

Decision Support Unit Project Specification Form	
Project Number	DSU/2015-16/M/24
Appraisal title	Quality assurance of models which inform NICE Technology Appraisals
Synopsis of the technical issue	<p>In March 2013 HM Treasury published a series of recommendations on quality assurance for analytical models that inform government policy (The Macpherson Recommendations).</p> <p>Assessment Groups (AGs) and Evidence Review Groups (ERGs) have the opportunity to contribute to NICE's quality assurance process in two ways. Firstly they provide external peer review of economic models submitted either by the company within the STA process or by consultees within the MTA process. Secondly, within the MTA process it is usual for the AG to develop a <i>de novo</i> economic model, which they are responsible for quality assuring. Within STA's the ERG's may sometimes use the company's economic model to carry out further exploratory analyses which may require them to modify the model in several ways. The ERG is responsible for quality assuring the modified model that is used to generate those exploratory analyses.</p> <p>NICE has asked the DSU to look at whether quality assurance processes are consistent across the nine Independent Academic Centres who are commissioned to provide AGs or ERGs to the Technology Appraisals Programme and to develop a consensus statement on the quality assurance processes that should be used by AGs and ERGs.</p>
Question(s) to be answered by DSU	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. What quality assurance processes could be employed by the AGs and ERGs 2. Which of these processes are already being employed by AGs and ERGs

	<p>and how consistent is their application across the 9 Independent Academic Centres.</p> <p>3. Which quality assurance processes could be practically implemented by AGs and ERGs within NICE's existing timelines given the resources available within the Independent Academic Centres.</p>
How will the DSU address these questions	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Survey senior staff from the Independent Academic Centres to establish the current use of quality assurance processes within AGs and ERGs. 2. Identify additional quality assurance processes that could be employed from the existing published review by Chilcott et al.,¹ and relevant guidance from HM Treasury (Macpherson Report² and the Aqua book³). 3. Invite the senior staff from the Independent Academic Centres to attend a workshop with the aim of developing a consensus statement on quality assurance processes for AGs and ERGs <p>References</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Chilcott J, Tappenden P, Rawdin A, Johnson M, Kaltenthaler E, Paisley S, et al. Avoiding and identifying errors in health technology assessment models: qualitative study and methodological review Health Technology Assessment 2010; 14(25). 2. Macpherson N. Review of quality assurance of Government analytical models: final report. HM Treasury. March 2013 3. The Aqua Book: guidance on producing quality analysis for government. HM Treasury March 2015
Exact analyses required	One survey questionnaire will be sent to each academic centre. Separate responses will be requested for MTAs and STAs due to differing timelines and resources.

DSU deliverables/outcomes (eg report, statement, etc)	<ol style="list-style-type: none">1) A report describing a) quality assurance methods identified from the published systematic review and relevant HM Treasury guidance, b) the survey methodology, c) the survey results and d) a description of the issues discussed at the workshop.2) A consensus statement on the quality assurance processes that should be used by AGs and ERGs
---	---