

NATIONAL INSTITUTE FOR HEALTH AND CARE EXCELLENCE

NICE guidelines

Equality impact assessment

Air pollution: outdoor air quality and health

The impact on equality has been assessed during guidance development according to the principles of the NICE equality policy.

1.0 Scope: before consultation (To be completed by the developer and submitted with the draft scope for consultation)

1.1 Have any potential equality issues been identified during the development of the draft scope, before consultation, and, if so, what are they?

Socio-economic: distribution of exposure may be linked with measures of socioeconomic disadvantage. Impact of air pollutants is greater in those with pre-existing conditions and so likely to be larger in those in socioeconomic disadvantage. Sources of air pollution will vary with socioeconomic pollution with greater number of multiple car owning families in higher socioeconomic groups; however vehicle age is likely to be older in disadvantaged groups (and so vehicles may be more polluting per mile driven).

Urban/rural: exposure to air pollution will vary with level of urbanisation (higher levels of particulate and NO_x pollution in many urban areas, but higher levels of ozone likely in rural areas). The linkage between socioeconomic disadvantage, rural/urban living and air pollution is likely to be complex.

Age: impact of air pollution is likely to be greater among older people, and potentially among infants and possibly pregnant women.

Other: exposure to air pollutants will vary depending on factors such as time spent in different activities (driving, indoors, being active outside).

1.2 What is the preliminary view on the extent to which these potential equality issues need addressing by the Committee? For example, if population groups, treatments or settings are excluded from the scope, are these exclusions justified – that is, are the reasons legitimate and the exclusion proportionate?

Issues identified above will need to be discussed by the committee during development of recommendations in light of evidence identified.

Completed by Developer: Hugo Crombie

Date 10/7/2015

Approved by NICE quality assurance lead: Simon Ellis

Date 10/7/2015

2.0 Scope: after consultation (To be completed by the developer and submitted with the final scope)

2.1 Have any potential equality issues been identified during consultation, and, if so, what are they?

Stakeholders noted that in addition to people living in pollution 'hotspots' those working in hotspots might be at particular risk. In addition those living in areas outside 'hotspots' may experience ill health as a result of air pollution.

Stakeholders noted that some groups, such as those with pre-existing conditions, were likely to be particularly affected by air pollution.

The impacts of air pollution might be seen across the life-course, including prenatally. At risk groups include 'pregnant women, children and the deprived'.

Stakeholders noted that the impact of air pollution is not restricted to deprived areas and that it may be greater in some affluent areas. Individuals are frequently exposed to air pollution that they have not had a role in generating.

2.2 Have any changes to the scope been made as a result of consultation to highlight potential equality issues?

The scope has been clarified to include the whole population as well as people living or working in pollution hot spot areas.

Additional emphasis on people with pre-existing conditions (and inclusion of interventions to provide information or warnings to these groups has been added).

Where evidence allows a consideration of impacts on specific groups, including pre-natally or in pregnant women, this will be included.

Further clarification and discussion of the equality aspects of the distribution and exposure to air pollution have been added within the constraints of space allowed by the scope document.

2.3 Is the primary focus of the guideline a population with a specific disability-related communication need?

If so, is an alternative version of the 'Information for the Public' document recommended?

If so, which alternative version is recommended?

The alternative versions available are:

- large font or audio versions for a population with sight loss;
- British Sign Language videos for a population who are deaf from birth;
- 'Easy read' versions for people with learning disabilities or cognitive impairment.

No

Guideline development: before consultation (to be completed by the developer before draft guideline consultation)

3.1 Have the potential equality issues identified during the scoping process been addressed by the Committee, and, if so, how?

Yes. EP1 looks at the epidemiology of air pollution and includes at risk groups. The committee discussed the likely impact on health of air pollution and noted that this is likely to be greater in disadvantaged groups as they are likely to be exposed to higher levels of pollutants. The committee noted that interventions to improve air quality are likely to have a greater impact in these groups and so recommendations were justified.

The committee noted that interventions which restrict higher polluting vehicles or impose charges on them may adversely affect disadvantaged groups as they may be more likely to rely on older, more polluting vehicles. People with some mobility disabilities may be more reliant on access by private motor vehicles than other groups, and may find replacements harder to come by. However, as noted above, these groups are more likely to benefit from changes to air quality. They note that the implementation of recommendations to restrict certain vehicle types would need to ensure that access to services was maintained. This might include exemptions for vehicles from some groups such as people with disabilities.

3.2 Have any **other** potential equality issues (in addition to those identified during the scoping process) been identified, and, if so, how has the Committee addressed them?

The committee noted that some actions (such as a move to the use of electric vehicles) would be easier where off-street parking was available. This is likely to be limited in deprived areas.

The use of public funds to support a move to electric vehicles might also be seen as regressive as the current high purchase price of these vehicles mean they are restricted to relatively wealthy groups. However the committee felt that this was justified in at least the short term to support the development of the necessary infrastructure, and that these changes might also support a reduction in price of electric vehicles as the sector matures.

The committee discussed recommendations to reduce exposure among cyclists. They noted that pedestrians are also exposed to air pollution. However, no evidence directly relating to citing of facilities for pedestrians was found so they were unable to

3.2 Have any **other** potential equality issues (in addition to those identified during the scoping process) been identified, and, if so, how has the Committee addressed them?

make recommendations in this area. However they made a research recommendation.

3.3 Were the Committee's considerations of equality issues described in the consultation document, and, if so, where?

Yes. In committee discussion sections.

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

See discussion above (3.1) about the potential impact of recommendations which restrict access to specific vehicle classes

3.5 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?

See discussion above (3.1) about the potential impact of recommendations which restrict access to specific vehicle classes on some people with disabilities.

3.6 Are there any recommendations or explanations that the Committee could make to remove or alleviate barriers to, or difficulties with, access to services identified in questions 3.1, 3.2 or 3.3, or otherwise fulfil NICE's obligation to advance equality?

See sections 3.1, 3.2 above.

Completed by Developer – Hugo Crombie

Date__20/10/16_____

Approved by NICE quality assurance lead ____Andrew Harding

Date__29/06/17

4.0 Final guideline (to be completed by the Developer before GE consideration of final guideline)

4.1 Have any additional potential equality issues been raised during the consultation, and, if so, how has the Committee addressed them?

Two stakeholders noted that pregnant women should be included in the definition of vulnerable groups in the guideline. The committee discussed this but agreed they had not received any evidence to support this and therefore were unable to add this group due to insufficient evidence to determine this group was at disproportionate risk.

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

No

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

No

4.4 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 to services identified in questions 4.2, 4.3 and 4.4, or otherwise fulfil NICE's obligations to advance equality?

No

4.4 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 to services identified in questions 4.2, 4.3 and 4.4, or otherwise fulfil NICE's obligations to advance equality?

4.5 Have the Committee's considerations of equality issues been described in the final guideline document, and, if so, where?

Yes in the committee's discussion section of the final guideline.

Updated by Developer __S Willett__

Date ____ 04 May 2017 _____

Approved by NICE quality assurance lead ____Andrew Harding_____

Date ____20/06/17_____

5.0 After Guidance Executive amendments – if applicable (To be completed by appropriate NICE staff member after Guidance Executive)

5.1 Outline amendments agreed by Guidance Executive below, if applicable:

None

Approved by Developer ____R.Kettle_____

Date____06/06/2017_____

Approved by NICE quality assurance lead _____Andrew Harding_____

Date____29/06/17_____

