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Dr Peter Wilson  NHSE Women & Childrens’ Programme of Care Co-Chair
Dr Peter-Marc Fortune  President, Paediatric Intensive Care Society (PICS)
Professor Liz Draper  Principal Investigator, Paediatric Intensive Care Audit Network (PICANet)
Louise Shepherd  Chair, Children’s Hospital Alliance
Fiona Lynch  Nursing Consultant, Evelina Children’s Hospital
Dr Liam Brennan  Vice-Chair, Academy of Medical Royal Colleges (AoMRC)
Dr Mike Linney  Wessex Regional Representative, Royal College of Paediatrics and Child Health (RCPCH)
Miss Carin Van Doorn  Chair of Congenital Committee, Society for Cardiothoracic Surgery in Great Britain and Ireland
Darren Banks  Director of Strategic Development, Central Manchester University Hospitals [deputising for Sir Mike Deegan]
Mr Richard Stewart  Chair of Children’s Surgical Forum, Royal College of Surgeons
Eithne Polke  Chair, Paediatric Intensive Care Society: Acute Transport Group
Dr Mark Davidson  Consultant Paediatric Intensivist, Royal Hospital for Sick Children, Glasgow

**Apologies:**
Dr Jacqueline Cornish  NHSE National Clinical Director for CYP and Transition, NHS England
Sir Mike Deegan  Chief Executive, Central Manchester University Hospitals NHSFT [ deputy, Darren Banks]
Professor Andrew Wolf  President, Association of Paediatric Anaesthetists of Great Britain and Ireland/Royal College of Anaesthetists
Mr Oliver Gee  NHSE CRG Chair for Specialised Surgery in Children

**In attendance from NHS England:**
Rob Konstant-Hambling  Head of Intelligence, Specialised Services
John Stewart  SRO for Paediatric Intensive Care & Specialised Surgery Review
Dr Miriam Fine-Goulden  Clinical Fellow, Specialised Commissioning
Rachel Lundy  Lead Commissioner for Paediatric Intensive Care, Review team
Linda Doherty  Lead Commissioner for Paediatric Specialised Surgery, Review team
Sophie Solti  Paediatric Intensive Care & Specialised Surgery Review Team
Lil Stephenson  Project Director, Paediatric Intensive Care & Specialised Surgery Review
Jo Stringer (by teleconference)  Senior Communications Manager Specialised Commissioning
**Welcome, introductions and apologies**

1. Members were welcomed to the first meeting of the expert stakeholder panel for the Review of Paediatric Critical Care (PCC) and Specialised Surgery in Children, and thanked in advance for their input to the review process.

   Apologies had been received from Dr Jacqueline Cornish, Sir Mike Deegan, Professor Andrew Wolf and Mr Oli Gee.

**Terms of Reference**

2. The group noted Paper 1 – Terms of Reference (ToR) for the Review which already been published. Panel members agreed to send any further comments on the group terms of reference (paper 2) to the Review team via email and felt it was important to be kept informed of the views of other members.

The following points were made during the discussion:

- Clear and consistent definitions of paediatric critical care and specialised surgery in children needed to be used throughout to ensure the scope of the review was clear.

- The intention to work with providers around potential solutions needed to be referenced.

- The overall aim that the panel's work should contribute to excellent patient care should be referenced more explicitly.

- The panel was reminded that the role of the group was to assist NHS England in devising a delivery plan for sustainable, high quality paediatric critical care and specialised surgical services, as opposed to recommendations as to how this could be achieved.

- It would be important to ensure the right stakeholders and wider clinical community had the opportunity to contribute to the Review. Further work-streams to consider issues in greater detail would be set up, and the review team planned to proactively engage experts, stakeholders, patients and user groups going forward. Further consideration would be given to surgical representation on the group.

- Many services were interdependent with paediatric intensive care (PIC). The panel acknowledged the need for this review to remain tightly focussed on paediatric critical care, extracorporeal membrane oxygenation (ECMO), and transport for children requiring critical care and specialised surgery.

A final version of the ToR would be circulated including these comments.
### Actions:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Person Responsible</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>All panel members</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Review Team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Review Team</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Any additional comments from panel members to be sent to the paedsreview inbox ([england.paedsreview@nhs.net](mailto:england.paedsreview@nhs.net))
- Review team to make amendments to Paper 2 as outlined above.
- Review team to consider surgical representation on group.

### Issues to address in the Review

3

The chair initiated discussion by updating the panel on the key issues identified by NHS England to date as drivers for the review as outlined in paper three. Panel members were asked for their views on these, and were in agreement that the paper accurately described the range of issues facing paediatric critical care and surgical services.

The panel was updated on initial analysis undertaken on PIC and specialised surgical services. For the initial analysis, PICAnet, Secondary Use of Service (SUS) and Hospital Episode Statistics (HES) data had been used.

The following points were made during the presentation:

- Admissions trends for paediatric intensive care units (PICUs) showed that more than half of admissions fell within the category of unplanned non-surgical. The largest proportion of planned admissions was cardiovascular after surgery and the largest proportion of unplanned admissions was respiratory.

- Seasonal variation demonstrated a decrease in PIC admissions in August. Planned post-surgery admissions were stable all year and it was thought that a decrease in respiratory disease in August may explain this trend.

- The changing nature of the population admitted to PICUs was discussed.

- The number of admissions in under 19s for paediatric surgery was increasing each year. Growth within specialised paediatric surgical providers was particularly increasing

The following points were made in discussion:

- For future PIC analysis it would be helpful to depict units in similar geographical area separately.

- It would be helpful to consider how any changes to services that may arise as result of the Review would be evaluated. NHS England had begun some early work on evaluating major programmes that may be relevant.
The workforce aspect of the review was discussed and the need to consider two distinct elements: optimising use of the existing workforce, and ensuring that the future workforce was both sufficient in numbers and adequately trained for the roles required.

Transition from paediatric to both adult and neonatal care was a particular issue that may warrant investigation. Panel members also noted the current lack of consistency around the age that individuals transitioned from paediatric to adult care: 16, 18 or 19 were commonly used.

The need to understand the impact of neonatal care and neonatal surgical activity on paediatric critical care and specialised surgery in children was discussed. Outputs of this Review and the Neonatal Care Review would be shared to ensure alignment.

Action:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Person Responsible</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Review Team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review Team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review Team</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Review Team to share the draft data slides with panel members following the meeting.
- Review team to separate out the PIC units in future analysis.
- Review team to consider role of NHS England’s work in evaluating major programmes to this review.

Aims and principles for future services

It was explained that service reviews undertaken by NHS England aimed to contribute to the three ambitions of the five year forward view: (i) improving population health; (ii) improving quality of care; and (iii) improving value for money. This review would particularly address the need to ensure that services were sustainable in the future.

The panel agreed with high level principles discussed and felt that the scoping of work-streams would help to add the next level of detail. The four proposed work-streams were: ECMO, transport, models of care including interdependencies and workforce.

The panel also discussed:

- The need to link in with other major initiatives such as the Sustainability Transformation Plan (STP) process.
- The need to be informed of progressing thinking and comments from other panel members. The Review Team agreed to circulate a summary of and comments received back to the wider panel periodically.
### Action:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Person Responsible</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• The Review team to provide summary updates on comments sent through from the panel.</td>
<td>Review Team</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Next steps and close
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The chair provided an update on the next steps for the Review. The Review team would contact panel members regarding work-streams following the meeting.

- The panel noted the importance of having clear and consistent communications and messaging regarding the Review. The NHS England communications could advise on messaging as the need arose.

- The Review was focussed on England only, however the Review team would investigate how best to keep devolved nations informed of its development.

- The importance of providing engagement opportunities was discussed. Initial webinars with distinct audiences were planned on 5th January 2017 as an offer of early engagement with further opportunities to follow. The panel agreed to cascade webinar details through their networks to ensure maximum participation.

### Action:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Person Responsible</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Review team to contact panel members regarding establishment of work-streams.</td>
<td>Review Team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Panel members to coordinate communications through the NHS England communications team to ensure consistent messaging.</td>
<td>All Panel Members</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Review team to consider how best to keep devolved nations informed of developments arising from the Review.</td>
<td>Review Team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Panel members to cascade webinar registration details for 5 January through their networks.</td>
<td>All Panel Members</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>