

Dilemmas in Early Access Programmes

IQPC Conference on Early and Managed Access Programmes, 22-24 October 2018, London/UK

Hartwig Gajek, M.D., Hesyra-Medical GmbH

So many good reasons for Early Access

- › **Humanity**
- › **Ethics**
- › **Responsibility**
- › **Perception of company**
- › **... potentially others**



... and a few aspects to be considered

- › **Patients**
- › **Doctors/
Pharmacists**
- › **Industry**
- › **Regulators**
- › **Payers/Healthcare
providers**

Seite 3



Serving patients

- › **Driven by expectation for personal relief, rather than standards of ‚clinical equipoise‘**
- › **Hope overriding fear of potential harm, or sense of futility**
- › **Terminally ill patients, and relatives, taking chance of ‚last resort‘**
- › **May opt to exit clinical trials, especially if allotted to control/ placebo arm, hoping to improve their odds**

Seite 4



Doctors and Pharmacists

- › Typically, a key stakeholder in EAP
- › The man in the middle – between pressure from patients, and needing support from industry
- › Should receive adequate support in patient interaction
- › Increased liability with prescription of unlicensed medicine, esp. if based on scarce data (e.g., ph1/2a only)
- › Administrative burden (submissions, reporting, diversity of EAP, ...)

Seite 5



Industry

- › EA being rationed
 - › Quantity of drug available
 - › Competition with clinical trial recruitment
 - › Accessible only where framework exists
- › Internal rules for decision making to be set
- › Struggle to match external expectations with reality
- › Need to determine objectives, and adequacy of approach

Seite 6



Industry

- › **Need to balance fostering awareness, or creating advocacy for drug, and potential frustration by patients/HCP's**
- › **Mindful of accrual rates in development programmes, and EAP**
- › **Consumption of internal resources**
 - › **Review committee (internal/external)**
 - › **Internal administration**
 - › **Production logistics**
 - › **RA/PV management**
 - › **Unpredictable timelines**
 - › **Diverse local requirements**

Seite 7



Regulatory Authorities

- › **Primary mission**
 - › **Risk-Benefit Ratio**
 - › **Public health issues**
- › **RA usually relaxed about confounding of clinical trial data, but potential exists**
- › **Requiring structured clinical evidence for efficacy and safety**
- › **Visibility of EAP, in the absence of critical contribution of information for drug licensing**

Seite 8



Payers or Healthcare Providers

- › **Although reimbursement for EA not ,inherent‘, remuneration of ,reasonable‘ cost may be negotiable**
 - › Manufacturing, logistics
 - › Administration/monitoring ?
 - › Insurance ?
- › **Mechanism of charging unclear**
 - › Direct-to-patient?
 - › Hospital/pharmacy?
 - › Healthcare provider?
- › **Pricing models for EAP potentially impacting HTA – unclear whether positively or negatively**

Seite 9



Payers or Healthcare Providers

- › **Period of coverage beyond RA approval, until reimbursement**
 - › Regulatory paths designed as ,adaptive licensing‘, but no corresponding mechanisms for reimbursement
 - › Transition to regular reimbursement may be challenging
- › **Overall, payers reluctant to pay, struggling to cover licensed medicines**
 - › Issue of ,equity of access‘?
 - › Bigger companies afford EA, while for smaller enterprises, the burden may be significant

Seite 10



Concluding remarks

- › **Check your objectives: being good Samaritan, or collect data**
- › **Consider involving healthcare providers, being responsible for 'equity in access'**
- › **Regulatory Authorities have a degree of oversight, but EAP are not within their original remit**
- › **RA usually helpful in designing practical data collections**
- › **If you require payer-relevant data, you may be anyway too late with EAP**