

Engagement Report for Clinical Commissioning Policies

Unique Reference Number	1873
Policy Title	Clinical Commissioning Policy Statement Proton Beam Therapy for Head & Neck Cancer in Adults
Lead Commissioner	██████████
Clinical Reference Group	Radiotherapy
Which stakeholders were contacted to be involved in policy development?	<p>A policy working group was established in line with NHS England's standard methods.</p> <p>The draft policy proposition was sent to the following groups for comment:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Registered stakeholders for the Radiotherapy Clinical Reference Group (CRG); and • Members of Radiotherapy CRG.
Identify the relevant Royal College or Professional Society to the policy and indicate how they have been involved	<p>The relevant Royal Colleges or Professional Societies are part of the Radiotherapy CRG or registered stakeholders, and include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Royal College of Physicians; and • Royal College of Radiologists. <p>Named representatives for each of these organisations were sent copies of the draft policy proposition and invited to provide comment.</p>
Which stakeholders have actually been involved?	<p>A response was received from the Royal College of Radiologists. Seven additional responses were received from stakeholders including the British Association of Head & Neck Oncologists (BAHNO).</p>

<p>Explain reason if there is any difference from previous question</p>	<p>Not applicable.</p>
<p>Identify any particular stakeholder organisations that may be key to the policy development that you have approached that have yet to be engaged. Indicate why?</p>	<p>None identified.</p>
<p>How have stakeholders been involved? What engagement methods have been used?</p>	<p>The draft commissioning policy statement was distributed to stakeholders via email for a period of two weeks of stakeholder testing, in preparation for public consultation.</p> <p>Stakeholders were asked to submit their responses via email, using a standard response and in line with NHS England's standard processes for developing clinical commissioning policies.</p> <p>Stakeholder testing asked the following questions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Do you have any further comments on the proposed changes to the document? • If Yes, please describe below, in no more than 500 words, any further comments on the proposed changes to the document as part of this initial 'sense check'. • Please declare any conflict of interests relating to this document or service area.
<p>What has happened or changed as a result of their input?</p>	<p>No changes have been made to the policy statement as a result of stakeholder testing.</p> <p>There were eight responses in total to stakeholder testing of which seven respondents actively supported the policy statement. The remaining respondent felt that although the evidence presented was weak and there needed to be further research into the use of PBT for this indication.</p>

	<p>Further research into the use of PBT in this indication was also referenced by five further respondents. The policy working group (PWG) are aware of the limited evidence base for use of PBT in this indication and would support further research taking place. The PWG are anticipating that following approval of a not for routine commissioning policy, proposals for evaluative commissioning will be developed.</p>
<p>How are stakeholders being kept informed of progress with policy development as a result of their input?</p>	<p>All stakeholders (including CRG members and registered stakeholders) will be notified when the final policy statement is published.</p>
<p>What level of wider public consultation is recommended by the CRG for the NPOC Board to agree as a result of stakeholder involvement?</p>	<p>Not applicable.</p>