

Engagement Report for Clinical Commissioning Policies

Unique Reference Number	D14 X01
Policy Title	Bone morphogenetic protein-2 in spinal fusion
Accountable Commissioner	David Stockdale
Clinical Reference Group	Complex Spinal Injury
Which stakeholders were contacted to be involved in policy development?	Complex Spinal Injury CRG membership and 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.
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.

FOR PUBLIC CONSULTATION ONLY

<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>Three responses were received from registered stakeholders, and none from CRG members.</p> <p>Key response themes as follows:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Stakeholders have requested to include additional evidence 2) Stakeholders have requested to include unpublished evidence 3) A stakeholder suggested to update the illustrative patient pathway diagram 4) A stakeholder suggested to change the criteria for commissioning to include TLIF and PLIF procedures < 2 levels 5) Additional stakeholders (Scoliosis Organisation) were identified to include in the public consultation
<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) The PWG noted that evidence was either already included in the evidence review, was excluded from the evidence review because it did not respond to the research questions or did not change the outcome of the policy proposition. 2) The PWG noted that unpublished evidence cannot be taken into account. 3) The illustrative patient pathway was updated in section 8 of the policy proposition. 4) The PWG noted that PLIF/ TLIF 1 and 2 levels are outside the scope of this policy. 5) Additional stakeholders will be invited to comment as part of public consultation. <p>In summary, a minor update was made to the policy proposition. No updates were made to the evidence review.</p>
<p>How are stakeholders been 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>