

Facilitating Development and Utilization of Genome-Based Diagnostic Technologies: A Workshop

November 15, 2011

**Mark Gorman
Director of Survivorship Policy**

NCCS

- ♦ Founded in 1986.
- ♦ Mission: Advocate for Quality Cancer Care- Quality Chasm six aims.
- ♦ Survivor led: Bylaws require majority of BoD have personal diagnosis.
- ♦ Created concept and language of “cancer survivorship” as alternative to “patient” or “victim”.

About Me

- ♦ Long-term survivor (13+ years) metastatic melanoma.
- ♦ B-Raf (or other) unknown.
- ♦ Initial year's treatment -> surgery 1999.
- ♦ Surgery 2003, no tumor bank, but tried .
- ♦ N.E.D. now

Patient Expectations

- ♦ Patients have rising expectations with regard to genomic and other tests.
- ♦ Better match to effective treatment.
- ♦ Less time lost on ineffective.
- ♦ Christopher Hitchens example.

- ✦ Do not understand the complexity.
- ✦ Not just another blood test.
- ✦ Confusing claims about usefulness.

NCCS positions

- ◆ Support FDA oversight.
- ◆ Cancer care planning.

FDA Role

- ◆ NCCS would like a clear regulatory pathway for companion diagnostics and drugs- Comments Oct. 12, 2011.
- ◆ We assume that LDTs that will guide treatment decisions will be covered by Guidance, but this is not clearly stated.
- ◆ Uncertainty yields inefficiency.

Support for patient understanding

- ♦ Cancer treatment planning becomes ever more complex.
- ♦ Patients need information and time to understand implications of choices offered.
- ♦ Comprehensive Cancer Care Improvement Act can help.

CCCCIA

- ♦ Would create a new Medicare service for cancer care planning.
- ♦ Provide more time with clinicians for patients to get their questions answered prior to decisions and when treatment changes.
- ♦ Rep. Lois Capps this and three prior Congresses.

One patient's perspectives

- ♦ I want to reduce uncertainty.
- ♦ I want to manage my resources.
- ♦ I need to trust my entire care team.
- ♦ All are interdependent.
- ♦ Severe illnesses may be different from less threatening -> different rules?

Perceived value

- ♦ I believe there is value in genomic testing.
- ♦ It should help reduce uncertainty and narrow choices.
- ♦ If my cancer comes back, I would seek it and consider paying out of pocket.
- ♦ I already explored this in 2003.

Can I rely on a test?

- ♦ Patients often seek second opinions.
- ♦ Even now there are issues of interpretation of pathology.
- ♦ Would I face repeat tests? Repeat costs?
- ♦ There seems to be a question of standards and standardization.

- ✦ Reaction to FDA meeting in 2010- shocked by lack of standardization between labs.
- ✦ Sharon Terry- role for NIST.

Care coordination a help?

- ◆ Who makes up my care team?
- ◆ Who advises me and how well do they understand the tests?
- ◆ This issue seems to involve more than just reimbursement and goes to physician roles.
- ◆ What models of coordinated care help?

Investigational interventions

- ♦ If an intervention is investigational, I need to know that. It will temper my expectations and may impact my choices.
- ♦ Investigational interventions should be used in a manner which generates evidence.

- ✦ This was true for high dose chemotherapy with bone marrow rescue.
- ✦ Collection may not need to be RCT, but needs to be systematic.
- ✦ Setbacks such as at Duke are likely to undermine patient trust, harm the field and delay progress.

One survivor's frustration

- ✦ Tired of conversations about how to bring best care models and goals to widespread use that always begin with the question “How can it be paid for?”
- ✦ Prefer dialogue that BEGINS with “What do patients and survivors want and need?” THEN: “How to align incentives to realize it?”