NATIONAL INSTITUTE FOR HEALTH AND CARE EXCELLENCE

INTERVENTIONAL PROCEDURES PROGRAMME

Equality impact assessment

IPG576 Extraurethral (non-circumferential) retropubic adjustable compression devices for stress urinary incontinence in women

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

Briefing

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

Gender: The guidance only refers to the use of this procedure in women.

Disability: People with stress urinary incontinence may be covered under the Equality Act 2010 if their leakage has a substantial adverse effect on day to day activities for longer than 12 months. People with small occasional leakages are unlikely to be covered. People with disability such as Multiple Sclerosis and Parkinson's disease are more likely to suffer from stress urinary incontinence.

Age: Stress urinary incontinence is more prevalent as age increases.

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 brief (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 brief (such as additional issues raised during the committee meeting) been agreed to highlight potential equality issues?	
No		
4.	Have any additional stakeholders related to potential equality issues been identified during the committee meeting, and, if so, have changes to the stakeholder list been made?'	
No		
Date: 01/02/2017 Consultation		
1.	Have the potential equality issues identified during the briefing 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.		
	pecific data relating to disability was identified in the literature ented 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?	
Not applicable		
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 applicable		
7.	Have the committee's considerations of equality issues been described in the consultation document, and, if so, where?	
No		

Approved by Programme Director and Clinical Advisor

Date: 01/02/2017

Final interventional procedures document



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