
R&D Compliance: Prepare Now for Future Enforcement

Dennis K. Barnes, JD, MBA, CPA
VP, Chief Compliance Officer
Parexel International

George K. Ng, Esq.
EVP, CAO, Chief Legal Officer
Sorrento Therapeutics, Inc.

Paul Curtin, JD, CFE
Exec. Director, R&D Compliance
Allergan

Yogesh Bahl
Managing Director, Life Sciences
AlixPartners, LLP

Daniel A. Kracov, Esq.
Partner, Head of Regulatory Practice
Arnold & Porter

Pharmaceutical Compliance Congress
Washington DC
October 2015

Agenda

- Growing Risks in R&D
- Third Parties and R&D
- Hypothetical Case Study

Growing Risks in R&D

- Regulator focus has shifted/shifting more to R&D; remember risk exposure in research prior to clinical trials
- Investigator Initiated Studies
 - Does research request and approval relate to an “appropriate” therapeutic area?
 - Does approval follow a standardized, well-documented process?
 - Are payments at fair market value? Any non-monetary items of value provided?
 - Are payments made prior to verifying attained milestones?
 - Do the investigators subcontract? Do the work through a government-owned institution?
 - Who is handling patient recruitment and informed consent?
- Post-approval studies / Research & Consulting Services / Scientific Publications
 - Documented, legitimate business purpose and need
 - Fair Market Value in connection with payments and other items that could be deemed of value
 - Author connected with data and analysis? Author meets requirements?

Growing Risks in R&D (continued)

- Limited pool of talent globally that understand the science, the business, the regulations, and the focus to conduct R&D in a risk-adjusted effective fashion
 - Medical science liaisons (MSLs) and their activities are a growing focus
 - Who is making what request for information?
 - How are the requests tracked and documented?
 - How are off-label risks managed?
 - Social media, crowd sourcing, telemonitoring: relationship to whistleblowing?
 - Data security & privacy regulations; analysis “in the cloud”
 - 3rd & 4th Party Risk; relationships among IRBs, investigators, sponsors and vendors
 - Continued lack of integrated global IT infrastructure; continued M&A activity
 - Comparative Effectiveness
 - Patient recruitment and potential gaps in site selection; increase in CRO subcontracting and foreign trials
 - Unexpected learnings and transparency
 - Managing data and new mining paradigms; predictive analytics
-

Third Parties and R&D

- Third-parties:
 - Joint collaboration partners (pre-clinical)
 - CROs, sub-CROs
 - KOLs and Investigators
 - Event Planners, travel agencies, etc.
- Emerging markets continue to represent the fundamental challenge to growth from a corruption perspective.
 - Roughly 60% of FDA regulated clinical trials are conducted in foreign markets.
 - Since 2002 the number of active Food and Drug Administration (FDA) regulated investigators based outside the United States has grown by 15% annually.

Hypothetical Case Study

- Acme Pharmaceuticals Inc. (“Acme”) is developing a diabetes drug and has completed Phase I and Phase II trials.
- Acme has developed the protocol for its Phase III global clinical trial and has received protocol approval from the FDA.
- After receiving protocol approval, Acme has hired a contract research organization, CRO, Inc. (“CRO”) to own and run the Phase III global clinical trial.
- After some negotiation and modifications, Acme and CRO agree on the protocol, including patient recruitment rates in each country.
- The primary end points are:
 - XXXX
 - XXXX
 - XXXX
- The global clinical trial is to start and be completed in 2.5 years at a total cost (revenue, grants, and pass-through costs) to CRO of \$75 million.
- Any changes in scope and CRO fees will be agreed to in writing.

Hypothetical Case Study (continued)

- The following are details for the Phase III global clinical trial:
 - Recruit 1,000 patients, of which 900 patients will be included in the double-blind randomized trial.
 - Patients will be recruited from 20 countries, with 50% coming from Asia, 40% coming from Europe, and 10% from the United States.
 - Patient recruitment goals and rates:
 - China, 150 patients at 4.6 patients per month
 - India, 150 patients at 5.3 patients per month
 - Korea, 100 patients at 6.1 patients per month
 - Japan, 50 patients at 7.4 patients per month
 - Philippines, 50 patients at 3.2 patients per month
 - Poland, 150 patients at 7.2 patients per month
 - Czechoslovakia, 100 patients at 5.5 patients per month
 - France, 75 patients at 8.1 patients per month
 - Portugal, 75 patients at 9.2 patients per month
 - United States, 100 patients at 12.6 patients per month

Hypothetical Case Study (continued)

- Lets break up ourselves into 2 groups, where one side of the group is Acme and the other side is CRO.
- If you are Acme, what are your risks in connection with the Phase III clinical trial?
- If you are CRO, what are your risks in connection with the Phase III clinical trial?

Hypothetical Case Study (continued)

- Scenarios for discussion:
 - 5 months into the trial, CRO informs Acme that it cannot meet the patient recruitment rates in China, Czechoslovakia, and Poland. The patient recruitment goal was 50% too high in each of these countries.
 - 8 months into the trial, allegations arise of forged informed consent forms in China.
 - 12 months into the trial, allegations arise of fictitious patients in Poland.
 - 18 months into the trial, allegations arise of critical missing data in the trial master file in Korea.
 - 22 months into the trial, Acme realizes that data collected 20 of the patients from Czechoslovakia is not usable.
 - 23 months into the trial, the clinical trial cost has increased from the projected \$75 million to \$125 million.
 - The Phase III trial was completed at a total CRO cost of \$145 million, the FDA approved the product, and Acme is now conducting post marketing / pharmacoeconomic studies.
- Under each of the above scenarios, what do you need to manage if you are Acme?,
- Under each of the above scenarios, what do you need to manage if you are CRO?

Q&A