



EUPATI: Preparing guidance for interaction Interactive session at DIA Europe 2015







Guidance for interaction – Why?



- Patients & PO involved more widely
- EMA has developed a mature framework over time
- However, overarching guidance on meaningful and ethical interaction missing in many areas
- PO-industry code by some PCWP members did not cover drug development
- EUPATI aims to come up with guidance, covering four areas:
 - Industry
 - Ethics committees
 - Health Technology Assessment (HTA)
 - Regulators
- EMA framework used as guiding principle



Industry led R & D

- Clear & robust guidance most needed in this area (WS July 2014)
- Building on best practice & established examples (EATG, Eurordis)
- Current codes focus on market, post approval
- Not everybody is ready for meaningful interaction (on both sides)
- Need to cover interaction opportunities within process of drug development
- Consider guiding principles developed by Lifetrain http://www.emtrain.org/index.php/lifetrain2
- Clarify framework coverage (formalised / ad hoc; individual experts / organisations).
- Legal obstacles in some countries
- Matchmaking discussion: how much can we do within EUPATI?
 PO alignment necessary.
- Implementation is a process!



Ethics committees

- Challenging area EC are under national jurisdiction
- Big differences within Europe, patients not mentioned in some regulations
- New CT Regulation gives some, but not enough leverage
- Patients could be included in different positions and tasks
 - External reviewer
 - General advisor
 - Regular EC member
- Key areas for patient input:
 - Assessing study risk/burden/benefit
 - Informed consent documents
- Need to clarify prerequisites & criteria for patients joining committees
- Likely: recommendations including call for better European legislation in this area



HTA

- Patient inclusion in HTA: well documented area
- Few implemented examples to draw on, national jurisdiction prevailing
- 2010 survey: 52% of responding agencies involve patients in process, 22% provide trainings & 19% evaluate involvement
- Barriers for better involvement well known
 - Time, cost
 - Enthusiasm of staff
 - Concern about bias etc
- Capacity building the biggest single issue
- No single model to build on around; case studies needed for better input
- EC collaborative committee on HTA, Eurordis & EPF participating
- ISPOR & EUNet HTA sources



Regulatory bodies

- Mature EMA framework to draw on
- Dialogue with patients started in 1996 with HIV patients
- Patient's Working Group from 2003; PCWP formally established 2006. Legal basis since 2004 (Art 78 Regulation EC 726/2004)
- Interaction covers areas of common interests with clearly defined objectives
 - Facilitate participation in benefit/risk evaluation
 - Ensure that patients, consumers and their organisations are listened to and involved in developing plans and policies
 - Enhance organisation understanding of EMA role within EU regulatory network re development, evaluation, monitoring & provision of information on medicines
 - Optimise communication tools to support their role in the safe & rational use



Regulatory bodies

- EMA framework relies on 5 critical elements
 - 1. Network of European PCO
 - 2. EMA Working Party as forum of exchange
 - 3. Pool of patients acting as experts
 - 4. Interaction with EU regulatory network
 - 5. Capacity building
- Yearly report on interaction; satisfaction survey every 2 years
- 3 categories of patient participation
 - 1. Member, alternate or observer
 - 2. Individual patient expert
 - 3. Representative of an organisation
- EMA framework easily adaptable at national level, efforts in different countries ongoing

DIA guidances session Apr 15



- Very useful session, good feedback
- Guidance documents much awaited for
- Grid and guidance elements more clear
- Need to address implementation and updating guidances

Next steps



- First draft due Jul 7 2015
- Report on guidance due to IMI Jan 2016
- External consultations in 2016 (EFPIA, EMA PCWP, EC)