

Wound Care Advisory Group meeting held on 10 February 2015

(Recommendations for web publishing)

The role of the Wound Care Advisory Group (WCAG) is to:

- provide objective advice to PHARMAC on the possible approaches for standardisation and rationalisation of wound care products nationally,
- assist with defining requirements and specifications that require consideration in relation to each wound care subcategory,
- review clinical evidence and appropriateness of new wound care products and/or new technology offered by wound care suppliers,
- help ensure that products are fit for purpose, clinically appropriate and meet the needs of patients at a sustainable cost, and
- consider, make recommendations or report to PHARMAC and/or PTAC on any other matters that may be referred to it by PHARMAC.

This document contains recommendations made by the WCAG at its 10 February 2015 meeting. Numbering has been updated to reflect this.

1. Members present from the Wound Care Advisory Group:

Julie Betts (Chair)
Alan Shackleton
Amanda Pagan
Catherine Hammond
Susie Wendelborn
Wendy Mildon

2. Recommendations

After reviewing further information provided by suppliers and questions from PHARMAC staff, the Group recommended the following:

- 2.1 Remove Conforming Bandages as a subcategory and move to Securement Bandages subcategory groupings.
- 2.2 Clarify with USL whether its brand of elastic adhesive bandages is impregnated with zinc, and if yes, move into impregnated zinc bandages subcategory.
- 2.3 Highlight antimicrobial dressings that have possible crossover of products in medicines for internal purposes, so that the Group is aware of other clinicians that would have an interest in these products.
- 2.4 Amend “Simple Single Adhesive Dressings” subcategory heading to “Simple First Aid Dressings”.
- 2.5 Leave Nipple Dressing under the Maternity subcategory heading.
- 2.6 Leave Cutinova under Foam Dressings subcategory heading.
- 2.7 Leave recommendations 2.47 and 2.48 from the previous meeting actioned.
- 2.8 Create new “Collagen Dressings” subcategory and move Biobrane range of products into this subcategory.
- 2.9 Transparent Film Silicone Dressings should be identified separately to other transparent film dressings under the Transparent Film Dressings heading.
- 2.10 Leave burns bags under the “Other” category under its own subcategory heading.
- 2.11 Leave Smith & Nephew’s “Cloths – Sterile” listing as is.
- 2.12 Move Smith & Nephew’s “Post-Surgical Dressings” listing under the “Wound Dressing Packs” subcategory heading.
- 2.13 Leave Jackson Allison’s “Dressing Bags” listing as is.

- 2.14 Reverse previous recommendation 2.73 regarding “Skin Preparations” subcategory heading.
- 2.15 Leave recommendations 2.77 – 2.78 actioned.
- 2.16 Fabric Tapes – Fabric Tapes – High Adhesion: move Durapore under “Silk Tapes” subcategory heading and move Medipore so that it is listed with “Mefix” (Adhesive Tapes – Non Woven Fabric Tapes subcategory)
- 2.17 Leave recommendations 2.82 and 2.83 actioned.

3. Other comments regarding the Schedule

- 3.1 The Group noted that while the wound care products were generally sitting under the correct category and subcategory headings, it was agreed that that the Schedule would continue to change and be refined as the Group received further information.
- 3.2 Members of the Group noted that some of the products in the updated Schedule were incorrectly listed or required further information.

4. Therapeutic Group Review on a Selection of Wound Care Subcategories

The Group were asked the following set of standard questions when reviewing the range of products available under a specific subcategory heading:

- 1. What are the products in each subcategory mainly used for?
- 2. In looking at the various sizes and lengths per subcategory, what options would be required (i.e. essential) and why?
- 3. What would an optimal and clinically appropriate range of options be for each subcategory and why?
- 4. How many suppliers would be optimal in this subcategory and why?
- 5. Is there anything that is particular to this subcategory that requires specific consideration (e.g. additional costs/time in using one product/brand over another)?
- 6. Is there anything else that can be done to assist with standardisation in this subcategory?
- 7. How would you approach standardisation in this subcategory?

The Group agreed that the alternative uses for products should also be considered when considering question 1. Additional questions were also asked for specific subcategories.

Range Subcategory: Securement Bandages – Non Sterile

- 4.1 The Group advised that securement bandages – non-sterile were mainly used for securing dressings and support.
- 4.2 The Group advised that having a range of widths would be important, but longer lengths were less important; anything above 4 m is not essential.

- 4.3 The Group advised that the optimal number of suppliers in this market would depend on the quality of the product. The Group considered it was possible to have a single supplier if the product was of high quality and at a reasonable price.
- 4.4 PHARMAC staff noted it was possible that PHARMAC could go out to market seeking different proposals (single, dual, multiple suppliers) and depending on the quality of product, could potentially go with a single supplier model. Alternatively, depending on the pricing, PHARMAC could seek to have both a low-quality/cheaper product and a high-quality/expensive product so that the DHB hospitals could choose depending on its intended use.
- 4.5 The Group advised that PHARMAC should consult with those involved in the care of neonates, occupational therapists, lymphoedema specialists and bariatrics specialists before going out to tender.
- 4.6 The Group advised that Tubular Gauze should not be in the Securement Bandages – Non Sterile category. The Group advised that Tubular Gauze should be under a separate Tubular Bandage subcategory.
- 4.7 The Group advised that the tubular bandages needed to be reorganised under three main subcategory headings (Tubular Cotton Bandages, Tubular Cotton Bandages with Elastic, Tubular Net Elastic Bandages) and reviewed again once this was done.

Range Subcategory: Securement Bandages – Sterile

- 4.8 The Group advised that the answers provided for Securement Bandages – Non Sterile would also apply to Securement Bandages – Sterile.
- 4.9 The Group reviewed the summary of spend and noted that the 1.5 m lengths were the only lengths being used in this market. The Group commented that this may be due to DHB hospital purchasing habits rather than a clinical requirement.
- 4.10 The Group advised that PHARMAC could potentially go out to market for a range of lengths (1.5 m – 2.3 m) and consider switching to a longer length if the price was lower and everything else was equal (e.g. quality, materials used, training).

Range Subcategories: Tubular Knit Bandages, Tubular Net Bandages, Tubular Support Bandages

- 4.11 The Group advised that the tubular bandage range of products should be reviewed again once they were reorganised under the three headings described in 6.7.

Range Subcategories: Cotton Undercast Padding, Foam Undercast Padding, Synthetic Undercast Padding, Viscose Undercast Padding, Resistant Undercast Padding

- 4.12 The Group advised that it would be more appropriate to review the Casting category once a Casting Specialist has joined the Wound Care Advisory Group.

Range Subcategories: Burn Gel Dressings

- 4.13 The Group advised that Burn Gel Dressings were used as first aid burn treatment, mainly used in the ED department.
- 4.14 The Group noted that the range of products available under the Burn Gel Dressings were all from Jackson Allison and said that there was currently no other competition in this market.
- 4.15 The Group advised that Waterjel had specific properties (e.g. cooling effect and protection against infection) which made it non-interchangeable with other products.
- 4.16 The Group advised that Burn Gel Dressings were too clinically important to touch at this stage, but could be considered further if there was competition.

Range Subcategories: Contact Layer Dressings

- 4.17 The Group noted that the Contact Layer Dressing heading was too vague and recommended that this be amended once further information was obtained for each of the products in this subcategory.

Range Subcategory: Petrolatum impregnated dressings

- 4.18 The Group advised that petrolatum impregnated dressings were low usage historic products that were continuing to be used due to familiarity.
- 4.19 The Group recommended that PHARMAC not make any changes to this market.
- 4.20 The Group recommended that Xeroform should be under the antimicrobial contact layer dressing's subcategory heading.

Range Subcategory: Low Adherent Dressings with Adhesive Border

- 4.21 The Group advised that Low Adherent Dressings with Adhesive Border are used for superficial wounds that are low-exudating, surgical wounds and second degree burns.
- 4.22 The Group advised that all sizes were likely to be needed.

- 4.23 The Group advised that Telfa was not a low adherent dressing with adhesive border and should be taken out of this subcategory.

Range Subcategory: Transparent Film Dressings with Visible Surgical Site Pad

- 4.24 The Group recommended that the products under the Transparent Film Dressings with Visible Surgical Site Pad should be moved into the Transparent Film Dressings with Absorbent Pad subcategory.

Range Subcategory: Transparent Film Dressings with Absorbent Pad

- 4.25 The Group advised that the products under this category were interchangeable with low-adhesive dressings with adhesive borders.
- 4.26 The Group recommended that Polymem be removed from this subcategory because they were foams and asked that PHARMAC to investigate further regarding Hydrofilm, Tegaderm and Cutifilm as to whether they had absorbent pads.
- 4.27 The Group advised that PHARMAC could set parameters around the different sizes and go out to market based on the sizing parameters (e.g. small, medium, large, extra-large).
- 4.28 The Group advised that the optimal number of suppliers would depend on the quality of product and noted that adhesive properties would be an important factor when considering products under this subcategory.
- 4.29 The Group advised that PHARMAC should consult with General, Orthopaedic and Cardiac Surgeons when considering the restriction of the range of products available under this subcategory.

Range Subcategory: Transparent Film Dressing Rolls

- 4.30 The Group advised that Transparent Film Dressing Rolls were used as securement tapes with waterproof properties and were used predominantly in primary care and aged care.
- 4.31 The Group noted that the uses of these products were not encouraged in DHB hospitals due to the possible risk of infection in using non-sterile tapes.
- 4.32 The Group noted that hypoallergenic properties may be important but required evidence from suppliers to support such a claim.

Range Subcategory: Transparent Film Dressings

- 4.33 The Group advised that Transparent Film Dressings were primarily used to fix primary dressings and provided a waterproof barrier.
- 4.34 The Group recommended that the word "Sterile" should be added to the subcategory heading.

- 4.35 The Group noted that Meiptel Film was used specifically in the treatment of radiation-induced skin reactions and advised that it was important to have this remain listed as there were no other interchangeable products.
- 4.36 The Group advised that with the exception of Mepitel Film, all other transparent film dressings were relatively interchangeable.
- 4.37 The Group noted that adhesive quality was important for this subcategory.
- 4.38 The Group noted that Tegaderm and Opsite transparent film dressings also needed to be included in this subcategory.

Range Subcategory: Transparent Spray-On Dressing

- 4.39 The Group noted that only Smith & Nephew's product was available under this category and there was a lack of competition in this market.
- 4.40 The Group recommended that PHARMAC leave this market at this stage and consider whether it would be appropriate to remove this subcategory at a later stage.

Range Subcategories: IV Securement Island Dressings, PICC Line Securement Dressings, Port Securement Dressings, Securement Dressings for Drain Sites, Transparent Dressings, Transparent Dressings with Antimicrobial

- 4.41 The Group recommended that PHARMAC seek advice from IV nurse specialists regarding these products.
- 4.42 The Group recommended that PICC Line Securement Dressings could be combined with IV Securement Island Dressings subcategory.

Range Subcategory: Combine Dressings – Non Sterile

- 4.43 The Group advised that Combine Dressings – Non Sterile was mainly used in primary care in aged care settings.
- 4.44 The Group noted that these products were also used in chronic wounds that did not heal properly and those with chronic conditions.
- 4.45 The Group advised that main uses included padding, wrapping and generally used where you needed something low-priced to roll around a limb.
- 4.46 The Group noted that the 100 metre rolls supplied by WM Bamfords were likely to be used as cavity dressings but recommended that PHARMAC should investigate further.
- 4.47 The Group recommended that the Combine Dressings that were not Rolls (i.e. dressings) were likely to be sterile and therefore should be combined with Combine Dressings – Sterile.

Range Subcategory: Combine Dressings – Sterile

- 4.48 The Group advised that Combine Dressings – Sterile was used as primary and secondary dressings, mainly used as padding, post-surgical use and palliative care.
- 4.49 The Group advised that the various sizes could be set around a parameter (e.g. Small, Medium, Large) when intending to progress to market share procurement.
- 4.50 The Group noted that some of the different brands under this subcategory were manufactured at the same manufacturing plant but produced under different brand names.
- 4.51 The Group advised that quality was going to be a key factor on the number of suppliers that would be needed in this market, with absorbency being one of the more important factors for these products.
- 4.52 The Group advised that the construction (e.g. weave on the outside) may be important as it would affect the absorbency property of the dressing. The Group recommended that any proposals sought in the future should identify the construction of the dressing including the weave.
- 4.53 The Group noted that products under this subcategory are also included in surgical packs and advised PHARMAC that this should be considered when looking to go out to market.
- 4.54 The Group noted that No.13 Wound Dressing (Small), No.14 Wound Dressing (Medium), No.15 Wound Dressing (Large) was likely to be a Sterile Dressing Pack that needed to sit under Other – Wound Dressing Packs subcategory heading.

Range Subcategories: Gamgee Dressings – Non Sterile and Sterile

- 4.55 The Group noted that Gamgee Dressings may be another term used for combine dressings.
- 4.56 The Group recommended that Gamgee Dressings – Non Sterile and Gamgee Dressings – Sterile should be combined with Combined Dressings – Non Sterile and Sterile respectively, subject to confirming that both Gamgee Dressings and Combine Dressings had the same construction and uses.

Range Subcategory: Post-Surgical Dressings

- 4.57 The Group recommended that PHARMAC seek clarification from Smith & Nephew on the Dressing, 60 packs.

Range Subcategory: Lap Sponges

- 4.58 The Group advised that Lap Sponges were primarily used to mop up fluids during surgery.
- 4.59 The Group recommended that PHARMAC seek further advice from Surgeons/ Theatre Nurses.

Range Subcategory: Wound Dressing Packs

- 4.60 The Group advised that Wound Dressings Packs are used as ready-made sterile packs for cleaning and dressing wounds.
- 4.61 The Group noted that different DHBs have preferences for different Wound Dressing Packs due to the different preferences for the tools in the pack (e.g. woven/non-woven swab, cotton wool/synthetic swab, different type of tweezers).
- 4.62 The Group advised that the different brands would be interchangeable as long as the different DHBs had the opportunity to evaluate the products before implementation.
- 4.63 The Group noted that the major concern around the dressings packs were due to tweezers in the pack and the quality of them.
- 4.64 The Group advised that it was important to evaluate the quality of the sterile guard and the external wrapping needed to be robust.
- 4.65 The Group advised that there needed to be further investigation on the use of cotton swabs as it was not recommended to be used on wounds due to risks around wool fibres contaminating the wound.

Range Subcategory: Non Woven Fabric Tapes

- 4.66 The Group advised that Non Woven Fabric Tapes are mainly used in surgery/theatre, to fix dressings and securing, particularly for curved surfaces.
- 4.67 The Group noted that these tapes may be used in breast surgery and recommended that PHARMAC seek further advice from surgeons.
- 4.68 The Group noted that Fixomull has largely superseded Hypafix and the products under this subcategory were largely interchangeable.
- 4.69 The Group recommended that this subcategory could be further divided into sterile and non-sterile headings. The Group noted that Propax Hypafix was likely to be sterile and was unsure whether there were any competing brands.
- 4.70 The Group advised that adhesive qualities, hypoallergenic properties and stretch were important factors for products under this subcategory.