

NATIONAL INSTITUTE FOR HEALTH AND CARE EXCELLENCE

HEALTH TECHNOLOGY APPRAISAL PROGRAMME

Equality impact assessment – Guidance development

STA Ponatinib for treating chronic myeloid leukaemia and acute lymphoblastic leukaemia

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? |
|---|

Potential equality issues arising from the current treatment options for CML and ALL were identified during scoping but these were not considered equalities issues under the equalities legislation. The provisional recommendations give all people with Ph+ ALL and most with CML an additional treatment option before SCT.

- | |
|--|
| 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

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

N/A

- | |
|--|
| 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?

The recommendations do not cause any adverse impact on people with disabilities.

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?

N/A

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

None/NA

Approved by Associate Director (name):Frances Sutcliffe

Date: 01/02/2017

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?

- Yes – patient groups raised that the present (ACD) recommendation disadvantages people in England (and potentially Wales) compared to Scotland. However, this does not relate to any groups protected by the legislation - committee’s decision relates equally to all people in England. Equality of access across countries in the UK is not an equality issue to be addressed by committee.

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?

The recommendations have been changed after consultation. Ponatinib is recommended within its marketing authorisation. No barriers existed, or have been created as a result of this change.

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 appraisal determination, and, if so, where?

No/ N/A

Approved by Centre or Programme Director (name): Frances Sutcliffe...

Date: 20/04/2017

