NATIONAL INSTITUTE FOR HEALTH AND CARE EXCELLENCE

HEALTH TECHNOLOGY APPRAISAL PROGRAMME

Equality impact assessment – Guidance development

STA Alemtuzumab for active relapsing-remitting multiple sclerosis

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?

A consultee organisation raised 2 potential equality issues during the scoping stage:

- 1. A potential to disadvantage patients over the age of 50-55 years because these were excluded from the relevant clinical trials.
- A perceived inequality for patients who have been treated with glatiramer in the access to fingolimod, and that such a situation should be avoided.

The Committee did not address these issues because they were considered not relevant for this appraisal:

- 1. Guidance will only be issued in line with marketing authorisation, and it is not expected to be restricted to people below 50—55 years of age
- 2. The wording of NICE's recommendation for fingolimod is based on the marketing authorisation for fingolimod, and this would be the same in this 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 potential equalities issues were raised in the submission, expert statements or academic reports.

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 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?	
Not applicable.		

Approved by Associate Director (name): Elisabeth George...

Date: 28 11 13

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.	
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?
N/a	
5.	Have the Committee's considerations of equality issues been

described in the final appraisal determination, and, if so, where?

The summary table states that no relevant equality considerations were raised during scoping or the appraisal.

Approved by Centre or Programme Director (name): Meindert Boysen

Date: 10 03 14