paediatric Surgeons
Darren Banks (by phone)	Director of Strategy, Central Manchester University Hospitals NHSFT and Shelford Group
Ian Barrington	Divisional Director, Bristol Children's Hospital
Apologies:	
Dr Liam Brennan	Vice-Chair, Academy of Medical Royal Colleges
Dr Gale Pearson	Chair, Paediatric Intensive Care CRG, NHS England
Professor Huon Gray	National Clinical Director for Heart Disease, NHS England
Louise Shepherd	Chair, Children's Hospital Alliance
Eithne Polke	Chair, Paediatric Intensive Care Society: Acute Transport Group
Dr Mike Linney	Royal College of Paediatrics and Child Health (RCPCH)
Miss Carin Van Doorn	Chair, Congenital Committee, Society for Cardiothoracic Surgery
Dr Jacqueline Cornish	National Clinical Director for CYP and Transition, NHS England
Robert Munday Crates	Patient and public voice (parent)
Professor Nick Harding	Chair, Place Based Commissioning Oversight Group, NHS England

In attendance from NHS England:



Laura Norris	Review Team
Dr Miriam Fine-Goulden	Clinical Fellow, Specialised Commissioning
Rachel Lundy	Lead Commissioner for Paediatric Intensive Care
Linda Doherty	Lead Commissioner for Paediatric Specialised Surgery
Martha Colman	Review Team
Barry Thomas	Senior Informatics Manager, Specialised Services, NHS England
Priya Oomahdat	Review Team
Anthony Prudhoe	Women and Children's Specialised Services, NHS England
Anna Eccleston	Women and Children's Programme of Care Manager, NHS England

Discussion

The meeting did not form any conclusions, nor does it pre-empt the content of any consultation that may be undertaken as part of the review of paediatric critical care and specialised surgery in children.

Welcome,	introductions and apologies		
1	Members were welcomed to the fifth meeting of the Expert Stakeholder Panel (the panel") for the national review of paediatric critical care (PCC) and specialised surgery in children (the 'review').		
	John Stewart was unavailable for the meeting so Peter Wilson explained that he would be chairing in his absence.		
	Mrunal Sisodia from the National Network of Parent Carer Forums has joined the panel since the last meeting and was welcomed to the panel.		
	Apologies were received from Huon Gray, Louise Shepard, Liam Brennan, Gale Pearson, Robert Munday-Crates, Carin van Doorn, Mike Linney, Nick Harding and Jackie Cornish.		
Minutes fr	om previous meeting and update on actions under	way	
2	Minutes from the fourth panel meeting on 2 May 2017 were agreed, with the exception of an update to ensure consistency in panel members' titles.		
It was confirmed that the panel minutes would be placed on the NHS England website, in the interests of transparency.			
Actions:		Person Responsible	
 Request that NHS England communications team place Expert Stakeholder Panel Meeting Minutes on the NHS England website 		Review team	
Update on the proposals for congenital heart disease surgery for children in England(CHD)			



3	Proposals for congenital heart disease (CHD) are currently out for consultation. Laura Norris updated the panel on the current positon. Panel members were asked to complete conflict of interest and confidentiality forms (papers three and four) and return to the review team. It was noted that, should the CHD proposals be implemented, the paediatric critical care review would need to take into account the fact that the proposed requirements of the CHD review would be staged		
Actions:	across a number of years.	Person Responsible	
	•	Panel members	
Specialise	d surgery in children: update on activity, and discu	ission on	
		analysis had is defined within accurate. ce areas, there is within specialist cussion the tworked model of ued, but it is clear e services should elp ensure better or the review. work on updating ership with a nore difficult to complex care it will need the stand the new s once the new ous definition of by the panel. sed surgery in e or those with anowledge the are delays in	



 Review and agree definition of specialised surgery in children. Undertake work to rationalise specialised surgery procedure codes. Propose methodology for panel engagement in work to code children with more complex care needs. Service interdependencies Anthony Prudhoe presented some early thoughts about how the review could approach the issue of interdependencies between PCC, specialised surgery in children, and other services. He asked the panel to consider whether it would be possible to consider service interdependencies within the context of a managed system of care. In discussion the following points were made: It will be important for the review to consider the relevant service interdependencies, with the aim of giving patients and the public confidence in the care they are receiving. The solution should be about patient centred care. There may be a difference between a theoretical solution, and a solution that works in practice. The review may wish to propose a staged approach to achieving an 'ideal' scenario in future years, and take a pragmatic approach in the meantime. The review's work on interdependencies may wish to differentiate between directions of interdependency, i.e. where one service is reliant on another but not vice versa. Consideration should be given to how the impact of interdependencies will be evaluated. The review will set up a group to look specifically at interdependences in patnership with the Programme of Care and bringing in expertise from panel members. Actions: Set up group to work on interdependencies. Review team The next panel meeting is on 13 September 2017. Panel members are encouraged to send any comments on all papers presented by correspondence in the meantime. The next models of care workstream meeting is on 26 July 2017. This will include discussion of a range of	Actions:		Person Responsible
procedure codes. Review team • Propose methodology for panel engagement in work to code children with more complex care needs. Review team Service interdependencies Anthony Prudhoe presented some early thoughts about how the review could approach the issue of interdependencies between PCC, specialised surgery in children, and other services. He asked the panel to consider whether it would be possible to consider service interdependencies within the context of a managed system of care. In discussion the following points were made: • It will be important for the review to consider the relevant service interdependencies, with the aim of giving patients and the public confidence in the care they are receiving. The solution should be about patient centred care. • There may be a difference between a theoretical solution, and a solution that works in practice. The review may wish to propose a staged approach to achieving an 'ideal' scenario in future years, and take a pragmatic approach in the meantime. • The review's work on interdependencies may wish to differentiate between dependency and co-location, and be clear about any required colocation of services. • An ideal service framework could also differentiate between directions of interdependency, i.e. where one service is reliant on another but not vice versa. • Consideration should be given to how the impact of interdependencies will be evaluated. The review will set up a group to look specifically at interdependences in partnership with the Programme of Care and bringing in expertise from panel members. Actions: Review team Next steps and			-
 Propose methodology for panel engagement in work to code children with more complex care needs. Service interdependencies Anthony Prudhoe presented some early thoughts about how the review could approach the issue of interdependencies between PCC, specialised surgery in children, and other services. He asked the panel to consider whether it would be possible to consider service interdependencies within the context of a managed system of care. In discussion the following points were made: It will be important for the review to consider the relevant service interdependencies, with the aim of giving patients and the public confidence in the care they are receiving. The solution should be about patient centred care. There may be a difference between a theoretical solution, and a solution that works in practice. The review may wish to propose a staged approach to achieving an 'ideal' scenario in future years, and take a pragmatic approach in the meantime. The review's work on interdependencies may wish to differentiate between dependency and co-location, and be clear about any required colocation of services. An ideal service framework could also differentiate between directions of interdependency, i.e. where one service is reliant on another but not vice versa. Consideration should be given to how the impact of interdependencies will be evaluated. The review will set up a group to look specifically at interdependences ir partnership with the Programme of Care and bringing in expertise from panel members. Actions: Person Responsible Set up group to work on interdependencies. Review team 			Review team
code children with more complex care needs. Service interdependencies 5 Anthony Prudhoe presented some early thoughts about how the review could approach the issue of interdependencies between PCC, specialised surgery in children, and other services. He asked the panel to consider whether it would be possible to consider service interdependencies within the context of a managed system of care. In discussion the following points were made: • It will be important for the review to consider the relevant service interdependencies, with the aim of giving patients and the public confidence in the care they are receiving. The solution should be about patient centred care. • There may be a difference between a theoretical solution, and a solution that works in practice. The review may wish to propose a staged approach to achieving an 'ideal' scenario in future years, and take a pragmatic approach in the meantime. • The review's work on interdependencies may wish to differentiate between dependency and co-location, and be clear about any required colocation of services. • An ideal service framework could also differentiate between directions of interdependency, i.e. where one service is reliant on another but not vice versa. • Consideration should be given to how the impact of interdependencies will be evaluated. The review will set up a group to look specifically at interdependences in partnership with the Programme of Care and bringing in expertise from panel members. Actions: Person Responsible • Set up group to work on interdependenci	Pron	ose methodology for panel engagement in work to	Review team
5 Anthony Prudhoe presented some early thoughts about how the review could approach the issue of interdependencies between PCC, specialised surgery in children, and other services. He asked the panel to consider whether it would be possible to consider service interdependencies within the context of a managed system of care. In discussion the following points were made: It will be important for the review to consider the relevant service interdependencies, with the aim of giving patients and the public confidence in the care they are receiving. The solution should be about patient centred care. There may be a difference between a theoretical solution, and a solution that works in practice. The review may wish to propose a staged approach to achieving an 'ideal' scenario in future years, and take a pragmatic approach in the meantime. The review's work on interdependencies may wish to differentiate between dependency and co-location, and be clear about any required colocation of services. An ideal service framework could also differentiate between directions of interdependency, i.e. where one service is reliant on another but not vice versa. Consideration should be given to how the impact of interdependencies will be evaluated. The review will set up a group to look specifically at interdependences ir partnership with the Programme of Care and bringing in expertise from panel members. Actions: Person Responsible Set up group to work on interdependencies. Review team Next steps and close An update was provided on the next steps for the review. The next models of care workstream meeting is on 26 July 2017. Panel members are encouraged to send any comments on all papers presented by correspondence in the m			
could approach the issue of interdependencies between PCC, specialised surgery in children, and other services. He asked the panel to consider whether it would be possible to consider service interdependencies within the context of a managed system of care. In discussion the following points were made: • It will be important for the review to consider the relevant service interdependencies, with the aim of giving patients and the public confidence in the care they are receiving. The solution should be about patient centred care. • There may be a difference between a theoretical solution, and a solution that works in practice. The review may wish to propose a staged approach to achieving an 'ideal' scenario in future years, and take a pragmatic approach in the meantime. • The review's work on interdependencies may wish to differentiate between dependency and co-location, and be clear about any required colocation of services. • An ideal service framework could also differentiate between directions of interdependency, i.e. where one service is reliant on another but not vice versa. • Consideration should be given to how the impact of interdependencies will be evaluated. The review will set up a group to look specifically at interdependences in partnership with the Programme of Care and bringing in expertise from panel members. Actions: Person Responsible • Set up group to work on interdependencies. Review team Next steps and close 6 6 An update was provided on the next steps for the review. • The next panel meeting is on 13 September 2017.	Service int	erdependencies	
partnership with the Programme of Care and bringing in expertise from panel members. Actions: Person Responsible • Set up group to work on interdependencies. Review team Next steps and close Review team 6 An update was provided on the next steps for the review. • The next panel meeting is on 13 September 2017. • Panel members are encouraged to send any comments on all papers presented by correspondence in the meantime. • The next models of care workstream meeting is on 26 July 2017. This will include discussion of a range of sub-projects within PCC	 Service interdependencies Anthony Prudhoe presented some early thoughts about how the review could approach the issue of interdependencies between PCC, specialised surgery in children, and other services. He asked the panel to consider whether it would be possible to consider service interdependencies within the context of a managed system of care. In discussion the following points were made: It will be important for the review to consider the relevant service interdependencies, with the aim of giving patients and the public confidence in the care they are receiving. The solution should be about patient centred care. There may be a difference between a theoretical solution, and a solution that works in practice. The review may wish to propose a staged approach to achieving an 'ideal' scenario in future years, and take a pragmatic approach in the meantime. The review's work on interdependencies may wish to differentiate between dependency and co-location, and be clear about any required colocation of services. An ideal service framework could also differentiate between directions of interdependency, i.e. where one service is reliant on another but not vice versa. 		een PCC, e asked the panel service ystem of care. In he relevant service ents and the public e solution should be cal solution, and a hy wish to propose a rio in future years, he. wish to differentiate clear about any tiate between service is reliant on
Actions: Responsible • Set up group to work on interdependencies. Review team Next steps and close Review team 6 An update was provided on the next steps for the review. • The next panel meeting is on 13 September 2017. • Panel members are encouraged to send any comments on all papers presented by correspondence in the meantime. • The next models of care workstream meeting is on 26 July 2017. This will include discussion of a range of sub-projects within PCC			
Next steps and close 6 An update was provided on the next steps for the review. • The next panel meeting is on 13 September 2017. • Panel members are encouraged to send any comments on all papers presented by correspondence in the meantime. • The next models of care workstream meeting is on 26 July 2017. This will include discussion of a range of sub-projects within PCC	Actions:		
 An update was provided on the next steps for the review. The next panel meeting is on 13 September 2017. Panel members are encouraged to send any comments on all papers presented by correspondence in the meantime. The next models of care workstream meeting is on 26 July 2017. This will include discussion of a range of sub-projects within PCC 	Set up group to work on interdependencies.		Review team
 The next panel meeting is on 13 September 2017. Panel members are encouraged to send any comments on all papers presented by correspondence in the meantime. The next models of care workstream meeting is on 26 July 2017. This will include discussion of a range of sub-projects within PCC 			
 The next panel meeting is on 13 September 2017. Panel members are encouraged to send any comments on all 			



	5
Action	Person Responsible
Send comments on papers by correspondence.	Panel members