



Equality Screening, Disability Duties and Human Rights Assessment Template

Part 1 – Policy scoping

Part 2 – Screening questions

Part 3 – Screening decision

Part 4 – Monitoring

Part 5 – Disability Duties

Part 6 – Human Rights

Part 7 – Approval and Authorisation

Part 1. Policy scoping

Information about the policy

Name of the policy

NICE Technology Appraisal TA679 - Dapagliflozin for treating chronic heart failure with reduced ejection fraction

Is this an existing, revised or a new policy?

New

What is it trying to achieve? (intended aims/outcomes)

This guidance provides evidence-based recommendations on dapagliflozin (Forxiga) for symptomatic chronic heart failure with reduced ejection fraction in adults.

Dapagliflozin is recommended as an option for treating symptomatic chronic heart failure with reduced ejection fraction in adults, only if it is used as an add-on to optimised standard care with:

- angiotensin-converting enzyme (ACE) inhibitors or angiotensin-2 receptor blockers (ARBs), with beta blockers, and, if tolerated, mineralocorticoid receptor antagonists (MRAs), **or**
 - sacubitril valsartan, with beta blockers, and, if tolerated, MRAs.
-

Are there any Section 75 categories which might be expected to benefit from the intended policy?

If so, explain how.

This guidance should benefit adult patients as an option for treating symptomatic chronic heart failure with reduced ejection fraction, only if they meet the criteria outlined.

Who initiated or wrote the policy?

National Institute for Health and Care Excellence (NICE)

Who owns and who implements the policy?

NICE owns the policy. The Department determines whether the policy should be endorsed for Northern Ireland, and, if endorsed, the HSCB / HSC Trusts implement it.

Implementation factors

Are there any factors which could contribute to/detract from the intended aim/outcome of the policy/decision?

N/A

Main stakeholders affected

Who are the internal and external stakeholders (actual or potential) that the policy will impact upon? (please delete as appropriate)

staff

service users

voluntary/community/trade unions

other, please specify ___ Families/Carers___

Other policies with a bearing on this policy

N/A

Available evidence

Evidence to help inform the screening process may take many forms. Public authorities should ensure that their screening decision is informed by relevant data.

What evidence/information (both qualitative and quantitative) have you gathered to inform this policy? Specify details for each of the Section 75 categories.

In developing this guidance, NICE have assessed its equality impact in scoping, consulting and before issuing the final guideline. This process is designed to mitigate the impact on equality. In addition, DoH locally consult on equality and human rights issues.

Section 75 category	Details of evidence/information
Religious belief	Religion will have no bearing on the guidance
Political opinion	Political opinion will have no bearing on the guidance
Racial group	Ethnicity will have no bearing on the guidance
Age	The committee noted concerns from a patient expert statement which highlighted that if dapagliflozin was limited to specialist care for heart failure, people with type 2 diabetes would have access to it in primary care, but people who had HFrEF without diabetes would not. The committee considered that the population who had HFrEF were likely to be older and have worse kidney function than people with diabetes alone. The committee recalled standard clinical practice is for a heart failure specialist and a multidisciplinary team to determine the most appropriate second-line treatment to offer. It noted that specialist advice could be given to a primary care healthcare professional, so people would not need to

Section 75 category	Details of evidence/information
	<p>visit a hospital to start dapagliflozin. The committee noted its recommendation applied to all people included in the dapagliflozin for HFREF marketing authorisation and not only those with comorbid diabetes. It therefore did not consider this an equalities issue.</p> <p><u>This guidance is aimed at adult patients as an option for treating symptomatic chronic heart failure with reduced ejection fraction, only if they meet the criteria outlined.</u></p>
Marital status	Marital status will have no bearing on the guidance
Sexual orientation	Sexual orientation will have no bearing on the guidance
Men and women generally	Gender will have no bearing on the guidance
Disability	Disability will have no bearing on the guidance
Dependants	Dependant status will have no bearing on the guidance

Needs, experiences and priorities

Taking into account the information referred to above, what are the different needs, experiences and priorities of each of the following categories, in relation to the particular policy/decision?

Specify details for each of the Section 75 categories

Section 75 category	Details of needs/experiences/priorities
Religious belief	There is no evidence that different religions will have any different needs, experiences, priorities or issues in relation to the guidance.
Political opinion	There is no evidence that different political opinions will have any different needs, experiences, priorities or issues in relation to the guidance.
Racial group	There is no evidence that different racial groups will have any different needs, experiences, priorities or issues in relation to the guidance.
Age	This guidance relates to, and should benefit adult patients as an option for treating symptomatic chronic heart failure with reduced ejection fraction, only if they meet the criteria outlined.
Marital status	There is no evidence that those of different marital status will have any different needs, experiences, priorities or issues in relation to the guidance.
Sexual orientation	There is no evidence that different sexual orientation will have any different needs, experiences, priorities or issues in relation to the guidance.

Section 75 category	Details of needs/experiences/priorities
Men and women generally	There is no evidence that different genders will have any different needs, experiences, priorities or issues in relation to the guidance.
Disability	There is no evidence that people with disabilities will have any different needs, experiences, priorities or issues in relation to the guidance.
Dependants	There is no evidence that those of different dependant status will have any different needs, experiences, priorities or issues in relation to the guidance.

Part 2. Screening questions

1. What is the likely impact on equality of opportunity for those affected by this policy, for each of the Section 75 equality categories? minor/major/none

Section 75 category	Details of policy impact	Level of impact? minor/major/none
Religious belief	No impact on equality of opportunity	None
Political opinion	No impact on equality of opportunity	None
Racial group	No impact on equality of opportunity	None

Section 75 category	Details of policy impact	Level of impact? minor/major/none
Age	No impact on equality of opportunity	None
Marital status	No impact on equality of opportunity	None
Sexual orientation	No impact on equality of opportunity	None
Men and women generally	No impact on equality of opportunity	None
Disability	No impact on equality of opportunity	None
Dependants	No impact on equality of opportunity	None

2. Are there opportunities to better promote equality of opportunity for people within the Section 75 equalities categories?

Section 75 category	If Yes , provide details	If No , provide reasons
Religious belief		No evidence to support this
Political opinion		No evidence to support this
Racial group		No evidence to support this

Section 75 category	If Yes , provide details	If No , provide reasons
Age		No evidence to support this
Marital status		No evidence to support this
Sexual orientation		No evidence to support this
Men and women generally		No evidence to support this
Disability		No evidence to support this
Dependants		No evidence to support this

3. To what extent is the policy likely to impact on good relations between people of different religious belief, political opinion or racial group? minor/major/none

Good relations category	Details of policy impact	Level of impact minor/major/none
Religious belief	The policy will not impact on good relations	None
Political opinion	The policy will not impact on good relations	None

Good relations category	Details of policy impact	Level of impact minor/major/none
Racial group	The policy will not impact on good relations	None

4. Are there opportunities to better promote good relations between people of different religious belief, political opinion or racial group?

Good relations category	If Yes , provide details	If No , provide reasons
Religious belief		No evidence to support this
Political opinion		No evidence to support this
Racial group		No evidence to support this

Additional considerations

Multiple identity

Generally speaking, people can fall into more than one Section 75 category. Taking this into consideration, are there any potential impacts of the policy/decision on people with multiple identities?

(For example; disabled minority ethnic people; disabled women; young Protestant men; and young lesbians, gay and bisexual people).

No impact. This guidance will benefit all relevant service users, including those with multiple identities.

Provide details of data on the impact of the policy on people with multiple identities. Specify relevant Section 75 categories concerned.

N/A

Part 3. Screening decision

If the decision is not to conduct an equality impact assessment, please provide details of the reasons.

This guidance will impact on all sections of the community equally.

If the decision is not to conduct an equality impact assessment the public authority should consider if the policy should be mitigated or an alternative policy be introduced - please provide details.

N/A

If the decision is to subject the policy to an equality impact assessment, please provide details of the reasons.

N/A

Mitigation

When the public authority concludes that the likely impact is 'minor' and an equality impact assessment is not to be conducted, the public authority may consider mitigation to lessen the severity of any equality impact, or the introduction of an alternative policy to better promote equality of opportunity or good relations.

Can the policy/decision be amended or changed or an alternative policy introduced to better promote equality of opportunity and/or good relations?

No

If so, **give the reasons** to support your decision, together with the proposed changes/amendments or alternative policy.

N/A

Timetabling and prioritising

Factors to be considered in timetabling and prioritising policies for equality impact assessment.

If the policy has been **'screened in'** for equality impact assessment, then please answer the following questions to determine its priority for timetabling the equality impact assessment.

On a scale of 1-3, with 1 being the lowest priority and 3 being the highest, assess the policy in terms of its priority for equality impact assessment.

Priority criterion	Rating (1-3)
Effect on equality of opportunity and good relations	
Social need	
Effect on people's daily lives	
Relevance to a public authority's functions	

Note: The Total Rating Score should be used to prioritise the policy in rank order with other policies screened in for equality impact assessment. This list of priorities will assist the public authority in timetabling. Details of the Public Authority's Equality Impact Assessment Timetable should be included in the quarterly Screening Report.

Is the policy affected by timetables established by other relevant public authorities?

N/A

If yes, please provide details.

Part 4. Monitoring

Public authorities should consider the guidance contained in the Commission's Monitoring Guidance for Use by Public Authorities (July 2007).

The Commission recommends that where the policy has been amended or an alternative policy introduced, the public authority should monitor more broadly than for adverse impact (See Benefits, P.9-10, paras 2.13 – 2.20 of the Monitoring Guidance).

Effective monitoring will help the public authority identify any future adverse impact arising from the policy which may lead the public authority to conduct an equality impact assessment, as well as help with future planning and policy development.

To provide further assurance regarding implementation, the Regulation Quality Improvement Authority (RQIA) will extend its support of regional audits to cover some clinically based NICE guidance and will look at a sample of the technology appraisals each year.

Part 5 - Approval and authorisation

Screened by:	Position/Job Title	Date
Jonathan Adair	Acting EO2	23/03/2021
Approved by:		
Steven White	DP	23/03/2021
Copied to EHRU:		

The Screening Template is 'signed off' and approved by a senior manager responsible for the policy, made easily accessible on the public authority's website as soon as possible following completion and made available on request.