



Aesthetic Abdominal Procedures

Version:	2016-19
Ratified by:	NHS Leeds West CCG Assurance Committee on; 16 November 2016 NHS Leeds North CCG Governance on Performance and Risk Committee on; 17 November 2016 NHS Leeds South and East CCG Governance and Risk Committee on 13 November 2016
Name & Title of originator/author(s):	Dr Simon Stockill Medical Director, NHS Leeds West CCG Dr Manjit Purewal, Medical Director NHS Leeds North CCG Dr David Mitchell, Medical Director NHS Leeds South and East CCG Dr Fiona Day, Consultant in Public Health Medicine, Leeds City Council
Name of responsible committee/individual:	Dr Simon Stockill Medical Director, NHS Leeds West CCG Governing Body Dr Manjit Purewal, Medical Director NHS Leeds North CCG Governing Body Dr David Mitchell, Medical Director NHS Leeds South and East CCG Governing Body
Date issued:	July 2017
Review date:	December 2019
Target audience:	Primary and secondary care clinicians, individual funding request panels, and the public
Document History:	Leeds CCGs Cosmetic Exceptions and Exclusions Policy Feb 2014

Executive Summary

This policy applies to all Individual Funding Requests (IFR) for people registered with General Practitioners in the following three Clinical Commissioning Groups (CCGs), where the CCG is the responsible commissioner for this treatment or service:

- NHS Leeds West CCG
- NHS Leeds North CCG
- NHS Leeds South and East CCG

This policy does not apply where any one of the Leeds CCGs is not the responsible commissioner.

The policy updates all previous policies and must (where appropriate) be read in association with the other relevant Clinical Commissioning Groups in Leeds commissioning policies, which are to be applied across all three CCGs, including but not limited to policies on cosmetic exceptions and non-commissioned activity.

All IFR and associated policies will be publically available on the internet for each CCG.

This policy relates specifically to **Aesthetic Abdominal Procedures**.

Contents

1	Introduction	4
2	Purpose	4
3	Scope	5
4	Definitions	7
5	Duties	7
6	Main Body of Policy	8
7	Equality Impact Assessment (EIA).....	9
8	Implications and Associated Risks.....	9
9	Education and Training Requirements.....	9
10	Monitoring Compliance and Effectiveness	9
11	Associated Documentation	9
12	References	10
Appendices		12
A	Equality Impact Assessment.....	12
B	Policy Consultation Process:	14
C	Version Control Sheet.....	15

1 Introduction

The Clinical Commissioning Groups (CCGs) (NHS Leeds West CCG, NHS Leeds North CCG and NHS Leeds South and East CCG) were established on 1 April 2013 under the Health and Social Care Act 2012 as the statutory bodies responsible for commissioning services for the patients for whom they are responsible in accordance with s3 National Health Service Act 2006.

As part of these duties, there is a need to commission services which are evidence based, cost effective, improve health outcomes, reduce health inequalities and represent value for money for the taxpayer. The CCGs in Leeds are accountable to their constituent populations and Member Practices for funding decisions.

In relation to decisions on Individual Funding Requests (IFR), the CCGs in Leeds have a clear and transparent process and policy for decision making. They have a clear CCG specific appeals process to allow patients and their clinicians to be reassured that due process has been followed in IFR decisions made by the Non Commissioned Activity Panel, Cosmetic Exclusions and Exceptions Panel, or Non NICE Non Tariff Drug Panel (the IFR panels).

Due consideration must be given to IFRs for services or treatments which do not form part of core commissioning arrangements, or need to be assessed as exceptions to Leeds CCGs Commissioning Policies. This process must be equitably applied to all IFRs.

All IFR and associated policies will be publically available on the internet for each CCG. Specialist services that are commissioned by NHS England or Public Health England are not included in this policy.

2 Purpose

The purpose of the IFR policy is to enable officers of the Leeds CCGs to exercise their responsibilities properly and transparently in relation to IFRs, and to provide advice to general practitioners, clinicians, patients and members of the public about IFRs. Implementing the policy ensures that commissioning decisions in relation to IFRs are consistent and not taken in an ad-hoc manner without due regard to equitable access and good governance arrangements. Decisions are based on best evidence but made within the funding allocation of the CCGs.

The policy outlines the process for decision making with regard to services/treatments which are not normally commissioned by the CCGs in Leeds, and is designed to ensure consistency in this decision making process.

The policy is underpinned by the following key principles:

- The decisions of the IFR panels outlined in the policy are fair, reasonable and lawful, and are open to external scrutiny.
- Funding decisions are based on clinical evidence and not solely on the budgetary constraints.

- Compliance with standing financial instructions / and statutory instruments in the commissioning of healthcare in relation to contractual arrangements with providers.

Whilst the majority of service provision is commissioned through established service agreements with providers, there are occasions when services are excluded or not routinely available within the National Health Service (NHS). This may be due to advances in medicine or the introduction of new treatments and therapies or a new cross-Leeds Clinical Commissioning Group statement. The IFR process therefore provides a mechanism to allow drugs/treatments that are not routinely commissioned by the Leeds CCGs to be considered for individuals in exceptional circumstances.

3 Scope

The CCGs in Leeds have established the processes outlined in this policy to consider and manage IFRs in relation to the following types of requests:

Policy development and review: consultation and engagement

The policy was developed to:

- ensure a clear and transparent approach is in place for exceptional/individual funding request decision making; and
- provide reassurance to patients and clinicians that decisions are made in a fair, open, equitable and consistent manner.

It was originally developed in line with NICE or equivalent guidance where this was available or based on a review of scientific literature. This included engagement with hospital clinicians, general practice, CCG patient advisory groups, and the general public cascaded through a range, mechanisms.

The policy review was undertaken using any updated NICE or equivalent guidance, and input from clinicians was sought where possible. Engagement sessions with patient leaders were undertaken and all policies individually reviewed. Patient leaders were satisfied with the process by which the policy was developed, particularly in light of the robust process (including extensive patient engagement) by which NICE guidance are developed, and acknowledging their own local role in providing assurance. No concerns were raised with regard to the policy

Aesthetic Abdominal Procedures

Leeds CCGs *do not routinely commission* aesthetic (cosmetic) surgery and other related procedures that are medically unnecessary.

Providing certain criteria are met, Leeds CCGs will commission aesthetic (cosmetic) surgery and other procedures to improve the functioning of a body part or where medically necessary even if the surgery or procedure also improves or changes the appearance of a portion of the body.

Please note that, whilst this policy addresses many common procedures, it does not address all procedures that might be considered to be cosmetic. Leeds CCGs reserve the right not to commission other procedures considered cosmetic and not

medically necessary. This policy is to be used in conjunction with the Individual Funding Requests (IFR) Policy for Leeds CCGs and other related policies.

Leeds CCGs routinely commission interventional procedures where National Institute for Health and Care Excellence (NICE) guidance arrangements indicate “normal” or “offered routinely” or “recommended as option(s)” and the evidence of safety and effectiveness is sufficiently robust.

Leeds CCGs do not routinely commission interventional procedures where NICE guidance arrangement indicates “special”, “other”, “research only” and “do not use”.

The commissioning statements for individual procedures are the same as those issued by NICE. (www.nice.org.uk).

An individual funding request (IFR) may be submitted for a patient who is felt to be an exception to the commissioning statements as per the Individual Funding Request Policy.

The CCGs accept there are clinical situations that are unique (five or fewer patients) where an IFR is appropriate and exceptionality may be difficult to demonstrate.

Whilst the Leeds CCGs are always interested in innovation that makes more effective use of resources, in year introduction of a procedure does not mean the CCGs will routinely commission the use of the procedure.

An individual funding request is not an appropriate mechanism to introduce a new treatment for a group or cohort of patients. Where treatment is for a cohort larger than five patients, that is a proposal to develop the service, the introduction of a new procedure should go through the usual business planning process. CCGs will not fund interventional procedures for cohorts over 5 patients introduced outside a business planning process.

Endpoints

Following completion of the agreed treatment, a proportionate follow up process will lead to a final review appointment with the clinician where both patient and clinician agree that a satisfactory end point has been reached. This should be at the discretion of the individual clinician and based on agreeing reasonable and acceptable clinical and/ or cosmetic outcomes.

Once the satisfactory end point has been agreed and achieved, the patient will be discharged from the service.

Requests for treatment for unacceptable outcomes post treatment will only be considered through the Individual Funding Request route. Such requests will only be considered where a) the patient was satisfied with the outcome at the time of discharge and b) becomes dissatisfied at a later date. In these circumstances the patient is not automatically entitled to further treatment. Any further treatment will therefore be at the relevant Leeds Clinical Commissioning Group’s discretion, and will be considered on an exceptional basis in accordance with the IFR policy.

Leeds CCGs are committed to supporting patients to stop smoking in line with NICE guidance in order to improve short and long term patient outcomes and reduce

health inequalities. Referring GPs and secondary care clinicians are reminded to ensure the patient is supported to stop smoking at every step along the elective pathway and especially for flap based procedures (in line with plastic surgery literature: abdominoplasty, panniculectomy, breast reduction, other breast procedures).

4 Definitions

The CCGs in Leeds are not prescriptive in their definitions. Each IFR will be considered on its merits, applying this Policy.

Routinely commissioned – this means that this intervention is routinely commissioned as outlined in the relevant policy, or when a particular threshold is met. Prior approval may or may not be required, refer to the policy for more information.

Exceptionality request – this means that for a service which is not routinely commissioned, or a threshold is not met, the clinician may request funding on the 'grounds of exceptionality' through the individual funding request process. Decisions on exceptionality will be made using the framework defined in the overarching policy 'Individual Funding Requests (IFR) Policy for the Clinical Commissioning Groups in Leeds'.

5 Duties

Whilst this policy and associated decision making policies will be applied on a cross- Leeds basis for patients from all three CCGs in Leeds, each individual CCG will retain responsibility for the decision making for its own patients. To this end, each CCG will delegate its decision making in relation to IFRs to a CCG specific decision maker for patients from that specific CCG, in accordance with its own Constitution.

This decision maker will attend the relevant IFR panel and will also have responsibility for approving the triage process for patients from their own CCG population. The triage process is the process of screening requests to see whether the request meets the policy criteria and which referrals need to be considered by an IFR panel; see sections on IFR panels for more information. The decision maker for each CCG is responsible for decision making solely for patients within their own CCG registered population. This will normally be the Medical Director or their designate. This will be detailed in the CCG Constitution as an Appendix.

In exceptional circumstances, when a CCG is unable to send a delegated decision maker to the IFR panel, the panel may discuss the case in their absence and may make a recommendation. However, the decision maker for the specific CCG must make the final decision whether or not to approve the IFR.

6 Main Body of Policy

Exceptionality funding can be applied for in line with the overarching policy through the IFR process if you believe your patient is an exception to the commissioning position. Please refer to the overarching policy for more information.

6.1 Repair of true incisional or ventral hernias

Status: routinely commissioned

Leeds CCGs consider repair of a true incisional or ventral hernia to be medically necessary, these are routinely commissioned.

In order to distinguish a ventral hernia repair from a purely cosmetic abdominoplasty, the surgeon must document the size of the hernia, whether the ventral hernia is reducible, whether the hernia is accompanied by pain or other symptoms, the extent of diastasis (separation) of rectus abdominus muscles, whether there is a defect (as opposed to mere thinning) of the abdominal fascia, and other notes indicating the presence and size of the fascial defect.

6.2 Panniculectomy following significant weight loss for males and females

Status: Prior Approval via IFR process is always required

This framework applies for all patients who achieve significant weight loss either through weight management programmes or through Bariatric Surgery. Removal of redundant skin folds resulting from weight loss after surgery or planned weight loss is not routinely commissioned by Leeds CCGs unless the criteria outlined below are met.

Primary eligibility criteria (for any of the above procedures)

- Patient's BMI must be 30 or less for 12 months AND
- There must have been at least 25% weight loss AND
- a period of more than 2 years must have elapsed since the weight loss surgery or period of significant weight loss AND
- Photographic evidence of the condition is required by the IFR panel – only photographs taken by medical photography will be accepted

Requests that do not meet these criteria will be rejected prior to panel unless there are very clear grounds for exception.

Leeds CCGs consider panniculectomy only medically necessary where, in addition to the primary eligibility criteria:

- the panniculus hangs below the level of the pubis (covers the whole of the mons pubis); AND
- the medical records document that the panniculus causes chronic intertrigo (dermatitis occurring on opposed surfaces of the skin) that consistently recurs over 3 months while receiving appropriate medical therapy, or remains refractory to appropriate medical therapy over a period of 3 months.

6.3 Abdominoplasty, Panniculectomy and abdominal suction lipectomy for other reasons than significant weight loss

Status: Prior Approval via IFR process is always required

Leeds CCGs consider abdominoplasty, panniculectomy and suction lipectomy to be cosmetic for any other reason than in section 6.2 and will not be routinely funded. Any requests for funding require exceptionality approval.

7 Equality Impact Assessment (EIA)

This document has been assessed, using the EIA toolkit, to ensure consideration has been given to the actual or potential impacts on staff, certain communities or population groups, appropriate action has been taken to mitigate or eliminate the negative impacts and maximise the positive impacts and that the implementation plans are appropriate and proportionate.

These policies are designed to mitigate or eliminate any negative impacts and to maximise positive impacts.

The full EIA is attached as Appendix A.

8 Implications and Associated Risks

This policy and supporting frameworks set evidence based boundaries to interventions available on the NHS. It may conflict with expectations of individual patients and clinicians.

9 Education and Training Requirements

Members of the panels will undergo training at least every three years, particularly in relation to the legal precedents around IFRs. Effective policy dissemination is required for local clinicians.

10 Monitoring Compliance and Effectiveness

Each IFR panel will maintain an accurate database of cases approved and rejected, to enable consideration of amendments to future commissioning intentions and to ensure consistency in the application of the CCGs in Leeds Commissioning Policies.

The financial impact of approvals outside of existing Service Level Agreements will be monitored to ensure the Leeds CCGs identify expenditure and ensure appropriate value for money. Member Practice clinicians need to be aware that all referrals will ultimately be a call on their own CCG budgets.

11 Associated Documentation

This policy must be read in conjunction with the underpinning Leeds CCGs decision making frameworks.

12 References

1. Core GB, Mizgala CL, Bowen JC 3rd, Vasconez LO. Endoscopic abdominoplasty with repair of diastasis recti and abdominal wall hernia. *Clin Plast Surg.* 1995;22(4):707-722.
2. Lockwood T. Rectus muscle diastasis in males: Primary indication for endoscopically assisted abdominoplasty. *Plast Reconstr Surg.* 1998;101(6):1685-1691.
3. Bridenstine JB. Use of ultra-high frequency electrosurgery (radiosurgery) for cosmetic surgical procedures. *Dermatol Surg.* 1998;24(3):397-400.
4. Matarasso A, Matarasso SL. When does your liposuction patient require an abdominoplasty? *Dermatol Surg.* 1997;23(12):1151-1160.
5. Nahas FX, Augusto SM, Ghelfond C. Should diastasis recti be corrected? *Aesthetic Plast Surg.* 1997;21(4):285-289.
6. O'Brien JJ, Glasgow A, Lydon P. Endoscopic balloon-assisted abdominoplasty. *Plast Reconstr Surg.* 1997;99(5):1462-1463.
7. No authors listed. Guiding principles for liposuction. The American Society for Dermatologic Surgery, February 1997. *Dermatol Surg.* 1997;23(12):1127-1129.
8. Coleman WP 3rd, Lawrence N. Liposuction. *Dermatol Surg.* 1997;23(12):1125
9. No authors listed. Update from the Ultrasonic Liposuction Task Force of the American Society for Dermatologic Surgery. *Dermatol Surg.* 1997;23(3):211-214.
10. Apfelberg DB. Results of multicentred study of laser-assisted liposuction. *Clin Plast Surg.* 1996;23(4):713-719.
11. Ramirez OM. Abdominoplasty and abdominal wall rehabilitation: A comprehensive approach. *Plast Reconstr Surg.* 2000;105(1):425-435.
12. Elbaz JS, Flageul G, Olivier-Masveyraud F. "Classical" abdominoplasty. *Ann Chir Plast Esthet.* 1999;44(4):443-461.
13. Micheau P, Grolleau JL. Incisional hernia. Patient management. Approach to the future operated patients. *Ann Chir Plast Esthet.* 1999;44(4):325-338.
14. Vastine VL, Morgan RF, Williams GS, et al. Wound complications of abdominoplasty in obese patients. *Ann Plast Surg.* 1999;42(1):34-39.
15. Cardenas-Camarena L, Gonzalez LE. Large-volume liposuction and extensive abdominoplasty: A feasible alternative for improving body shape. *Plast Reconstr Surg.* 1998;102(5):1698-1707.
16. Cassar K, Munro A. Surgical treatment of incisional hernia. *Br J Surg.* 2002;89(5):534-545.
17. Dumanian GA, Denham W. Comparison of repair techniques for major incisional hernias. *Am J Surg.* 2003;185(1):61-65.
18. Aly AS, Cram AE, Chao M, et al. Belt lipectomy for circumferential truncal excess: The University of Iowa experience. *Plast Reconstr Surg.* 2003;111(1):398-413.
19. Golladay ES. Abdominal hernias. eMedicine General Surgery Topic 2703. Omaha, NE: [eMedicine.com](http://www.emedicine.com); updated July 9, 2002. Available at: <http://www.emedicine.com/med/topic2703.htm>. Accessed July 2013.
20. State of Minnesota, Health Technology Advisory Committee. Tumescant liposuction. St. Paul, MN: HTAC; 2002.
21. Cooter R, Robinson D, Babidge W, et al. Systematic review of ultrasound-assisted lipoplasty: Update and reappraisal. North Adelaide, Australia: Royal Australasian College of Surgeons, Australian Safety and Efficacy Register of New Interventional Procedures (ASERNIP) — Surgical; 2002.
22. Patterson J. Outcomes of abdominoplasty. Bazian Ltd., eds. London, UK: Wessex Institute for Health Research and Development, University of Southampton; 2003.
23. Pham C, Middleton P, Watkin S, Maddern G. Laparoscopic ventral hernia repair: An accelerated systematic review. North Adelaide, Australia: Australian Safety and Efficacy Register of New Interventional Procedures — Surgical (ASERNIP-S); 2004.
24. Kannan K, Ng C, Ravintharan T. Laparoscopic ventral hernia repair: Local experience. *Singapore Med J.* 2004;45(6):271-275.
25. Sanchez LJ, Bencini L, Moretti R. Recurrences after laparoscopic ventral hernia repair: Results and critical review. *Hernia.* 2004;8(2):138-143.
26. Egea DA, Martinez JA, Cuenca GM, et al. Mortality following laparoscopic ventral hernia repair: Lessons from 90 consecutive cases and bibliographical analysis. *Hernia.* 2004;8(3):208-212.
27. LeBlanc KA. Incisional hernia repair: Laparoscopic techniques. *World J Surg.* 2005;29(8):1073-1079.
28. Van Geffen HJ, Simmermacher RK. Incisional hernia repair: abdominoplasty, tissue expansion, and methods of augmentation. *World J Surg.* 2005;29(8):1080-1085.

29. Bragg TW, Jose RM, Srivastava S. Patient satisfaction following abdominoplasty: An NHS experience. *J Plast Reconstr Aesthet Surg.* 2007;60(1):75-78.
30. Graf R, de Araujo LR, Rippel R, et al. Lipoabdominoplasty: Liposuction with reduced undermining and traditional abdominal skin flap resection. *Aesthetic Plast Surg.* 2006;30(1):1-8.
31. Vila-Rovira R. Lipoabdominoplasty. *Clin Plast Surg.* 2008;35(1):95-104; discussion 105.
32. Heller JB, Teng E, Knoll BI, Persing J. Outcome analysis of combined lipoabdominoplasty versus conventional abdominoplasty. *Plast Reconstr Surg.* 2008;121(5):1821-1829.
33. Halbesma GJ, van der Lei B. The reverse abdominoplasty: A report of seven cases and a review of English-language literature. *Ann Plast Surg.* 2008;61(2):133-137.
34. den Hartog D, Dur AH, Tuinebreijer WE, Kreis RW. Open surgical procedures for incisional hernias. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev.* 2008;(3):CD006438.
35. Pring CM, Tran V, O'Rourke N, Martin IJ. Laparoscopic versus open ventral hernia repair: A randomized controlled trial. *ANZ J Surg.* 2008;78(10):903-906.
36. Staalesen T, Elander A, Strandell A, Bergh C. A systematic review of outcomes of abdominoplasty. *J Plast Surg Hand Surg.* 2012;46(3-4):139-144.
37. Aetna Clinical Policy Bulletins http://www.aetna.com/cpb/cpb_menu.html Accessed July 2013
38. Laparoscopic ventral hernia repair: An accelerated systematic review. North Adelaide, Australia: Australian Safety and Efficacy Register of New Interventional Procedures — Surgical (ASERNIP-S); 2004.

Appendices

A Equality Impact Assessment

Title of policy	Aesthetic Abdominal Procedures	
Names and roles of people completing the assessment	Fiona Day Consultant in Public Health Medicine, Helen Lewis, Head of Acute Provider Commissioning	
Date assessment started/completed	26.6.16	25.7.16

1. Outline

Give a brief summary of the policy	The purpose of the commissioning policy is to enable officers of the Leeds CCGs to exercise their responsibilities properly and transparently in relation to commissioned treatments including individual funding requests, and to provide advice to general practitioners, clinicians, patients and members of the public about IFRs. Implementing the policy ensures that commissioning decisions are consistent and not taken in an ad-hoc manner without due regard to equitable access and good governance arrangements. Decisions are based on best evidence but made within the funding allocation of the CCGs. This policy relates to requests for aesthetic abdominal procedures.
What outcomes do you want to achieve	We commission services equitably and only when medically necessary and in line with current evidence on cost effectiveness.

2. Evidence, data or research

Give details of evidence, data or research used to inform the analysis of impact	See list of references
---	------------------------

3. Consultation, engagement

Give details of all consultation and engagement activities used to	Discussion with clinicians and patient representatives on the principles of decision making. Discussion with patient leaders relating to changes in the content of the policy and advice on proportionate engagement.
---	---

inform the analysis of impact	<p>The policy review was undertaken using any updated NICE or equivalent guidance, and input from clinicians was sought where possible. Engagement sessions with patient leaders were undertaken and all policies individually reviewed. The patient leaders were satisfied with the process by which the policy was developed, particularly in light of the robust process (including extensive patient engagement) by which NICE guidance are developed, and acknowledging their own local role in providing assurance. No concerns were raised with regard the policy.</p> <p>Local clinical commissioning and clinical providers have had the opportunity to comment on the draft policies.</p>
--------------------------------------	---

4. Analysis of impact			
<p>This is the core of the assessment, using the information above detail the actual or likely impact on protected groups, with consideration of the general duty to; eliminate unlawful discrimination; advance equality of opportunity; foster good relations</p>			
	Are there any likely impacts? Are any groups going to be affected differently? Please describe.	Are these negative or positive?	What action will be taken to address any negative impacts or enhance positive ones?
Age	No		
Carers	No		
Disability	No		
Sex	No		
Race	No		
Religion or belief	No		
Sexual orientation	No		
Gender reassignment	No		
Pregnancy and maternity	No		
Marriage and civil	No		

partnership			
Other relevant group	No		
If any negative/positive impacts were identified are they valid, legal and/or justifiable?			
Please detail.			

5. Monitoring, Review and Publication			
How will you review/monitor the impact and effectiveness of your actions	Annual report of IFR activity reported through relevant committees to Governing Bodies of the 3 CCGs. A limited equity audit is undertaken as part of this. Complaints and appeals monitoring.		
Lead Officer	Simon Stockill	Review date:	Dec 2019

6. Sign off			
Lead Officer			
Director on behalf of the 3 Leeds CCG Medical Directors	Dr Simon Stockill, Medical Director, Leeds West CCG	Date approved:	24.8.16

B Policy Consultation Process:

Title of document	Aesthetic Abdominal Procedures
Author	F Day
New / Revised document	Revised
Lists of persons involved in developing the policy	F Day Consultant in Public Health Medicine, Leeds City Council Donald Dewar, Consultant Plastic Surgeon, LTHT
List of persons involved in the consultation process	See appendix A

C Version Control Sheet

Version	Date	Author	Status	Comment
1	26.6.16	F Day	Draft	Only change from previous policy- loss of sentence stating criteria for exceptionality in 6.3 to ensure consistency with other policies ' <i>If there is substantial panniculus restricting function or causing skin ulceration.</i> ' on advice from consultant plastic surgeon
3	29.6.17	F Day	Policy	Clarification of the panniculus level required for approval <ul style="list-style-type: none"> the panniculus hangs below the level of the pubis (covers the whole of the mons pubis);