

NATIONAL INSTITUTE FOR HEALTH AND CARE EXCELLENCE

Medical technologies evaluation programme

Equality impact assessment: Guidance development

GID-MT569 Memokath 051 Ureter stent for ureteric obstruction (update of MTG35)

The impact on equality has been assessed during this evaluation according to the principles of the [NICE Equality scheme](#).

Medical technology consultation document

1. Have the potential equality issues identified during the scoping process been addressed by the committee, and, if so, how?

Yes. The original scope was updated to state Memokath 051 should be used in adults. Memokath 051 is contraindicated in children.

2. Have any other potential equality issues been highlighted in the sponsor's submission, or patient organisation questionnaires, and, if so, how has the committee addressed these?

Some ureteral obstructions are caused by tumours, and everyone with cancer is protected under the Equality Act 2010 from the point of diagnosis. People with ureteric strictures caused by tumours may benefit from having Memokath 051 available as an alternative to double J stents. This is because it may be associated with a reduced number of replacement procedures and reduced adverse events, which would reduce their overall number of appointments and improve their quality of life as they undergo cancer treatments, or make them more comfortable and have more time out of hospital if they have a limited life expectancy. Memokath 051 may also provide an alternative treatment for people with ureteric strictures who cannot tolerate or who have failed conventional stents, who would otherwise be nephrostomy-dependent and may be disabled under the Equality Act 2010.

3. Have any other potential equality issues been identified by the committee and, if so, how has the committee addressed these?

None

4. Do the preliminary recommendations make it more difficult in practice for a specific group to access the technology compared with other groups? If so, what are the barriers to or difficulties with access for the specific group?

No

5. Is there potential for the preliminary recommendations to have an adverse impact on people with disabilities because of something that is a consequence of the disability?

No

6. Are there any recommendations or explanations that the committee could make to remove or alleviate barriers to, or difficulties with access identified in questions 4 or 5, or otherwise fulfil NICE's obligations to promote equality?

None

7. Have the committee's considerations of equality issues been described in the medical technology consultation document, and, if so, where?

Yes, in section 4.4

Approved by Associate Director: Anastasia Chalkidou

Date: 11/8/2022

Medical technology guidance document

1. Have any additional potential equality issues been raised during the consultation, and, if so, how has the committee addressed these?

No.

2. If the recommendations have changed after consultation, are there any recommendations that make it more difficult in practice for a specific group to access the technology compared with other groups? If so, what are the barriers to access for the specific group?

Not applicable.

3. If the recommendations have changed after consultation, is there potential for the preliminary recommendations to have an adverse impact on people with disabilities because of something that is a consequence of the disability?

Not applicable.

4. If the recommendations have changed after consultation, are there any recommendations or explanations that the committee could make to remove or alleviate barriers to, or difficulties with, access identified in questions 2 and 3, or otherwise fulfil NICE's obligations to promote equality?

Not applicable.

5. Have the committee's considerations of equality issues been described in the medical technology guidance document, and, if so, where?

Section 4.4 of the guidance.

Approved by Programme Director: Sarah Byron

Date: 5/10/2022