Stakeholder Testing Response Form

Please complete one response form per consultation document that you wish to provide comments on.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>22nd January, 2018</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Respondent's Name</td>
<td>Professor DC Mangham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respondent's Organisation</td>
<td>Royal College of Pathologists</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Replying on behalf of organisation?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Document responding to:</td>
<td>Sarcoma Service Specification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relevant CRG</td>
<td>Specialised Cancer Surgery CRG</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is proposed that highly specialised products will go for period of public consultation. Please select the consultation level that you consider to be most appropriate.

1 - changes that could reasonably be expected to be broadly supported by stakeholders - up to 6 week consultation

2 - up to 12 weeks consultation to include some additional proactive engagement activities during the live consultation period

Do you have any further comments on the proposed changes to the document?

1. YES
If Yes, please describe below, in no more than 500 words, any further comments on the proposed changes to the document as part of this initial ‘sense check’.

Re: Commissioning arrangements – what allowance/consideration has been made for Greater Manchester’s unique status as having devolved healthcare budgets. Some input from Greater Manchester Health and Social Care Devolution is required.

Page 14:
Under “Joint Soft Tissue and Bone Sarcoma MDT Providers” – “Robert Jones and Agnes Hunt Orthopaedic and District Hospital NHS Trust” is part of GMOSS, which constitutes the fully formed sarcoma MDT.

Page 15:
Under “Soft Tissue MDT Providers” Manchester University Foundation Trust” (MFT) has been mistakenly omitted. Are there any other omissions?

In earlier documentations it was explicitly stated that all sarcoma units/services should be supported by a fully accredited histopathology department. I can’t find this in the revision. Has this requirement been dropped?

Across the UK, there is variable practice regarding pathology “double reporting” of all newly diagnosed sarcomas and suspected sarcomas. This is not mentioned in this document. Are there guidelines.

Is there to be any update/new guidance for molecular pathological analysis of sarcomas as a confirmatory diagnostic test? The document simply states that there will be “appropriate molecular analysis for all sarcomas”. Given the increasing role for personalised medicine, will targeted NGS for sarcomas become a requirement? Has this been considered?

Minor point:
Page 7: “It is recognised that distinguishing between fibroids and tumour on imaging is very difficult” – “fibroids” are tumours!

Please declare any conflict of interests relating to this document or service area.
I am a GMOSS pathologist