

NATIONAL INSTITUTE FOR HEALTH AND CARE EXCELLENCE

HEALTH TECHNOLOGY APPRAISAL PROGRAMME

Equality impact assessment – Guidance development

STA Teclistamab for treating relapsed and refractory multiple myeloma after 3 or more treatments (Review of TA869)

The impact on equality has been assessed during this appraisal according to the principles of the NICE equality scheme.

Consultation

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

No equality issues identified during scoping process.

2. Have any other potential equality issues been raised in the submissions, expert statements or academic report, and, if so, how has the committee addressed these?

A patient carer organisation stated that teclistamab may need to be delivered at better equipped treatment centres with specifically trained healthcare professionals. This may pose challenges for people who live further from these treatment centres and cannot afford, for financial or logistical reasons, to travel longer distances. The patient carer organisation also highlighted that issues around capacity for day units and inpatient access may cause unequal access to teclistamab. The committee considered these equality issues, and agreed that its recommendations do not have a different impact on people protected by the equality legislation than on the wider population.

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

No other issues identified.

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?

No.

7. Have the committee's considerations of equality issues been described in the draft guidance, and, if so, where?

Yes, section 3.18 of the draft guidance.

Approved by Associate Director (name): Ross Dent

Date: 10/07/2024

Final draft guidance

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, or difficulties with, access for the specific group?

No

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. 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?

N/A

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 Have the committee's considerations of equality issues been described in the final draft guidance, and, if so, where?

Yes, section 3.20 of the final draft guidance.

Approved by Associate Director (name): Ross Dent

Date: 27/09/2024