

## Engagement Report for Service Specifications

<b>Unique Reference Number</b>	B14/S/b
<b>Service Specification</b>	Penile cancer
<b>Accountable Commissioner</b>	Nicola Mcculloch
<b>Clinical Reference Group</b>	Specialised Urology
Which stakeholders were contacted to be involved in the specification development?	British Association of Urological Surgeons (BAUS) Specialised Urology Clinical Reference Group Public Health England
Identify the relevant Royal College or Professional Society to the policy and indicate how they have been involved	BAUS are the relevant Professional Society and are affiliated members of the CRG.
Which stakeholders have actually been involved?	British Association of Urological Surgeons (BAUS) Specialised Urology Clinical Reference Group Public Health England

Explain reason if there is any difference from previous question	Not applicable.
Identify any particular stakeholder organisations that may be key to the specification 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 service specification was distributed to members of the Specialised Urology CRG and its registered stakeholders for a period of 1 week of stakeholder testing. Testing was conducted through the NPoC email account.</p> <p>Stakeholder testing asked the following questions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Is the revised service specification clear and concise?</b></li> <li>• <b>What are your views with regard to the aim and objectives outlined in the specification and what the service specification is trying achieve?</b></li> <li>• <b>Do you have any further comments on the proposed changes to the document? If Yes, please describe below, in no more than 500 words any further comments on the proposed service specification as part of this initial ‘sense check’.</b></li> <li>• <b>If applicable, please declare any conflict of interests relating to this document or service area.</b></li> </ul>
What has happened or changed as a result of their input?	<p>The following changes were made:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Typographical errors have been corrected throughout the document.</li> <li>• Section 3.2.3. Patient information: text now references that information should include access to</li> </ul>

	relevant clinical trials which may be available.
How are stakeholders being kept informed of progress with specification development as a result of their input?	It should be noted that the CRG contained the main stakeholders for the intervention, as such stakeholders are kept informed about development through teleconferences and email exchange.
What level of wider public consultation is recommended by the CRG for the NPOC Board to agree as a result of stakeholder involvement?	It is recommended that the policy proposition is subject to 30 days of public consultation.

Draft for public consultation only