

NATIONAL INSTITUTE FOR HEALTH AND CARE EXCELLENCE

HEALTH TECHNOLOGY APPRAISAL PROGRAMME

Equality impact assessment – Guidance development

STA Leber's hereditary optic neuropathy (visual impairment, aged 12 and over) – idebenone [ID547]

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? |
| Yes, The LHON society and the Lily Foundation noted that there is inequality of access based on where people live because idebenone is available on the NHS in Scotland and Wales but not in England. LHON is most common in men aged 15 to 35. | |
| The committee considered that this was not an equality issue under the equality legislation. The committee also considered that differences in prevalence or incidence of a disease cannot be addressed in a technology appraisal. | |

- | | |
|--|---|
| 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 have been raised. | |

- | | |
|--|---|
| 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 raised. | |

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, the preliminary recommendations do not make it more difficult in practice for a specific group to access the technology compared with other groups.

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, there is no potential for the preliminary recommendations to have an adverse impact on people with disabilities because of something that is a consequence of the disability

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?

Yes, section 3.20 of the draft guidance.

Approved by Associate Director (name): ...Linda Landells.....

Date: 17 April 2024

Consultation 2

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

No additional equality issues were raised during consultation that had not already been raised.

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 not changed following consultation.

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?

The recommendations have not changed following consultation.

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?

The recommendations have not changed following consultation.

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

Yes, Section 3.21 of the draft guidance

Approved by Associate Director (name): Ross Dent

Date: 25/02/2025