## Engagement Report for Clinical Commissioning Policies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unique Reference Number</th>
<th>B14X07</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Policy Title</td>
<td>Surgical sperm retrieval for male infertility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accountable Commissioner</td>
<td>Nicola McCulloch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clinical Reference Group</td>
<td>Specialised Urology</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Which stakeholders were contacted to be involved in policy development?
- Specialised Urology CRG membership
- Specialised Urology CRG registered stakeholders
- Infertility Network UK
- British Fertility Society

### 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

### 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?
- None
| How have the stakeholders been involved? What engagement methods have been used? | 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.

Two comments were received from CRG-registered stakeholders. No comments were received from CRG members.

Key response themes were as follows:
1. Stakeholders requested change to patient pathway stating that the recommendation for procedures to be performed exclusively by urologists is not justified
2. Stakeholders requested change to patient pathway to discourage testicular biopsy procedures carried out in situations where there are no facilities for sperm storage
3. Stakeholders requested review of tariffs for procedures
4. Additional stakeholders were identified to include in consultation |

| What has happened or changed as a result of their input? | Stakeholders were invited to comment. See Appendix for detailed stakeholder comments.

The policy proposition was updated as a result of stakeholder comments and PESA for obstructive azoospermia will be provided within HFEA-licensed units by Reproductive Medicine specialists, with subspecialty training in Reproductive Medicine, who are trained to assess azoospermic men and perform surgical sperm retrieval procedures.

The policy proposition was updated as a result of stakeholder comments to clarify that facilities for sperm storage must be available for all surgical sperm retrieval procedures, and that purely diagnostic histological biopsies, without planned subsequent sperm retrieval, are excluded.

No updates were made to the evidence review. |

| How are stakeholders been informed of progress with policy development as a result of their input? | 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. |

| What level of wider public consultation is recommended by the CRG for the NPOC Board to agree as a result of stakeholder involvement? | Public consultation for a period of 30 days as supported by stakeholders. |