

Cheshire and Merseyside Area Prescribing Group

Decision support summary

Proposal	Notes	Approval
Add the drug and indication as a human readable	[optional] Date of NICE TA publication: date	MOP: start with the meeting date and add relevant
hyperlink.	[optional] Approval for implementation: 30 or 90	commentary.
Add the RAG designation.	days	[optional] FIRC/CEG: start with the meeting date
APG subgroup: meeting date	[optional] Deadline for implementation: date	and add relevant commentary
APG: meeting date	Brief summary of the most important reasoning.	
	Include costings and links to other information if applicable.	

Recommendation

What is the 'ask'?

Rationale

How did we come to this decision?

Is it a new therapy for a gap in treatment or a 'better' new therapy?

Why 'this' argument vs 'that' argument? Are there other options?

Why were the other options not used and what are the consequences. What is the impact on therapy?

Supporting information					
Additional facts useful to understanding in order of importance.					
What has been considered?					
APG decision					
Assurance of process and all relevant factors considered	□Y€	es 🗆 No	☐ Not applicable		
This submission is supported for ICB approval	□Ye	es 🗆 No	☐ Not applicable		
The proposed RAG designation is supported	□Y€	es 🗆 No	☐ Not applicable		
Declarations of interest have been managed	□Y€	es 🗆 No	☐ Not applicable		
Comments:					
Declarations of interest:					
APG subgroup summary					
Formal application submitted and prioritised	□Y€	es 🗆 No	☐ Not applicable		
Formulary status (RAG) agreed	□Y€	es 🗆 No	☐ Not applicable		
Consultation feedback addressed	□Y€	es 🗆 No	☐ Not applicable		
Declarations of interest managed	□Ye	es 🗆 No	☐ Not applicable		
Comments:					
Declarations of interest:					
Implementation					
Implementation requirements identified	□Y€	es 🗆 No	☐ Not applicable		

Impact on existing workload, existing pathways, or expertise considered	□ Yes	□ No	☐ Not applicable
ScriptSwitch message developed	☐ Yes	□ No	☐ Not applicable
Impact monitoring identified	□ Yes	□ No	☐ Not applicable
Access for the whole of Cheshire and Merseyside is equitable	☐ Yes	□ No	☐ Not applicable
Border issues considered	□ Yes	□ No	☐ Not applicable
Workforce capacity considered	□ Yes	□ No	☐ Not applicable
Governance requirements or prescribing restrictions identified	□ Yes	□ No	☐ Not applicable
Delivery of a net zero carbon NHS is supported	□ Yes	□ No	☐ Not applicable
ICB ability to meet its statutory requirements considered	☐ Yes	□ No	☐ Not applicable
Comments:		'	
Appropriateness			
Outcomes identified	□ Yes	□ No	☐ Not applicable
Aligned with ICB and local priorities	□ Yes	□ No	☐ Not applicable
Safety concerns identified	□ Yes	□ No	☐ Not applicable
Patient factors identified	□ Yes	□ No	☐ Not applicable
Place in therapy identified	□ Yes	□ No	☐ Not applicable
Effect on health inequalities considered	□ Yes	□ No	☐ Not applicable
Effect on protected groups considered	□ Yes	□ No	☐ Not applicable
Comments: (include place in therapy and any safety mitigations)			

Effectiveness

Evidence for clinical effectiveness reviewed	□ Yes	□ No	☐ Not applicable
Evidence for cost-effectiveness reviewed	☐ Yes	□ No	☐ Not applicable
The submission supported by national or local commissioning policy	☐ Yes	□ No	☐ Not applicable
Comments:			
Financial considerations			
Drug savings and costs assessed	☐ Yes	□ No	☐ Not applicable
Additional savings and costs assessed	☐ Yes	□ No	☐ Not applicable
Comments:			