

Engagement Report for Clinical Commissioning Policies

Unique Reference Number	A02X05
Policy Title	Chemosaturation for liver metastases from ocular melanomas
Accountable Commissioner	Ursula Peale
Clinical Reference Group	Hepatobiliary
Which stakeholders were contacted to be involved in policy development?	All registered CRG stakeholders Ophthalmology CRG and stakeholders KP24 Foundation OcuMel UK
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 its 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>Three responses from registered stakeholders were received in total. No responses were received from CRG members.</p> <p><u>Key responses were as follows:</u></p> <p>(1) All stakeholders either supported or had no comments regarding the 30 day period of public consultation</p> <p>(2) One stakeholder felt unable to respond due to lack of clarity on the process and requested a point of contact be made available to discuss how it can best engage going forward</p> <p>(3) One stakeholder commented on the difficulty of performing trials in rare forms of cancer, with another suggesting that trial data be collected through a Commissioning through Evaluation (CtE) process</p> <p>(4) Two stakeholders agreed with the proposed commissioning position based on the available evidence, with one stating that in some instances commissioning should be considered through the Individual Funding Request (IFR) route.</p>
<p>What has happened or changed as a result of their input?</p>	<p>The PWG has considered the feedback received and has responded:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - In response to (2), the Accountable Commissioner agreed to reach out to the stakeholder to clarify process and invite comments when policy is in public consultation - In response to (3), the PWG agreed that robust clinical trials are needed and that it plans to pursue this through the CtE process - In response to (4), the PWG noted that the IFR route will remain open however, that individual patients will need to prove exceptionality. <p>No changes were made to the policy proposition as a result of stakeholder testing.</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 updated 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? (see Appendix One)</p>	<p>Public consultation for a period of 30 days as supported by stakeholders.</p>
---	--