

## Engagement Report for Service Specifications

<b>Specification Reference Number</b>	A12/S(HSS)c
<b>Specification Title</b>	Stevens-Johnson Syndrome and Toxic Epidermal Necrolysis (SJS-TEN), All Ages
<b>Accountable Commissioner</b>	Sarah Watson
<b>Clinical Reference Group</b>	Burn Care and Specialised Dermatology
What stakeholders were contacted to be involved in service specification development?	<p>The stakeholders to the Specialised Dermatology and Burn Care CRGs were contacted.</p> <p>The service specification was led jointly by the Burn Care CRG and the Specialised Dermatology CRG.</p> <p>The specification and proposed pathway were circulated within the British Association of Dermatologists.</p> <p>A second round of stakeholder engagement took place with a targeting approach to the British Burns Association and the British Association of Dermatologists and further responses were received from this.</p>
What stakeholders have actually been involved? State reason for any difference from previous question	<p>BAD membership, British Dermatological Nursing Group (BDNG), Primary Care Dermatological Society (PCDS), British Burn Association (BBA), British Association of Plastic, Reconstructive and Aesthetic Surgeons (BAPRAS), Royal College of Ophthalmologists (RCOphth), Association of Anaesthetists of Great Britain and Ireland (AAGBI), Intensive Care Society and SJS Awareness</p>

	UK.
How have the stakeholders been involved? What engagement methods have been used?	Face to face meetings and circulation of proposal to interested organisations
What has happened or changed as a result of their input?	<p>The two areas which generated most debate were, firstly, the management of necrolytic epidermis – debridement vs. conservative approach; and secondly, the use of active interventions in SJS/TEN, particularly IVg. There is no evidence to suggest that either approach – surgical management with debridement vs. conservative management without debridement – is superior. The SJS/TEN guidelines now reflect the validity of both approaches.</p> <p>The specification was rewritten extensively due to the concerns expressed which in fact were mainly demonstrative of a lack of clarity in the original document.</p>
How have stakeholders been informed of progress with service specification development as a result of their input?	Individual responses to each person who submitted comments have been sent.
What level of wider public consultation is recommended by the CRG for the NPOC Board to agree as a result of stakeholder involvement? (see Appendix One).	4 weeks in line with other public consultations

FOR PUBLIC CONSULTATION ONLY