

**NATIONAL INSTITUTE FOR HEALTH AND CARE  
EXCELLENCE**

**HEALTH TECHNOLOGY APPRAISAL PROGRAMME**

**Equality impact assessment – Guidance development**

**STA Avelumab for maintenance treatment of locally  
advanced or metastatic urothelial cancer after platinum-  
based 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 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 other potential equality issues were raised
--

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

No potential equality issues were 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?
Not applicable

7. Have the committee's considerations of equality issues been described in the appraisal consultation document, and, if so, where?
Section 3.18 of the ACD says "No equality or social value judgement issues were identified."

**Approved by Associate Director (name):** Ross Dent

**Date:** 23/04/2021

## 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 potential equality issues were 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?
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?
Not applicable

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

Section 3.18 of the FAD states "No equality or social value judgement issues were identified"

**Approved by Associate Director (name):** Ross Dent

**Date:** 15/07/2021

## Final appraisal determination 2

(following appeal)

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

No potential equality issues were raised post appeal.

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?

Not applicable.

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

Section 3.22 of the FAD states "No equality or social value judgement issues were identified".

**Approved by Associate Director (name):** Ross Dent

**Date:** 01/03/2022