

# NATIONAL INSTITUTE FOR HEALTH AND CARE EXCELLENCE

## HEALTH TECHNOLOGY APPRAISAL PROGRAMME

### Equality impact assessment – Guidance development

#### STA Omalizumab for previously treated chronic spontaneous urticaria

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 potential equality issues were identified during the 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? |
|--|

No potential equality issues were raised in the submissions, or expert statements or academic report.
---

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

The Committee heard that, because omalizumab could only be given under medical supervision and people who are physically disabled or live far from a treatment centre may therefore have limited access to the technology. The Committee noted that some centres provide transportation for patients and, in some instances; community nurses administer omalizumab to these patients in their homes and concluded that this is mainly an implementation issue, and did not pose an equality issue that it needed to address. The
---

Committee also heard that the summary of product characteristics advises that omalizumab should be administered with caution in people who have kidney or liver diseases. The Committee noted that this is in line with clinical practice, and did not consider this to be an equality issue.

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?

The preliminary recommendations do not make it more difficult in practice for a specific group to access the technology compared with other groups.

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?

Not applicable.

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

Yes, section 4.23

**Approved by Associate Director (name):** Elisabeth George

**Date:** 14 10 2014

Technology appraisals: Guidance development

Equality impact assessment for the single technology appraisal of omalizumab for previously treated chronic spontaneous urticaria

Issue date: June 2015

## Final appraisal determination

(when an ACD issued)

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

No additional potential equality issues were raised during consultation on the ACD.

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, the recommendations do not make it more difficult in practice for a specific group to access the technology compared with other groups.

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?

There is no potential for the change in the recommendations to have an adverse impact on people with disabilities because of something that is a consequence of the disability.

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 final appraisal determination, and, if so, where?

Yes, section 4.23

**Approved by Centre or Programme Director (name):** Meindert Boysen

**Date:** 16/03/2015