

Engagement Report for Service Specifications

Unique Reference Number	B14/S/c
Service Specification	Urological cancers – Specialised Testicular Cancer services
Accountable Commissioner	Nicola McCulloch
Clinical Reference Group	Specialised Urology
Which stakeholders were contacted to be involved in the specification development?	<p>British Association of Urological Surgeons (BAUS)</p> <p>Specialised Urology Clinical Reference Group</p> <p>Public Health England</p> <p>British Association of Urological Nurses (BAUN)</p>
Identify the relevant Royal College or Professional Society to the policy and indicate how they have been involved	<p>BAUS are the relevant Professional Society and are affiliated members of the CRG. BAUS also provided a response as part of the stakeholder testing process.</p>

<p>Which stakeholders have actually been involved?</p>	<p>British Association of Urological Surgeons (BAUS) Specialised Urology Clinical Reference Group Public Health England British Association of Urological Nurses (BAUN)</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 specification development that you have approached that have yet to be engaged. Indicate why?</p>	<p>None.</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'.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If applicable, please declare any conflict of interests relating to this document or service area.
What has happened or changed as a result of their input?	<p>The following changes were made:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Pathway diagram was more clearly labelled as an example, rather than an exhaustive illustration. • Text relating to sperm-banking was clarified and strengthened to reference the need for clinicians to take men through a process of counselling and informed consent such that a decision to delay surgical intervention to enable sperm retrieval could be taken in full knowledge of the risks and benefits. • The reference to ten RPLND surgeries per centre was removed in favour of clarifying the support arrangements required for this surgery to be undertaken safely.
How are stakeholders being kept informed of progress with specification development as a result of their input?	<p>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.</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>It is recommended that the policy proposition is subject to 30 days of public consultation.</p>