

## **Engagement Report for Clinical Commissioning Policies**

Unique Reference Number	1841
Policy Title	Proton Beam Therapy for Craniospinal Irradiation in Adults
Clinical Reference Group	Radiotherapy
Which stakeholders were contacted to be involved in policy development?	A policy working group (PWG) was established in line with NHS England's standard methods.
	The draft policy proposition was sent to the following groups for comment:
	<ul> <li>Members of the Radiotherapy Clinical Reference Group (CRG); and</li> </ul>
	<ul> <li>Registered stakeholders of the Radiotherapy CRG.</li> </ul>
Identify the relevant Royal College or Professional Society	The relevant Royal Colleges and/or Professional Societies are either members of the Radiotherapy CRG or are registered stakeholders; this includes:
to the policy and indicate how they have been involved	<ul><li>Royal College of Physicians; and</li><li>Royal College of Radiologists.</li></ul>
	Named representatives for each of these organisations were sent copies of the draft policy proposition and invited to provide comment.
Which stakeholders have actually been involved?	No responses were received from the relevant Royal Colleges/Professional Societies, however, 5 responses were received from other stakeholders.
Explain reason if there is any difference from previous question	Not applicable.

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 identified.
How have stakeholders been involved? What engagement methods have been used?	<ul> <li>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.</li> <li>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.</li> <li>Stakeholder testing asked the following questions: <ul> <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> </li> </ul>
What has happened or changed as a result of their input?	No changes have been made to the policy statement as a result of stakeholder feedback. There were five responses to stakeholder testing and all respondents were supportive of the commissioning policy statement. Of the five responses, two respondents made comments advocating that the eligibility criteria within the policy be less restrictive. Development of the clinical commissioning and the eligibility criteria have been drafted in line with the latest available clinical evidence. For this reason, the PWG have concluded that no changes were required to the policy statement.
How are stakeholders being kept informed of	All stakeholders (including CRG members and registered stakeholders) will be notified if the draft policy proposition

progress with policy development as a result of their input?	goes out to public consultation and/or when the final policy statement is published.
What level of wider public consultation is recommended by the CRG for the NPOC Board to agree as a result of stakeholder involvement?	As this is a commissioning policy statement, the questions relating to the length of public consultation were not asked. The PWG recommends that the policy proceeds through the standard development route for policy statements and does not go out to public consultation. This is because all responses to stakeholder testing were supportive of the draft policy statement and relevant capacity and funding for treatment are available immediately through the proton beam therapy programme.