

SACGHS Task Force on the Oversight of Genetic Testing: Status Report

Andrea Ferreira-Gonzalez, Ph.D. SACGHS Oversight Task Force September 6, 2007

SACGHS Mandate

- To explore, analyze and deliberate on the broad range of human health and societal issues raised by the development and use, as well as potential misuse, of genetic technologies
- To make recommendations to the Secretary of HHS and other Departments upon request

SACGHS Scope

- Integration of genetic technologies into health care and public health
- Clinical, ethical, legal, and societal implications of new medical applications
- Research and data collection
- Patent policy and licensing practices
- Broader social applications of genetics (forensics, education, etc.)
- Emerging applications and issues

HHS Secretary's Charge

Undertake the development of a comprehensive map of the steps needed for <u>evidence development</u> and <u>oversight</u> for genetic and genomic tests, with improvement of health quality as the primary goal.

- Evidence of harm attributable to analytic validity, clinical validity, or clinical utility
- Distinctions between genetic tests and other laboratory tests
- Existing pathways that examine the analytic validity, clinical validity, and clinical utility
- Roles and responsibilities of involved agencies and private sector organizations

HHS Secretary's Charge

- Information provided by and resources needed for proficiency testing
 - Adequacy and transparency of proficiency testing processes
- Potential communication pathways to guide test use
- New approaches or models for private and publicprivate sector engagement in demonstrating clinical validity and developing clinical utility (effectiveness measures)
- Added value of revisions/enhancements to government oversight



NIH-DOE Task Force issued a report in 1997 on assuring safe and effective genetic testing:

- Recommended consideration of a genetics testing specialty under CLIA
- Recommended that proficiency testing be mandated for all laboratories conducting genetic testing
- Led to the formation of SACGT

Previous Reports on Oversight

SACGT Report of 2000 recommended:

- FDA should be responsible for the review, approval, and labeling of all new genetic tests that have moved beyond the basic research phase using a novel, streamlined process
- CLIA should be augmented with specific provisions to ensure the quality of laboratories conducting genetic tests
- Data collection efforts should continue after genetic tests reach the market and CDC should coordinate public-private sector collaborations

HHS Response (January 2001)

- Accepted recommendations and indicated that they would be implemented over time as resources allowed
 - FDA's oversight of genetic tests to include laboratory developed tests and genetic test kits
 - Post-market data collection to be performed by CDC and might be required of the test developer and other payers
 - CMS to develop new CLIA regulations for expanded oversight of genetic testing laboratories

Developments in 2001-2007

- Questions raised about FDA's authority to regulate LDTs
- FDA issues guidance clarifying
 - ASR regulation
 - review requirements for laboratory developed IVDMIAs
- In 2006, CMS halts plans to establish a genetics specialty; other measures to be undertaken instead

CMS-genetic testing

- Provide CMS surveyors with expert guidance to assess genetic testing labs
- Develop alternative PT mechanisms (e.g., interlaboratory comparisons)
- Develop educational materials
- Maximize expertise of accreditation organizations
- FDA and CDC to provide guidance for review of complex analytical test validations
- Collect data on genetic testing lab performance

Oversight Task Force (n=33)

SACGHS Members -- Andrea Ferreira-Gonzalez (Chair), Sylvia Au, Kevin FitzGerald, Steve Teutsch, Marc Williams

Ad Hoc Members -- Amy Brower, Barbara Evans, Mark Hoffman, Kathy Hudson, Paul Steven Miller, Richard Naples, Vicky Pratt, Sue Richards, Jim Robb, Gail Vance, Ann Willey

Federal Experts -- Michael Amos, Linda Bradley, Joe Boone, Phyllis Frosst, Steve Gutman, Muin Khoury, Tim O'Leary, Ira Lubin, Elizabeth Mansfield, Gurvaneet Randhawa, Judy Yost

Consultants -- Marie Earley, Scott Grosse, Lisa Kalman, Marie Mann, Joanne Mei, Glenn Palomaki

SACGHS Oversight Task Force Activities

- Beginning March 2007 Created an expanded Task Force with ad hoc members/consultants
- Six meetings of the full Task Force Developed an outline for a report, discussed the report's scope, and debated the use of key terms
- Periodic meetings of the "Steering Committee" (which consists of the five SACGHS members)
- "Chapter" meetings Teams assigned to each chapter received writing assignments and met as needed to refine drafts

Focus of Activity

- Identification of Gaps in knowledge
- Discussion of Harms
 - Real harms
 - Potential harms
- Develop policy options

Report Outline

- Chapter 1: Background, scope of the report, spectrum of harms, overview of each chapter
- Chapter 2: Technologies used to conduct genetic tests
- Chapter 3: Analytic validity, proficiency testing and clinical validity
- Chapter 4: Clinical utility and evidence development
- Chapter 5: Effective communication and Clinical Decision support
- Chapter 6: Summary of policy changes

- What is oversight for the purposes of this report
 - Inclusive use of term rather than strict regulatory perspective
- Genetic exceptionalism will be acknowledged as a social and policy reality, but will not necessarily drive content
- Text to be written on broad ethical issues/spectrum of harms and benefits
 - Overestimation of 'potential harm' may interfere with realization of benefit
- Will address harm due to 'reductionism'

- Will explicitly tie this in with Secretary's Personalized Health Care initiative
- Roles of different entities (e.g. regulatory agencies, government, knowledge generation agencies, provider, payer, etc.)
- Will identify issues that are peripheral to focus explicitly that will not be addressed in the report
- Status: Rough draft with content evolving based on content of other chapters

- Define genetic test for the purpose of the report
 - Incorporates definitions in use
 - Will include intended use of test (examples will be provided)
- Comprehensive list of methodologies being considered
- Identify future trends
- Status: major portion completed; further refinements in progress

- Most extensive content area
- Analytic validity—Proficiency Testing—Clinical Validity
- Status:
 - Exploring governmental, public/private and private oversight options
 - Second draft revised based on September 5 meeting and breakout

- At present no regulatory oversight for clinical utility (and this may not be appropriate)
- No existing infrastructure
- Largest gap in realization of benefit (value)
- Biggest opportunity to build processes for improvement

- Group has chosen to take a broad approach for identification of actionable items
- Consistent with the direction of health care in the US
 - Quality improvement
 - Evidence based best practice
 - Pay for performance

Status:

- Viewing utility from different perspectives (Patients, Providers, Payers, Public health, Quality improvement organizations, Guideline developers, etc.)
- Exploring governmental, quasi-governmental, private methods for the generation, synthesis and management of new evidence
- Second draft revised based on September 5 meeting and breakout



- Focus on effective communication
 - Pre- and post-analytic
 - Roles of laboratory, provider and patient
 - Genetic specialty vs. non-genetic specialty (provider and laboratory)
 - Direct-to-consumer

- Focus on clinical decision support
 - Pre- and post-analytic
 - Passive vs. active
 - Incorporation of evidence-based clinical guidelines
 - Opportunity to achieve greater impact based on experience in other sectors of health care
 - Clarify how CDS will be regulated

Status

- Earliest and farthest along in development
- Second draft revised based on September 5 meeting and breakout



Development of Policy Options

- Will follow 9/5 meeting
- Will synthesize based on gaps and harms
- Develop within each chapter.
- Steering committee members will review, consolidate and prioritize

SACGHS Report Timeline

- May-June
- July 9
 - Task Force met and developed first draft
 - In-person Task Force meeting to discuss first draft; work on gaps and recs.
- July 10
 - Progress report to SACGHS
- July-Sept
 - Second draft developed
- Sep 5
 - In-person Task Force meeting to discuss draft; work on policy options
- Sept 6
 - TF chair preset to CLIAC
- Sept-Oct
 - Report revised based on outcome of Sept meeting

Report Timeline, Cont'd

- Sept 17
 - TF chair presents to ACHDGDNC
- Oct 15
 - SACGHS reviews revised draft for release for public comment
- Nov 5
 - Draft released for public comment
- Nov 19-20
 - SACGHS devotes part of meeting to an extended comment period on oversight and a roundtable of professionals on the status of genetic education initiatives
- Dec 21
 - Close of public comment period
- Dec 21-Jan 31
 - Analysis of public comments

Report Timeline, Cont'd

- ~Feb 15
 - SACGHS meets to discuss public comments and proposed revisions to draft report, reviews (approves) transmission of revised report informally to OS
- February 18-Feb 28
 - Final substantive edits to reflect SACGHS input
- February 29
 - Revised draft report submitted to OS informally
- March 2008
 - Final report developed
- April 16
 - Final review by SACGHS via email
- April 30, 2008
 - Final report formally submitted



For more information about SACGHS, please visit:

http://www4.od.nih.gov/oba/SACGHS.HTM