

Please comment on the pre-meeting information you received (publicity, application process, directions to venue etc.)

- All very efficient and informative
- Need a bigger venue to allow any who want to come to attend
- Good advance warning, central choice of venue, good directions.
- Good
- Good
- Excellent and timely
- The information was perfectly adequate, applying was straightforward, and getting to the venue was greatly facilitated by the directions and maps provided.
- Good
- All fine. Very easy to find and park.
- Fine Thanks
- Excellent.
- Excellent. No problems at all
- Clear and accurate
- For some reason we did not receive an invitation until after the newsletter was published and circulated and, as a result, were only able to send one delegate. The directions were extremely clear, the venue was easy to find and travel was easy, taking 2.5 hours on the train.
- Clear and adequate
- The information was fine – easy to follow.
- Very good
- Excellent. However, difficult to find a bus from New Street to the venue so hence got a taxi.
- Good – could we get the slide presentations mailed to us?
- Satisfactory thanks for squeezing me in at the last minute!
- The venue was very easy to find and the information was adequate
- I was standing in for someone else, hence received all the information just prior to the meeting
- Good but not enough time to read the manual
- I received the flyer with the address and a map, as well as the schedule on it but didn't receive a hard copy of the annual report prior to the meeting.
- All satisfactory
- Information was sent in good time. I did not handle my application but that clearly went well and directions to the venue I found to be excellent.
- Good

Did you have any specific expectations for the day? If so were these met?

- Sharing of information - yes
- Yes
- No
- No comment
- Yes
- As a commissioner to understand how PICANet could support long term planning of services, with relevant information. To understand moving forward how this data will map with the National Minimum dataset.
- As a fairly new data clerk, I was hoping to gain a better understanding of PICANet's role and the implications of the report, and I did get a good insight into this. The day was also a good opportunity to meet other people doing a similar job to me with whom it would be difficult to make links otherwise.
- None
- Wanted clear explanations and exchange of views and these were achieved
- No
- To have data reviewed with other stakeholders. To see how data was being used. To meet up with others interested in PICU data analysis. All met in full
- Chance to meet others involved in PICANET, and to hear what developments are planned.
- Expectations met
- I had hoped for more on PIM2, and more about the SQPR sequential probability modelling which still doesn't seem to have been implemented...or am I missing something?
- As relatively new to the PICANet circuit, I hoped to be able to exchange news and views with other ICUs. My colleague was able to fill me in on details of 'who works where' on the way home but it would have been helpful to me [as I do not know all persons in the room] if people could have identified themselves by Unit of origin when speaking or being addressed – it is evident and laudable that everybody in the network knows one another but this is not very helpful to those new to the group. I hoped to be able to gauge national response to the report as well as our local response, and was pleased to gain an insight into the value with which this report was received, and also the appreciation of the hard work that goes on locally in order to gain such complete and consistent results. I felt that more clarification was required for Figures 5.2.1 and 5.2.2 in that these are comparisons of values only where there was a discrepancy – and a discussion of the reasons underlying these differences [My colleague tells me that it is likely that these are discrepancies between data collected whilst retrieving a patient compared to the values during the first hour after admission to a Unit]. Figures 5.3.1 and 5.3.2 show data completeness for NHS number and 30-day post ICU follow-up – more emphasis could have been placed on the fact that Units are permitted to choose the level to which they follow up these data items. As a neophyte in terms of analysing statistical tables, a little background explanation on how to read funnel plots for section 10 of the report would have been useful
- Yes
- Discussions surrounding the findings from the last year and how to improve the data – all of which was covered.
- Well met
- A very good meeting, as usual
- General awareness, & application of data collected to specific projects – both met
- Better than expected!
- This was the first meeting that I had attended and I found it very informative and useful
- Wanted to hear about the PICANet report – and that was well presented
- No I had not been before
- I didn't have any specific expectations as this was the first annual meeting that I have attended.
- No
- Not really – but felt the day went well.
- I wanted to hear about the work of PICANet and any related audit/research. Meeting met these needs

Please make any comments you may have on the structure of the day.

- Excellent
- Very good – nice balance of report vs what else is going on
- Much improved structure with more clinical based pm sessions. Best meeting so far.
- Structure of the meeting was well planned and well delivered.
- It was fine
- Good mix of sharing the highlights of the report and presentations from clinical colleagues who have used the data.
- The day was well structured, the start and finish times made travelling unproblematic and it seemed that there was adequate provision for debate around the presentations.
- No comment. It was well planned.
- I thought the afternoon presentations were particularly useful in demonstrating the relevance of the data
- The structure was O.K. A good starting time to enable travel at a reasonable time while still providing a variety of brief presentations. Will the presentations be available?
- No comments or suggestions – good timetable, kept too well.
- It was very good - no problems. I appreciated the 11 am start
- Fine. Perhaps coffee at the end of lunch would be a good idea (zzzzzz).
- Fractionally more emphasis on the results of the report, and less on the ways in which the data from the report are being used for research and for strategic planning.
- Afternoon presentations should have been more tightly chair, 2 of the Drs went on for too long!
- I think the structure is reasonable – going through the report and then presenting interesting projects related to PICANet, although this can lead to people deserting the later afternoon sessions.
- Excellent, interesting, stimulating
- Perfect!
- Good – could have started earlier/finished earlier
- It was nice to see so many consultants presenting in the afternoon.
- None
- Good structure, no changes. Afternoon for clinical sessions.
- Well structured.
- The day was structured well with start times allowing for travelling
- No comment
- I found the structure of the day o.k.
- Would have been better to start earlier and have more time for the presentations re audit and research projects linked to PICANet

How relevant / interesting did you find the different sessions?

Pre lunch session – presentations by PICANet team members.

- Excellent
- Very relevant in stimulating discussion
- All appropriate and succinct. Good synopsis of the whole data set.
- All sessions were of interest and generated good discussions
- Good
- Relevant and interesting
- This greatly clarified the contents of the report.
- Registration and coffee/tea was useful, it allows different teams and colleagues interactive of past and present developments etc.
- Presentation by pica net team was good.
- Interesting but perhaps too much emphasis on background. A clinical view of the data and a commissioners view might have contributed considerable interest
- Useful
- Data validity felt superfluous, because we assume it is, perhaps not rightly. rest of discussion relevant and good
- Very
- Good
- See previous comments, good. Some presenters need to improve their presentation skills a little.
- Most useful
- I think the best part was the discussion raised by Roger regarding lengths of stay and levels of care, and how that might be interpreted.
- Relevant and interesting
- Unfortunately I missed this session
- Good/interesting & relevant
- It is always difficult to make this bit interesting but on the whole it was good. Everyone present in a different style. Perhaps it would have been better to use one or two people rather than keep swapping over.
- Good explanation of the process and results
- Interesting
- Good
- These were very interesting as it increased my awareness of the need for accurate information.
- Interesting & Relevant
- It was very useful and informative
- Useful although similar information to previous year

## Post lunch session – presentations

- Excellent
- Fine
- Interesting to see clinical applications; interesting to contribute to thoughts for future applications and gives you heart to see that all the work we do is actually having an impact. This made the meeting for me; with relevant topics presented well.
- Well delivered and of interest
- I missed these
- Very useful particularly the PBR talk and the discussion around the Burns agenda. However limited time for discussion.
- I found the burns and RSV presentations particularly interesting. I had expected as a non-clinician that the afternoon presentations might not be relevant to me, but they gave a good idea of what PICANet can do and where it is going in the future, and I found that insight valuable.
- Good
- A/A. Very interesting
- Very useful. Both content and subject matter were interesting. They demonstrated good use of the data available from PICANET which justifies the effort of data collection and analysis. Also not too long.
- Staffing is not the most exciting thing to look at. Burns and respiratory excellent
- Very
- Good
- Good presentations, on the most part interesting although more from a strategic planning stance
- less useful, as already aware of most of it
- Overall an interesting collection of sessions, dealing with both research and medical politics.
- Relevant and interesting
- Excellent
- Good/interesting & relevant
- Enjoyed these!
- Very good presentations
- Interesting
- Good
- All of the presentations were informative but especially those about the future development of funding. All data collected will have to be more detailed as well as accurate in order to achieve full funding.
- Interesting & Relevant
- It was very useful and informative
- Very useful to understand how PICANet is making links to areas of development. Would have been good to spend more time debating further work for PICANet but was rushed last thing

Please comment on the venue and facilities for the day.

- Very good venue, nice and central, easily accessible. Good air conditioning, would have liked coffee following lunch
- Very convenient for us in Birmingham! Too small a room which limited attendees
- Central location in the UK, excellent room and technical facilities,
- Venue most suitable.
- Easy to get to, pleasant, good to have some meetings out of London
- Fine
- The venue was good – the air conditioning was a particular boon – and the catering was excellent
- Well planned
- Fine, but some healthier food would not have gone amiss! Too much stodge
- Very pleasant facilities, but some people may have missed out on the opportunity to attend as numbers were restricted. I was grateful to PICANet for facilitating an additional attendee from a cancellation.
- Enjoyed the lunch and appreciated the variety of food (as I don't eat bread) and the fruit. Thank you!
- Excellent. would have been nice to have coffee after lunch. coffee is something worth spending cash on - really seems to affect what people think of a session.!
- Excellent
- Fine
- Easy to find, well laid out. Air Con too effective – I was cold during most of the afternoon. Coffee and tea available during / after lunch as well as juice would have been nice.
- Fine, as a caffeine addict could have done with tea or coffee at lunch break!
- Room about the right size, although not much room to have lunch and chat etc. Lunch itself was very good.
- Good – parking easy!
- Excellent
- Easy to get to, but a bit cramped over lunch time.
- Great venue, although the entrance area for registration and lunch was very small for 80+ people. Presentation room was good. Air conditioning was noisy at the back of the room.
- Very good
- Perhaps a larger venue would have been better
- Good
- The venue was adequate although due to the number of delegates the area used during coffee and lunch was rather crowded. The conference room was a good size however due to the air conditioning the room was very cold; this made concentration difficult at times.
- Everything was fine
- Venue and facilities were excellent. Lunch was very good.
- OK. Difficult to get to Birmingham. May be better to have meeting in London as easier to get to.

Please make any suggestions for future PICANet meetings.

- As usual, excellent meeting, gets better every year.
- Keep same format; Perhaps explore future avenues with a little more time – particularly matters concerned with service delivery and configuration
- Similar structure with a clinical and non- clinical split would keep everyone happy.
- Excellent to have commissioners and PCTs represented.
- I think as interest in the annual meetings increases a larger venue would be required
- More of the same
- More Time for questions and discussion required. Clearly think it would be useful to investigate further PIC activity provided in non-PIC centres, so that a complete picture and be gained of critical care activity required for children.
- I would have suggested a scheduled forum for debate, but that fitted naturally into the meeting and would perhaps be unnecessary. I would also suggest a yet more northerly venue, as Birmingham is not significantly closer than London from some parts of the UK, but that is just Northern bias. I am grateful to have been invited to attend and I enjoyed the day.
- None at present
- As mentioned in previous sections
- Similar sessions demonstrating the use of the data – provides an insight to work nationally.
- Keep timing v tight.
- Please continue the same - better than the London venue
- More in the report about differences in regional practice such as neonatal surgery (PICU vs NICU) and adult ICUs holding patients (eg SW Region) which affect regional data significantly.
- None
- None
- I think moving the venue around has got to be encouraged. Why stick at Birmingham? Why not consider a move somewhere else next time? Leeds? Bristol??
- None
- Would be helpful to have someone from DoH to advise about future developments in PICU and PICANET from DoH perspective. Also to discuss future (ie PBR, commissioning etc) and how this may impact on the dataset.
- Would like them in the centre of the country – not London!
- None
- None
- None
- Maybe slightly nearer a mainline train station would be better
- None
- None
- None for now
- Very useful to hear about data available from PICANet and how this is being used to support developments in PIC.

Please indicate in which capacity you attended the meeting eg. clinician, nurse, data collection/entry staff.

- Research Nurse
- Not supplied
- Clinician
- Data collection but also attended for Clinicians
- Clinician
- Specialist Commissioner
- Data collection/entry (Clinical Audit Assistant)
- Data Collection
- Commissioner
- Nurse manager
- Clinician
- Clinician
- PICU consultant clinician and lead audit.
- Line manager to data collection/entry staff, Senior Sister for Research & Audit in 2 adult ICUs and one PICU, and non-PICU ICU nurse.
- Clinician
- Clinician
- Clinician
- Clinician/database manager
- Data analyst
- Nurse
- Nurse
- Clinician
- Clinician
- Nurse
- Clinician
- Data collection/entry staff.
- Commissioner

## Comments

- Thank you all for an excellent meeting
- Really enjoyed this years meeting, seeing the clinical applications and the great potential put another spin on the meeting. Thank for all the hard work
- Look forward to receiving the presentations.
- Would it be possible to have a copy of the two of the presentations. The PBR talk and the Burns talk to share with colleagues.
- Thank you for inviting me.
- Thank you for facilitating my colleague's attendance yesterday and with our taxi on leaving. We both found the day very interesting.
- Thanks for the day
- The meeting was well arranged and constructive. I have no criticisms or ideas for improvement.
- Thank you for a very enjoyable meeting
- Many thanks for squeezing me in at the last minute. I enjoyed the day.
- I found the meeting very helpful and useful. Thank you for a very informative day.