# NATIONAL INSTITUTE FOR HEALTH AND CARE EXCELLENCE

#### INTERVENTIONAL PROCEDURES PROGRAMME

### **Equality impact assessment**

# IPG583 Sacrocolpopexy using mesh to repair vaginal vault prolapse

The impact on equality has been assessed during guidance development according to the principles of the NICE Equality scheme.

#### **Scoping**

1. Have any potential equality issues been identified during the scoping process (development of the scope or discussion at the Committee meeting), and, if so, what are they?

Gender: This procedure is only relevant to women.

Ethnicity: Studies suggest that vaginal prolapse may occur more often in women of Northern European descent, and less frequently in women of African-American descent.

Disability: Women with vaginal vault prolapse may be covered under the Equality Act 2010 if their symptoms have a substantial adverse effect on day to day activities for longer than 12 months.

Age: Vaginal vault prolapse is more prevalent as age increases. Religion: Some types of mesh may have an element that is derived from animal or human sources and may not be acceptable to some religious beliefs or strict vegetarians.

2. What is the preliminary view as to what extent these potential equality issues need addressing by the Committee? (If there are exclusions listed in the scope (for example, populations, treatments or settings), are these justified?)

This was not thought to have an impact on the assessment of the procedure. No exclusions were applied.

3.	Has any change to the scope (such as additional issues raised during the Committee meeting) been agreed to highlight potential equality issues?
No.	

#### **Approved by Programme Director and Clinical Advisor**

**Date**: 02/02/2017

#### Consultation

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

In most of the published studies, the mean age of patients was over 60 years old.

No specific data relating to disability was identified in the literature presented in the overview.

Different mesh materials were considered by the Committee.

No specific data related to disability or ethnicity was identified in the literature or presented in the overview.

2. Have any other potential equality issues been raised in the overview, specialist adviser questionnaires or patient commentary, 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?

No	
4.	Do the preliminary recommendations make it more difficult in practice for a specific group to access a technology or intervention 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 obligation to promote equality?
Not a	pplicable
7.	Have the Committee's considerations of equality issues been described in the consultation document, and, if so, where?
Not a	pplicable

## **Approved by Programme Director and Clinical Advisor**

Date: 02/02/2017

## Final interventional procedures document

1.	Have any additional potential equality issues been raised during the consultation, and, if so, how has the Committee addressed these?	
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 a technology or intervention compared with other groups? If so, what are the barriers to, or difficulties with, access for the specific group?	
Not a	pplicable	
3.	If the recommendations have changed after consultation, 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?	
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 a	pplicable	
5.	Have the Committee's considerations of equality issues been described in the final interventional procedures document, and, if so, where?	

No
----

### **Approved by Programme Director**

Date: 9 February 2017