

NATIONAL INSTITUTE FOR HEALTH AND CARE EXCELLENCE

HEALTH TECHNOLOGY APPRAISAL PROGRAMME

Equality impact assessment – Guidance development

STA Ramucirumab for treating advanced gastric cancer or gastro-oesophageal junction adenocarcinoma after chemotherapy

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 were identified during the scoping

- | |
|--|
| 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? |
|--|

The company submission stated that the lack of an available licensed treatment after people have progressed on chemotherapy can lead to inequalities in access across geographies.
--

The Committee considered these statements but it did not consider this to be an equality issue that a technology appraisal can address and it was not aware that the potential inequality in access applied to any protected groups covered by the equality legislation. It concluded that there was no unfairness or unlawful discrimination, and as a result there were no equality issues associated with not recommending the treatment.
--

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

No other comments regarding equalities issues have been received.

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 appraisal consultation document, and, if so, where?

Yes, [in section 4.20 of the ACD](#) and the summary table.

Approved by Associate Director (name): ...Frances Sutcliffe.....

Date: 8 September 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?

In response to the ACD during consultation, the company re-asserted the equalities issue highlighted in its submission, and it commented that it disagreed with the statement from Committee that this was not an equalities issue that a technology appraisal can address. The company stated one of the main reasons NICE was originally set up in 1999 was “to reduce variation in the availability and quality of NHS treatments and care”.

The Committee considered these statements in the second Appraisal Committee meeting, and the Committee’s final views are presented in section 4.20 of the FAD. The Committee remained of the view that this was an issue of geographical variation and it was not aware that the potential inequality in access applied to any protected groups covered by the equality legislation. It also considered that any NICE recommendation would be applied consistently across England, thereby reducing variation in practice. It concluded that there was no unfairness or unlawful discrimination, and as a result there were no equality issues, and it did not need to alter its recommendations in any way.

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?

Not applicable.

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?

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 final appraisal determination, and, if so, where?

The Committee's considerations are described in section 4.20 of the FAD, and in the summary table.

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

Date: 16/11/2015