

Decision Support Summary

Cheshire and Merseyside Area Prescribing Group

Name and type of submission: Click or tap here to add the name and type of submission.

Date assessment tool complete: Click or tap here to the date this tool was completed.

Completed by: Click or tap here to enter your name.

Subgroup consensus

Formal application submitted and approved	☐ Yes	□ No	☐ Not applicable
Formulary status (RAG) agreed	☐ Yes	□ No	☐ Not applicable
Implementation requirements agreed	☐ Yes	□ No	☐ Not applicable
Implementation monitoring agreed	☐ Yes	□ No	☐ Not applicable
Expected outcomes and benefits identified	☐ Yes	□ No	☐ Not applicable
Comments:			

Impact summary

Implementation has been considered	☐ Yes	□ No	☐ Not applicable
Financial impact has been assessed	☐ Yes	□ No	☐ Not applicable
Impact on other parts of the system is understood	☐ Yes	□ No	☐ Not applicable
Impact on existing workload, existing pathways, or expertise considered	☐ Yes	□ No	☐ Not applicable
Workforce capacity has been considered	☐ Yes	□ No	☐ Not applicable

APG approval date: 04 Aug 2023

Review date: Aug 2027 (or earlier if there significant new information relating to this summary)

Area Prescribing Group administration provided by Midlands and Lancashire Commissioning Support Unit

Decision support summary

Version: 3.0

Governance requirements or prescribing restrictions identified	☐ Yes	□ No	☐ Not applicable
ICB ability to meet its statutory requirements is accounted for	☐ Yes	□ No	☐ Not applicable
Comments:			
Appropriateness			
Strategic fit with ICB and local priorities is confirmed	☐ Yes	□ No	☐ Not applicable
Safety concerns been addressed	☐ Yes	□ No	☐ Not applicable
Patient factors have been identified	☐ Yes	□ No	☐ Not applicable
Place in therapy identified	☐ Yes	□ No	☐ Not applicable
Wider stakeholder view is the same as the subgroup	☐ Yes	□ No	☐ Not applicable
Delivery of a net zero NHS is supported	☐ Yes	□ No	☐ Not applicable
Comments: (include place in therapy)			
Effectiveness			
Evidence for clinical effectiveness is robust	☐ Yes	□ No	☐ Not applicable
Evidence for cost-effectiveness robust	☐ Yes	□ No	☐ Not applicable
The submission supported with NICE or some other national or local commissioning policy	☐ Yes	□ No	☐ Not applicable
Comments:			
Ethics			
Improved health, wellbeing, independence, and outcomes have been identified	☐ Yes	□ No	☐ Not applicable
Health inequalities are unaffected or have been addressed	☐ Yes	□ No	☐ Not applicable
Protected groups are unaffected or have been supported	☐ Yes	□ No	☐ Not applicable
	,		

Access for the whole of Cheshire and Merseyside is equitable	☐ Yes	□ No	☐ Not applicable
Comments:			
Affordability			
Financial savings have been identified	☐ Yes	□ No	☐ Not applicable
Additional costs have been considered	☐ Yes	□ No	☐ Not applicable
A requirement for funding has been identified	☐ Yes	□ No	☐ Not applicable
Comments:			
Area Prescribing Group decision			
This submission is supported for ICB approval	☐ Yes	□ No	☐ Not applicable
The proposed RAG designation is supported	☐ Yes	□ No	☐ Not applicable
Comments:			
Signatories			
<u>→</u>			
Name of APG chair			
→			
Date and signature			