

NATIONAL INSTITUTE FOR HEALTH AND CLINICAL EXCELLENCE

HEALTH TECHNOLOGY APPRAISAL PROGRAMME

Equality impact assessment – Guidance development

STA Axitinib for the treatment of advanced renal cell carcinoma after failure of prior systemic treatment

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 potential 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?

The patient experts, patient organisations and NHS organisations raised the potential equality issues that older patients with additional health issues may find the adverse effects more difficult to tolerate, people with rare cancers such as kidney cancer have inequity of access to NHS funded treatments and the scope does not consider axitinib for people who are unsuitable for first-line immunotherapy. The Committee considered that these were not equality issues under the legislation. The Committee therefore concluded that its preliminary recommendation would not have a particular impact on any of the groups whose interests are protected by the legislation and there was no need to alter or add to its preliminary recommendations.

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 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, 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?

The Committee's considerations of equality issues have been described in section 4.18 and the summary table of the ACD.

Approved by Associate Director Frances Sutcliffe 29 November 2012

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 additional equality issues were raised during 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?

The recommendations did not change after 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 did not change after 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 did not change after consultation.

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

The Committee's considerations of equality issues have been described in section 4.21 and the summary table of the FAD.

Approved by Centre or Programme Director: Meindert Boysen

DATE: 8 March 2013

Consultation 2 post appeal

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

No equalities issues were identified during the scoping process.

7. 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 additional potential equality issues were raised in any of the submissions.

8. Have any other potential equality issues been identified by the Committee, and, if so, how has the Committee addressed these?

No additional potential equality issues were identified by the Committee.

9. 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

10. 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.

11. 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.

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

Yes, The Committee's considerations of equality issues have been described in section 4.24 and the summary table of the ACD.

Approved by Associate Director Frances Sutcliffe 25 February 2014

Final appraisal determination 2 post appeal

(when an ACD issued)

13. 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.

14. 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 did not change after consultation.

15. 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 did not change after consultation.

16. 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 did not change after consultation.

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

The Committee's considerations of equality issues have been described in section 4.26 and the summary table of the FAD.

Approved by Centre or Programme Director: Meindert Boysen

DATE: 5 December 2014