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Orphan Drug Act

- 1983
- For populations less that 200,000 in the US
- 7 years exclusivity for unpatented compounds
- Tax credits-50% of clinical trial costs
- Research Grants
Orphan Drug Designations/Approvals

Total # of designations through 2012 = 2730
Total # of approvals through 2012 = 421

No. Designated

No. Approved

Year
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26
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CDER: Rare Disease Novel Product History

- CY2008-2013* (*as of December 6, 2013)
  - Rare diseases ~1/3 of NME and original biologic APs at CDER
CDER: Rare Disease Novel Products in 2014

- In CY 2014, rare diseases were >40% of New Molecular Entity (NME) NDAs and original biologics (BLAs) Approvals at CDER in 2014
CDER: Rare Disease Novel Products in 2015*

- Thus far in CY 2015, rare diseases are ~1/3s of New Molecular Entity (NME) NDAs and original biologics (BLAs) Approvals

*CY2015 thus far includes AP actions taken from Jan 1 through Aug 31, 2015
Expedited Review

- Draft guidance recently provided for expedited approvals addressing serious diseases with unmet needs (June ‘13)
  - Fast track
  - Accelerated Approval
  - Priority Review
  - Breakthrough
    - New designation established by FDASIA that expedites the development and review of drugs that—
      - treat serious/life-threatening disease; and
      - preliminary clinical evidence indicates that drug may demonstrate substantial improvement over existing therapies on \( \geq 1 \) clinically significant endpoints
Breakthrough therapy

• Features of breakthrough therapy designation include:
  – Frequent FDA/sponsor communications & meetings
  – Cross-disciplinary project lead assigned to FDA review team to facilitate efficient review and serve as the scientific liaison
  – Organizational commitment involving FDA senior managers and experienced FDA review staff in a proactive collaborative, cross-disciplinary review

• Since its inception in 2012, CDER and CBER have designated 86 new therapies as breakthrough therapies from almost 300 requests
  – 24 have received marketing approval as of April 17
  – About 1/3 have involved rare diseases
CDER: Expedited Programs

- Rare Diseases
  - Most are serious or life-threatening, unmet medical needs
  - Most qualify for at least one expedited program
    - Many qualify for >1 (almost all for incentives)
    - Rare >> common diseases for expedited programs

Expedited Programs CY 2008-2013
CDER NME and Original BLA APs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Product Approvals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Priority</td>
<td>Rare: 70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Common: 30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fast Track</td>
<td>Rare: 60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Common: 40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Breakthrough</td>
<td>Rare: &lt;1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Common: &gt;99%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accel AP</td>
<td>Rare: 5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Common: 95%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CDER: Expedited Programs

- Rare Diseases 2014, for AP’d NME NDAs/BLAs
  - Most are serious or life-threatening, unmet medical needs
  - In 2014, 100% qualified for at least one expedited program
    - Most qualified for >1 expedited program (85%)
    - Rare>>common diseases for expedited programs
  - 100% qualified for Orphan designation
CDER: Expedited Programs

- Rare Diseases 2015*, for AP’d NME NDAs/BLAs
  - Most are serious or life-threatening, unmet medical needs
  - Thus far in 2015, 7/10 have qualified for at least one expedited program
    - 70% of Rare vs. 47% of common diseases qualified for an expedited program
  - 9/10 were Orphan drug designated products

![Expedited Programs 2015*](chart.png)
## Targeted APs Trending Up Over Time

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>All</th>
<th>Rare</th>
<th>Common</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1990-1992</td>
<td>~8%</td>
<td>~30%</td>
<td>~2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000-2002</td>
<td>~10%</td>
<td>~45%</td>
<td>~5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010-2014</td>
<td>~25%</td>
<td>~45%</td>
<td>~12%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Targeted Therapies

• Targeted therapies have grown from 5% of new drug approvals in the 1990s to 45% in 2013.
  – 80% of breakthrough and about 60% of orphan drugs in recent years have also used targeting. 44% of recently approved orphan products
  – Working closely with companies with targeted therapy programs reduced development time by 2 years.

• Common disease subsets “orphan subsets”
  – E.g., BRAF V600 mutation subsets of melanoma

• Rare Diseases and Rare Disease subsets
  – E.g., Cystic Fibrosis G551D mutation subset

• Smaller subsets available for clinical trials, smaller clinical development programs
  – Larger magnitude of effects anticipated
  – Safety, R-B assessments
“Patient-focused” Drug Development

- We understand that people with chronic diseases are “experts” in that disease, as far as the symptoms and the impact on QOL, and what might be acceptable tradeoffs
  - On risk
  - On uncertainty
- Series of 20 patient-focused meetings agreed to under PDUFA V
- FDA continuing to develop B/R assessment framework that incorporates burden of disease (hopefully with patient input)
- These are going well, but it is clear that these initiatives reflect a broader trend that is gaining traction
- Question arises over next steps
“Patient-focused” Drug Development

- How to meaningfully collect that knowledge, in rigorous manner, given that there is a spectrum of opinions and a spectrum of disease burden in any given disease?
- How to do this for the many thousands of diseases?
- Many patient groups and non-profits getting involved in evaluating these issues
- Piloting, e.g., with PRO qualification process and with submission of draft guidances by patient/professional groups
- For FDA/CDER, we must assess how such input can be translated into acceptable endpoints and drug development guidance
How Does FDA “view orphan diseases”

- Is the bar different for efficacy?
  - Yes and no, standards must be present to demonstrate the drug is safe and efficacious in adequate and well controlled trials but the agency has demonstrated tremendous flexibility.

- Functional vs “hard” (survival) endpoints
  - Both acceptable if clinically meaningful and a difference is clearly demonstrable due to therapy. Intermediate clinical endpoints can be used in accelerated approvals as well as qualified surrogate markers likely to predict clinical benefit.

- Label “expansion” when the disease has different subpopulations
  - It depends but open to broad label under some circumstances.

- Can natural history be used as a control
  - Yes, if collected rigorously in a truly comparable population with a well demarcated endpoint or “hard” endpoint and a major undeniable difference is identified.
CDER: Flexibility

- Level-of-Evidence supporting initial marketing application approval
- Categories
  - >2 adequate and well-controlled (A & WC) trials
  - 1 A & WC trial + supporting evidence
  - Other (e.g., case series)

### CDER 2014 NME/BLA Approvals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level-of-Evidence</th>
<th>Rare n (%)</th>
<th>Common n (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&gt;2 A &amp; WC trials</td>
<td>4 (20)</td>
<td>20 (74)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 A &amp; WC trial + supporting evidence</td>
<td>15 (75)</td>
<td>7 (26)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1 (5)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CDER: Flexibility

- Level-of-Evidence supporting initial marketing application approval

- Categories
  - ≥2 adequate and well-controlled (A & WC) trials
  - 1 A & WC trial + supporting evidence
  - Other (e.g., case series)

CDER 2015* NME/BLA Approvals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level-of-Evidence</th>
<th>Rare n (%)</th>
<th>Common n (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>≥2 A &amp; WC trials</td>
<td>1 (10)</td>
<td>8 (47)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 A &amp; WC trial + supporting evidence</td>
<td>8 (80)</td>
<td>7 (41)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1 (10)</td>
<td>2 (12)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Pediatric Rare Disease Voucher Program

- FDASIA
- FDA will award priority review voucher to sponsors of rare pediatric disease product application that meet certain criteria
  - Prevelance predominantly pediatric
  - New drug
  - Not seeking adult indication
- Can seek designation during development
- Voucher is transferable
- Formal guidance to be published
Rare Pediatric Disease Priority Review Vouchers

- 4 RPD PRVs have been awarded
  - Elosulfase (Vimizim) for Morquio A Syndrome (MPS IVa)
  - Dinutuximab (Unituxin) for high-risk neuroblastoma
  - Cholic acid (Cholbam) for bile acid synthesis disorders
  - Uridine triacetate (Xuriden) for hereditary orotic aciduria

- Program sunsets 1 year after third voucher awarded
  - Triggered March 17, 2015
  - Can award RPD PRVs through March 16, 2016
  - GAO report on the program being conducted

- Three sold and one redeemed,
Regulatory Collaborations

- Enhanced international collaborations in recent years
- EU:
  - International Rare Disease research Consortium (IRDIRC)
    - Several FDA members participate
  - Harmonized orphan drug designation application form
  - Regular meetings on orphan drugs, cancer, and pediatrics
- NIH
  - CDER-NIH CC taskforce
  - IND regulatory training workshop
Summary

- More therapies for Orphan diseases approved in 2014 than ever before, a strong trend continues
- Drug Development for Orphan diseases uses expedited review to a great degree
- Targeted Medicines are increasing and are common among therapies for Orphan diseases with both advantages and challenges
- Patient centered drug development is important in orphan disease
- FDA is willing to be very flexible in its approach to serious rare diseases with unmet need
- Rare disease voucher can be valuable incentives
- There is an increased level of global collaboration on rare diseases