

**NATIONAL INSTITUTE FOR HEALTH AND CARE
EXCELLENCE**

HEALTH TECHNOLOGY APPRAISAL PROGRAMME

Equality impact assessment – Guidance development

**STA Evolocumab for treating primary hyperlipidaemia and
mixed dyslipidaemia**

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

Consultation 1

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

The potential equality issues identified during the scoping process have been noted by the Committee. None of these issues related to protected characteristics, as defined by the Equalities Act, and so were not considered equality issues.

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 clinical experts noted that there is a need for community nursing support to administer treatment to patients who cannot self-inject whether because of disability or personal preference.

They also noted that patients in geographically remote areas may have difficulty accessing specialist care to start therapy.

Neither of these issues related to protected characteristics, as defined by the Equalities Act, and so were not considered equality issues.

3. Have any other potential equality issues been identified by the

Committee, and, if so, how has the Committee addressed these?

No other potential equality issues have been identified by the Committee.

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?

The Committee's considerations of equality issues have been described in the summary table of the FAD.

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

Date: 10 November 2015

Consultation 2

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

Please see response to question 1.

9. 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 further potential equality issues have been raised in response to the first appraisal consultation document.

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

No other potential equality issues have been identified by the Committee.

11. 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.

12. 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.

13. 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.

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

The Committee's considerations of equality issues have been described in the summary table of the ACD.

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

Date: 29 January 2016

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 have been raised during the consultation.

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?

The recommendations have changed to cover a larger population. 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 recommendations to have an adverse impact on people with disabilities.

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 of equality issues have been described in the summary table of the FAD.

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

Date: 27/04/2016

