

Engagement Report for Service Specifications

Unique Reference Number	B14/S/a
Service Specification	Urological cancers – Specialised kidney, bladder and prostate cancer services
Accountable Commissioner	Nicola McCulloch
Clinical Reference Group	Specialised Urology
Which stakeholders were contacted to be involved in the specification development?	<p>Specialised Urology Clinical Reference Group</p> <p>Public Health England</p> <p>British Association of Urological Surgeons (BAUS)</p> <p>British Association of Urological Nurses (BAUN)</p> <p>Royal College of Radiologists (RCR)</p> <p>Patient and Public Voice Representatives</p>

<p>Identify the relevant Royal College or Professional Society to the policy and indicate how they have been involved</p>	<p>BAUS and BAUN are the relevant Professional Societies and are affiliated members of the CRG, as are the RCR. BAUS and BAUN also provided responses prior to and as part of the stakeholder testing. All Clinicians were asked to self-report their data to allow minimum numbers to be tested. BAUS also checked minimum numbers with there national databases to ensure further clarity. Each Society also gave feedback on the new configurations.</p>
<p>Which stakeholders have actually been involved?</p>	<p>Specialised Urology Clinical Reference Group Public Health England British Association of Urological Surgeons (BAUS) British Association of Urological Nurses (BAUN) Royal College of Radiologists (RCR) Patient and Public Voice Representatives</p>
<p>Explain reason if there is any difference from previous question</p>	<p>Not applicable.</p>
<p>Identify any particular stakeholder organisations that may be key to the service</p>	<p>None.</p>

<p>specification development that you have approached that have yet to be engaged. Indicate why?</p>	
<p>How have stakeholders been involved? What engagement methods have been used?</p>	<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"> • Is the revised service specification clear and concise? • What are your views with regard to the aim and objectives outlined in the specification and what the service specification is trying achieve? • 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’. • If applicable, please declare any conflict of interests relating to this document or service area.
<p>What has happened or changed as a result of</p>	<p>The following changes were made:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • References now included within the document.

their input?	
How are stakeholders being kept informed of progress with service specification development as a result of their input?	It should be noted that the CRG contained the main stakeholders for the specification, 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 service specification is subject to 30 days of public consultation.

FOR PUBLIC CONSULTATION ONLY