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Background

- Europe lags significantly behind (Hall AK, Carlson MR, 2014):
  - United States: 448 approvals of orphan products in over 30 years since the ODA
  - 78 approvals in 14 years of European orphan drug regulation

- Access to innovative medicines and orphan drugs varies substantially between EU member states, mainly due to funding:
  - Several national HTA authorities view the cost-effectiveness of orphan and speciality drugs critically (Gammie T et al., 2015)

- Mounting political pressure to accelerate access:
    - EU legislation for harmonized pricing and reimbursement criteria
    - Overhaul of orphan drug regulation

- Rising influence of patients and patient organisations in the European regulatory bodies leads to a growing demand for timely access to innovative therapies
## Reality Check 2016 for Orphan Drugs: the same dossier can lead to different appraisals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Product / Indication</th>
<th>Key Clinical Evidence</th>
<th>HTA Assessment Outcome (status early 2016)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Teysuno** (tegafur, gimeracil, oteracil) advanced gastric cancer (in comb. with cisplatin) | • Phase III RCT (n = 527)  
• Multicentre, open label  
• Active comparator arm  
• Non-inferior to comparator (first endpoint) | • Reimbursement: Sweden, Italy  
• Conditional reimbursement: UK, Scotland  
• Rejection: Germany (in review) and France |
| **Inlyta** (axitinib) advanced renal cancer | • Phase III RCT (n = 723)  
• Multicentre, open label  
• Active comparator arm  
• Statistically significant benefit (first endpoint) | • Reimbursement: Sweden, Italy, UK, Scotland, France  
• Conditional reimbursement: Germany |
| **Kalydeco** (Ivacaftor) cystic fibrosis | • Two Phase III RCTs (n = 213)  
• Placebo controlled  
• Statistically significant benefit (first endpoint) | • Reimbursement: France, Italy, Germany  
• Conditional reimbursement: UK, Sweden  
• Rejection: Scotland |

Source: adapted from Kilburg, A, 2015
### Non-Consensus between European HTA Agencies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Consensus Issues</th>
<th>Non-Consensus Issues</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Time horizon of analysis</td>
<td>• Choice of comparators and outcome measures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Presentation of results</td>
<td>• Perspective of analysis (health care or societal)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Use of decision models</td>
<td>• Inclusion of costs (direct / indirect)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Discounting rates for costs and effects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• HRQoL methodology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Weights for calculating QUALYs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Uncertainty (deterministic or probabilistic sensitivity analysis)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summarized from: EUnetHTA Methods for health economic evaluations - A guideline based on current practices in Europe (May 2015)
- Compiled with feedback from 33 member countries (25 have published guidelines)
- Complete overview of current methodological guidelines used in Europe
What is being done?

- Greater understanding that benefit-risk and value judgements in rare diseases require unique and innovative approaches
- Establishment of rare disease policies and initiatives
  - Accelerated market approval (MA) → conditional market approvals (CMA)
  - Accelerated market access → conditional reimbursement
  - Early – i.e. before MA – managed and alternate funding (MEAs)
- Emphasis on
  - Early joint scientific and HTA advice
  - Iterative product development and generation of further evidence
  - Early inclusion of patient views and preferences
- Adapted HTA criteria for rare diseases
  - Level of innovation → addressing unmet medical needs
  - Significant contribution to patient care
  - Lower thresholds on efficacy and safety / lower significance levels
  - Economic data less considered, lower cost-effectiveness thresholds
  - Involvement of patient groups
EMA Accelerated Access Initiatives

- **Adaptive Pathways (AP)**
  - Aim: provide real-life case studies for timely access to medicines
  - Conditional approval and/or reimbursement during further evidence generation
  - Current status: ~60 products submitted; 20 selected and in process
  - CMA: 8 Phase II/early Phase III drugs approved, reimbursement: Germany 7 of 8, France 7 of 8, UK NICE none, UK SMC 3 under PAS (Stindt J, 2016)

- **PRIority MEdicines (PRIME):**
  - Aim: offer early, proactive and enhanced scientific, regulatory and HTA support at key milestones in development
  - Early identification of eligible products at proof of principle (prior to Phase II)

- **“Late Dialogues” and patient registries pilot programs**
  - Aim: post-launch data generation with one (set of) studies for regulators and HTA bodies, including real-world evidence
  - Generation of refined real-world based benefit-risk and value assessments
  - Parallel regulatory/HTA scientific advice on post-authorisation studies
EU Accelerated Access Initiatives

- European Commission Expert Group on Safe and Timely Access to Medicines for Patients (STAMP)
- **ADAPT SMART** – Accelerated Development of Appropriate Patient Therapies (IMI funded)
  - Joint enabling platform: 22 companies, EMA, HTAs, EU patient orgs, academics
- **EUnetHTA** – European Network of Health Technology Assessment
  - Aim: reduce time lag between regulatory and reimbursement decisions, reduce divergences across HTA bodies (slow progress since 2004)
  - 6 pilot projects on rapid relative effectiveness assessment (REA) of pharmaceuticals
  - Development of an HTA core model, guidelines synthesizing national criteria
  - National uptake of REA limited to date – Austria leading user
  - Pros: at the table on the ground level, potential influence, close interaction with national HTA bodies
  - Cons: negative REAs risk spreading to 33 member countries, significant additional resources
National Accelerated Access Initiatives

- Mainly focused on funding of orphan and speciality medicines before market authorisation
  - UK:
    - Early Access to Medicines Scheme (EAMS)
    - Patient Access Scheme (PAS)
    - UK Cancer Drugs Fund (CDF) (£340m)
  - France: Authorization for Temporary Use (ATU)
  - Italy: Fondo AIFA 5% (5% of promotional expenditure, €45m).
  - Compassionate use: myriad of further programs across EU member states leading to marked differences in access to innovative medicines

- Represent an increasingly interesting potential opportunity for early revenue generation
In Summary: The Bigger Picture
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Exceptional circumstances
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Adaptive Pathways

A holistic approach to support and facilitate early access

A Proposed Paradigm Shift

- **Minimising the time** to market authorisation, access and reimbursement is now – at last – becoming a joint goal of all stakeholders in the EU.

- The new **accelerated access (AA) programs** – once fully established – will create a paradigm shift in the market authorization (MA) and reimbursement of orphan and speciality products in Europe.

- This shift is **happening now** and may well see **adaptive pathways** become the norm - not the exception – of MA and access in rare diseases.

- **Focussed on transformative potential**: medicines that offer a major therapeutic advantage over existing treatments, or benefit patients with no treatment options or address clear unmet medical needs.

- Accompanied by a **shift in perception** of conditional market authorization (CMA) and conditional reimbursement:
  - FROM a “rescue solution” and a threat with added risks.
  - TO a key opportunity that is proactively planned.
A Proposed Paradigm Shift

- Accelerated access programs emphasise the need for *iterative product development* and the generation of *further evidence*

- Currently two approaches for approval in stages developing:
  - Initial approval and reimbursement based on **Phase II data** in a well-defined patient population with a clear unmet need, followed by extension to wider indication(s) once safety, efficacy and quality of care data is available → continued development in Phase III
  - CMA and reimbursement based on **surrogate endpoint data** (Phase II and III) combined with continued evidence generation with the use of real-world data → Phase IV
Requirements to Sustain the Paradigm Shift

- **Constructive dialogue** and alignment of all relevant stakeholders: industry, EMA, HTA bodies, and patients
- Early **joint scientific and HTA advice** → one set of studies that satisfy all regulatory hurdles for AA
- Early inclusion of **patient views** for benefit–risk and HTA appraisals
  - Training of patient representatives to participate in decision making
- **Mitigation of risks** for the pharmaceutical industry
  - Balancing of increased costs and risks in Phase II R&D with the reward of several years of earlier market access
  - Conditional reimbursement at a premium price
  - Early revenue stream potentially crucial for small and mid-cap biotechnology firms
- **Regulatory reassurance** for the post-authorisation phase (STAMP):
  - Feasibility of specific obligations for the generation of additional evidence
  - Clarity in regulatory processes and actions to be taken in the case of delays and negative outcomes – i.e. a clear exit strategy
  - Streamlining of annual renewal and extension processes and reports
The Role of Patient-Centered Real-World Evidence

- From both the EMA and HTA perspective, real-world data is an integral component of accelerated access programs.
- “Real world data is a still underutilized resource” EMA and STAMP.
- AA programs generally include the real-world monitoring of patients (e.g. in registries), including pharmacovigilance.
- Real-world data is essential to confirming the market approval, to broadening the indication, and to justifying the premium reimbursement of innovative products in rare diseases.

- Patient-preferences
  - are increasingly integrated into benefit-risk and value judgements of medicines.
  - this will include active patient participation in decision making both on an EMA and HTA level (Mühlbacher AC et al., 2016).
  - unmet medical need – ultimately the patients’ perspective – is a central AA element.
The Role of Patient-Centered Real-World Evidence

- EMA COMP defines a **significant benefit** of a product for orphan designation in three equal categories
  - an assumption of improved **efficacy**
  - an assumption of improved **safety**
  - an assumption of a **major contribution to patient care**:
    - ✓ more convenient modes of administration
    - ✓ improving patient compliance
    - ✓ improved availability of the product
    - ✓ improved quality of life of the patients
- Expected that **most** of the data to demonstrate significant benefit will be generated during the clinical development and available prior to market authorization

- **Patient-relevant outcomes measures (PROMs)** and **HRQoL** are an integral and crucial component of the development and appraisal of medicines in rare diseases

Source: Committee for Orphan Medicinal Products (COMP) Recommendation on elements required to support the medical plausibility and the assumption of significant benefit for an orphan designation, EMA, 2012
Phase II – the new Phase III?

- Not really, **surrogate parameters as the primary endpoint** likely to remain the best option for statistical significance
- **Early joint EMA/HTA consultation** to develop consensus on surrogate endpoints and on what constitutes significant effect sizes
- Consideration of HTA relevant and/or patient-centred parameters as secondary endpoints for **supportive data**, if feasible
- Patient-Relevant Outcome Measures (PROMs) - early patient-relevant research, including patient preferences, satisfaction and unmet medical needs, potential major contributions to patient care (based on the current standard of care)
- **Proliferation** of validated disease-specific instruments → development in Phase II, application in Phases III and IV
- **Objective**: CMA and market access at the conclusion of Phase II
- Increase of **risk** and cost in R&D balanced with potential benefits

Source: adapted and summarised from Stindt J, 2016
Phase III – merging into Phase IV?

- Quite possibly, the rationale for large, conventional and purely experimental Phase III studies is being increasingly questioned.
- Pressure to include real-world and patient-relevant populations, comparators and outcomes as primary endpoints → pragmatic trials.
  - Potential need to include multiple comparator arms (HTA perspective)
  - Broad yet clearly defined eligible population and potential sub-population analysis
  - Integration of generic and disease-specific PRO / HRQoL
  - Consideration of PROMs: patient preferences, satisfaction, unmet needs, major contributions to patient care
- Rare diseases: sites and participants largely overlap between Phases.
  - Fully integrated post-launch study planning with joint EMA/HTA advice
  - Phase III protocols with long-term follow-up in Phase IV
  - Protocol extensions, rollover from clinical study to registry
  - Regulatory expectation that a significant proportion of treated patients are monitored in Phase IV registries and/or pharmacovigilance programs.
The Future Norm?

Source: Jacoline Bouvy, Scientific Adviser, NICE, taken from ADAPT-SMART, presented at ISPOR 2016, Vienna
Observational Research Trends in Europe

- **Dynamic development and strong interest** in real-world and patient-centred research on all levels
  - Evidenced by a multitude of new initiatives and guidelines (e.g. PARENT, COMET “Core Outcome Set” (COS), EMA pilots, EUnetHTA)

- **Increased understanding of the unique conceptual and operational challenges** and benefits of observational research, e.g.
  - Ethical committees appreciate the differences between observational designs and clinical studies and offer fast track procedures (e.g. UK NHS proportionate review)
  - Research Sites: research teams with relevant experience, specifically adapted SOPs, financial departments offer differentiated rates
  - Understanding of the limitations, the statistical methods, and the interpretation of observational data, e.g. on a regulatory level and in peer-review for publication
  - Opportunities for high-impact publications increase KOL and investigator interest

- Additional resources and **experts with relevant experience** provide opportunities for increasing the number and efficiency of studies, potentially leading to **decreased timelines and costs**
Observational Research Trends in Europe

- Caveat: significant differences between countries and research sites remain → choosing the **right partners crucial** for success
- Long-term and excellent **relationships** with Investigators and their research teams are key success factor, particularly in rare diseases
- Sites and participants largely overlap between Phases II, III and IV
- Due to challenges in diagnosis and treatment, patients are likely to be concentrated in a limited number of teaching sites
  - “must have” sites for recruitment
- Principal Investigators are generally the leading experts in the field
  - Scientific input for study protocols and disease-specific instrument development
  - Essential to securing favourable ethical approval
  - Leading authors for peer-reviewed publications
  - Likely first adopters of the new medicine once market access is achieved
Observational Research Trends in Europe

- Research teams have excellent and longstanding patient relationships
  - Intense competition between studies at leading sites
  - Observational studies often less interesting financially → creative incentives to motivate and focus the team
  - Essential to recruitment → eligible patients trust recommendations by nurses
  - Ensure quality of the research → emphasis on training (e.g. data quality and completeness, privacy and security)
  - Streamlining processes → observational research should emphasise efficiency (e.g. patient screening, inclusion and exclusion criteria, etc.)
  - Caveat: selection and reporting bias (e.g. patient satisfaction)

- Significant investment (mostly in time) in site selection and relationship building justified
Observational Research Trends in Europe

- **New EU data protection regulation**
  - Issued May 2016, to come into effect by May 2018 (transposal to national law)
  - Likely **significant impact** on observational research
    - Patient consent strengthened, always required, broad consent no longer sufficient
    - Consent must be unambiguous, need to add all eventualities on the patient consent form which patients must consent to individually (e-informed consent unclear)
    - Patient data cannot be stored indefinitely
    - Secondary research without explicit consent no longer possible (regulation for pseudonymised data unclear)
    - Data transfer out of the EU basically forbidden, in exceptions to counties which the EU has defined as having equivalent privacy laws (e.g. USA currently not included)
    - “Right to be forgotten” strengthened

- Will further increase the onus on **ethical approvals**, **patient recruitment** and **consent**, and the assurance of data **privacy** and **security** as the key operational challenges
In Summary: Key Takeaway Points

1. Alternative pathways now represent a major potential opportunity for orphan and speciality medicines in Europe → accelerated market approval and access → early funding before approval

2. Keep a close watch on developments and, if applicable, review the planning for candidate compounds in the pipeline
   - Proactively pursue opportunities for early joint scientific and HTA advice
   - Benefit-risk evaluation of the specific opportunities offered by AA programs
   - Constructively address current practices that represent “barriers to change”

3. Implement real patient-centred research
   - Focus on the patient: research and understand unmet medical needs, preferences and satisfaction, potential significant contributions to medical care
   - Guide development decisions with patient intelligence
   - Full and early integration of real-world and patient-centred evidence generation

4. Last but not least: be nice to your investigators and research nurses
   - Invest, take the long view, build a relationship spanning from Phase II to IV
Phase IV Programs – www.p4pro.eu

- Specialized independent HTA consultancy focused on real-world and patient-centered research in rare diseases and orphan products
- Founded in 1998 (Start-up company of the year 2000)
- Headquartered in Basel, Switzerland
- EU Office based in Austria (near Munich, Germany)
- Pan-European Registries and programs including over 10’000 sites / physicians and more than 200’000 patients
- Knowledge and experience in many therapeutic areas
- Broad coverage of outcomes, including clinical, economic, HRQoL and PROMs
- Proven scientific track record and peer-reviewed publications
- Longstanding established network of professionals and strategic collaborations across the major markets
Thank you!

“What we call art here, is the application of a knowledge to an action.” René Daumal
Blue hour, view from the Müllerhütte, Stubai Alps, Tirol, Austria, 2009