

Engagement Report for Clinical Commissioning Policies

Unique Reference Number	B11X02
Policy Title	Robotic assisted surgery for oesophago-gastric cancers
Accountable Commissioner	Nigel Andrews
Clinical Reference Group	Oesophageal Surgery CRG
Which stakeholders were contacted to be involved in policy development?	Oesophageal Surgery CRG members Oesophageal Surgery CRG registered stakeholders
Identify the relevant Royal College or Professional Society to the policy and indicate how they have been involved	Representatives of relevant Royal College or Professional Societies were contacted for Stakeholder Testing as part of the CRG.
Which stakeholders have actually been involved?	All of the key stakeholders listed above were invited to comment.
Explain reason if there is any difference from previous question	Not applicable.

FOR PUBLIC CONSULTATION ONLY

<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.</p>
<p>How have the stakeholders been involved? What engagement methods have been used?</p>	<p>The draft policy was circulated to the full membership of the CRG and registered stakeholders for one week for their views, both to establish whether any amendments to the policy are required, and to understand from their perspective what the key questions to ask at consultation might be.</p> <p>A total of 6 responses were received; 3 from CRG members and 3 from CRG-registered stakeholders. Key response themes were as follows:</p> <p>(1) There were comments that future developments in robotic technology may reduce costs and be more versatile and thus the policy proposition for this technology is likely to need revisiting in a few years when further evidence is available. In response, a forward looking statement acknowledging that potential advances in robotic technology could result in a review of the policy position has been added.</p> <p>(2) There was concern that NHS England was evaluating robotic assisted surgery in clinical silos. The PWG notes that NHS England is currently exploring the development of a broader robotics strategy</p> <p>(3) One of the CRG-registered stakeholders, a manufacturer, requested for additional evidence to be reviewed. The PWG has looked at the suggested evidence and concluded that the studies were correctly excluded as per the agreed upon inclusion/exclusion criteria and do not alter the conclusions of the policy proposition (i.e. unpublished evidence was not included in the evidence review, and studies with more robust data/more patients were prioritised over studies with less robust data)</p> <p>(4) The manufacturer also suggested some additional stakeholders to include in consultation. The PWG notes that AUGIS has already been contacted; the other stakeholders identified (the Oesophageal Patients Association and the Cancer Recovery Foundation) will be invited to comment as part of public consultation.</p>
<p>What has happened or changed as a result of their input?</p>	<p>Stakeholders were invited to comment. Minor changes were made to the policy proposition. No changes were made to the evidence review. Additional identified stakeholders will be invited to comment as part of consultation.</p>
<p>How are stakeholders being kept informed of progress with policy development as a result of their input?</p>	<p>This engagement report, along with the policy proposition will be circulated as part of the public consultation. Stakeholders will be notified and invited to comment further.</p>

FOR PUBLIC CONSULTATION ONLY

<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>Public consultation for a period of 30 days as supported by stakeholders.</p>
--	--