

## Engagement Report for Clinical Commissioning Policies

<b>Unique Reference Number</b>	1691
<b>Policy Title</b>	Temozolomide as adjuvant treatment for people with newly diagnosed anaplastic astrocytoma without 1p/19q codeletion following surgery and radiotherapy.
<b>Clinical Reference Group</b>	Chemotherapy
Which stakeholders were contacted to be involved in policy development?	<p>A policy working group (PWG) 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"> <li>• Chemotherapy Clinical Reference Group (CRG); and</li> <li>• Registered stakeholders for the Chemotherapy CRG.</li> </ul>
Identify the relevant Royal College or Professional Society to the policy and indicate how they have been involved	<p>All of the relevant Royal Colleges and professional societies have membership on the chemotherapy CRG. These include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• British Oncology Pharmacy Association;</li> <li>• Royal College of Pathologists; and</li> <li>• British Society for Haematology.</li> </ul> <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?	No responses were received from relevant Royal Colleges or professional societies listed above. However, 5 responses were received from registered stakeholders including a response from The National Cancer Research Institute and The Royal College of Radiologists.
Explain reason if there is any difference from	Not applicable.

previous question	
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?	None.
How have stakeholders been involved? What engagement methods have been used?	<p>The draft policy proposition was distributed to stakeholders on 25<sup>th</sup> March 2019, 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"> <li>• It is proposed that highly specialised products will go for a period of public consultation. Please select the consultation level that you consider to be most appropriate. (6 weeks or up to 12 weeks).</li> <li>• Do you have any further comments on the proposed changes to the document?</li> <li>• 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'.</li> <li>• Please declare any conflict of interests relating to this document or service area.</li> </ul>
What has happened or changed as a result of their input?	<p>No changes have been made to the policy proposition as a result of feedback.</p> <p>There were 5 responses to stakeholder testing. Of the 5 responses received, all were supportive of the proposition. No specific concerns regarding the draft policy proposition were raised.</p>
How are stakeholders being kept	All stakeholders (including CRG members and registered stakeholders) will be notified when the draft policy proposition goes out to public consultation.

<p>informed of progress with policy development as a result of their input?</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>Of the 5 responses received, all of respondents recommended a public consultation period of <i>up to</i> 6 weeks. Given the unanimous support for the policy at stakeholder testing, the PWG is recommending a 30 day public consultation period.</p>