

Engagement Report for Clinical Commissioning Policies

Unique Reference Number	A12X02
Policy Title	Infliximab for the treatment of hidradenitis suppurativa
Accountable Commissioner	Jon Gulliver
Clinical Reference Group	Specialised Dermatology
Which stakeholders were contacted to be involved in policy development?	Specialised Dermatology CRG membership and all 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>Four responses were received in total: two from CRG registered stakeholders and two from CRG members. Key themes response themes were as follows:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Additional stakeholders (Hidradenitis Suppurativa Trust) were identified to invite to public consultation 2) A respondent requested amendments to estimated prevalence 3) A respondent requested further research 4) A stakeholder raised issues on the equity of access in UK 5) Stakeholders felt that the evidence support a routine commissioning position
<p>What has happened or changed as a result of their input?</p>	<p>Stakeholders were invited to comment.</p> <p>The Policy Working Group (PWG) responded specifically to the following comments:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> (1) Additional stakeholders will be invited to public consultation. (2) Section 5 epidemiology and needs of assessment of the policy proposition was updated with the suggested estimated prevalence (3) PWG noted that further research falls outside the scope of this policy (4) PWG noted that commissioning policy in Scotland and Wales is outside the scope of NHS England (5) Clinical Panel concluded that there was not sufficient evidence for a proposal to routine commissioning <p>In summary, a minor update was made to the policy proposition, and no updates were made to the evidence review.</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>
<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>