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Overview

• The Management Board, at its December 2015 meeting, has endorsed the timeframe for the implementation of the EU clinical trial portal and database. The timeframe foresees that the database and portal are available for independent audit by August 2017. If the system gets a green light from the audit, the EU Clinical Trial Regulation will come into effect by October 2018 at the latest.

• The first development iteration has been completed and its output, Release 0.1, is undergoing formal ("SAT") testing at EMA.

• Release 0.1 covers an initial, partial implementation of the functionality to prepare and submit an Initial CTA, and of the MS process to appoint the RMS.

• Release 0.1 will be provided for User Acceptance Testing (UAT) in March.

• A microsite has been set up to share news, documentation, diagrams and other material with Member States.
EU portal and database - Maximum project timeline

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q4</td>
<td>Q1</td>
<td>Q2</td>
<td>Q3</td>
<td>Q4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>J</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>J</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>J</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>J</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**System build**
- Auditable Release (VA)
- Production Release (V1)
- PGLR (V2)
- PGLR (V3)
- Maintenance

**Milestones**
- Appendix on disclosure rules endorsed by MB – Oct ’15
- Project delivery timeframe endorsed by MB – Dec ’15
- Interface specifications shared with MS – mid ’16
- Audit endorsed by MB – Dec ’17
- Interface delivered (Agency side) – Q2 ’17
- Audit
- Production Version completed – Jul ’18
- EC notice – Mar ’18
- 2-3 months decision making period
- 6 months
- Regulation applies – Oct ’18
- V1 Go-live – Sep ’18
- V2 Go-live – Q1 ’19
- V3 Go-live – Q2 ’19
- Project closure – Q3 ’19

**Use Case Specification**

**Requirements Management**
- Production data provisioning
- MS integration testing

**Change mgmt.**
- Develop auditor manual
- Develop user manual for V1
- Update user manual for V2 and V3
- Develop training quick guides & demo videos
- Finalise
- Hold training webinars

**Key**
- Auditable release
- Production release V1
- Post go live production releases V2 & V3
- Maintenance release
- Audit
- Training
- Milestone
# High-level UAT 1 process

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2016</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>November</td>
<td>December</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 9 16 23 30</td>
<td>7 14 21 28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Build

- **Plan UAT**
  - Up to 6 weeks
  - Plan and coordinate UAT (incl. development of UAT scenarios, scripts and communications with participants)

## Test

- **Pre-UAT**
  - 2.5 weeks
  - Conduct EMA UAT dry-run ("pre-UAT") to validate test scripts and environment setup **10 days**

## Comms

- **UAT**
  - 3 weeks for UAT 1
  - UAT Execution** 5 days for UAT 1**
  - Consolidation of UAT feedback and reporting **5 days**

---

*Member States & Stakeholder*
# Key UAT 1 meetings and dates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Milestone</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UAT focal points deadline</td>
<td>15th January 2016</td>
<td>Deadline for Organisations and Member States to provide the EMA with a nomination for their UAT focal point.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All UAT tester deadline</td>
<td>31st January 2016</td>
<td>Deadline for Organisations and Member States’ UAT focal point to provide the EMA with details of all testers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UAT 101 webinar</td>
<td>11th February 2016</td>
<td>Webinar to introduce UAT concepts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-UAT 1 start</td>
<td>19th February 2016</td>
<td>EMA UAT testing commences.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UAT 1 pre-mailing</td>
<td>25th February 2016</td>
<td>Specific UAT 1 preparatory information shared with UAT focal points via email.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UAT 1 kick-off webinar</td>
<td>10th March 2016</td>
<td>Provision of final test scripts for UAT 1 and UAT logistics overview.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UAT 1 execution start</td>
<td>11th March 2016</td>
<td>Member States receive system access to complete UAT 1.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iteration 1 demonstration webinar</td>
<td>11th March 2016</td>
<td>Webinar to give overview of the functionality developed in iteration 1.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UAT 1 execution end</td>
<td>17th March 2016</td>
<td>Deadline for testing and UAT focal points to provide consolidated feedback to the Agency.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UAT 1 feedback provided</td>
<td>29th March 2016</td>
<td>Provision of UAT 1 feedback by the Agency to the UAT focal points.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Follow up to the IT workshop held on 21/10/2015 – Interface Survey

- A questionnaire was circulated to all Member States, followed up by email reminders to maximise the response rate.

- The survey asked a single **key question**, to which responders must answer yes or no: “Do your Member State intend to set up/modify a national IT system to interact with the EU portal and database?”

- Supplementary questions followed depending on the response to the key question.
### Key question

**Do your Member State intend to set up/ modify a national IT system to interact with the EU portal and database?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes (15/30)</th>
<th>No (12/30)</th>
<th>Unclear* (3/30)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Austria</td>
<td>Bulgaria</td>
<td>Latvia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belgium</td>
<td>Cyprus</td>
<td>Malta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Croatia</td>
<td>Czech Republic</td>
<td>Spain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denmark</td>
<td>Estonia</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>Finland</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greece</td>
<td>France</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hungary</td>
<td>Liechtenstein</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ireland</td>
<td>Lithuania</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>Luxemburg</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td>Norway</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poland</td>
<td>Romania</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portugal</td>
<td>Slovenia</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slovakia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UK</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Empty and apparently contradictory answers at key question level have been recorded as ‘unclear’ and excluded from analysis.
15/30 responders DO intend to set up/modify a national IT system to interact with the EU portal and database
Half (15/30) of responders said that they do intend to set up or modify a national IT system to interact with the EU portal and database.

Of these 15 Member States:

• 13/15 intend to upload data and documents to fulfil EU requirements; the same group (12/15) also intends to use the EU portal as a central point that co-ordinates actions with the NCA and ethics committees (the remaining 1/15 responded N/A).

• 10/15 intend to simply download documents and data to their national system for review and planning at a national level.

• Approximately half (8/15) of respondents intend to enter national outcomes manually into the workspace and via that into the EU portal.
12/30 responders DO NOT intend to set up/modify a national IT system to interact with the EU portal and database
Take aways: responders who said no to the key question

Almost half (12/30) of responders said that they **do not** intend to set up or modify a national IT system to interact with the EU portal and database.

Of these 12 Member States:

- Approximately half (7/12) of respondents intend to download documents and data, for manual management and review and planning at national level.

- All respondents (12/12) want to perform their national work and interactions within the EU workspace and minimise download of information.
Interim report from subgroup with the task to amend Questions and Answers on clinical trials in emergency situations
ad-hoc CT meeting Feb 8 2016

Ann Marie Janson Lang (chair, SE)
Monique Al (NL)
Martyn Ward (UK)
Sandra Petraglia (IT)
PROTECTION OF SUBJECTS AND INFORMED CONSENT

• Prior informed consent – cornerstone of modern medical care

• Article 35 Emergency situation – not possible to obtain informed consent prior to – but after subject inclusion/first intervention

• Note emergency situations – not emergency trials
After intervention – informed consent sought without delay to continue participation

• Minors, incapacitated – by legally designated representative

• Other subjects – by subject or legally designated representative, confirmed by subject
• (36) “…Such situations relate to cases where for example a patient has suffered a sudden life-threatening medical condition due to multiple traumas, strokes or heart attacks, necessitating immediate medical intervention…”
Article 35 of Clinical Trial Regulation 1(3)

• it is not possible within the therapeutic window to supply all prior information to and obtain prior informed consent from his or her legally designated representative

• the investigator certifies that he or she is not aware of any objections to participate in the clinical trial previously expressed by the subject;

• the clinical trial relates directly to the subject’s medical condition because of which it is not possible within the therapeutic window to obtain prior informed consent from the subject or from his or her legally designated representative and to supply prior information, and the clinical trial is of such a nature that it may be conducted exclusively in emergency situations;
Article 35 of Clinical Trial Regulation 2(3)  
Clinically relevant benefit

- scientific grounds to expect that participation of the subject in the clinical trial will have the potential to produce a direct clinically relevant benefit for the subject resulting in a measurable health-related improvement alleviating the suffering and/or improving the health of the subject, or in the diagnosis of its condition;
Article 35 of Clinical Trial Regulation 3(3) Risk

- the clinical trial poses a minimal risk to, and imposes a minimal burden on, the subject in comparison with the standard treatment of the subject's condition.
Next steps of the subgroup on emergency situations

- Examples – emergency situations
- Clarify how to secure ”no prior objections” on participation in emergency trials
- Clarify – hierarchy with multiple consent procedures (minors, incapacitated, emergency situations) in the same trial
- Clarify – ”without undue delay” when seeking informed consent after inclusion/intervention
ETHICAL CONSIDERATIONS FOR CLINICAL TRIALS ON MEDICINAL PRODUCTS CONDUCTED WITH MINORS

Meeting in The Hague  7th January 2016

Agenda
Revision of the version of 2008
Major Modifications

- Assent needed, related to the child‘s maturity
- Ethics committee’s composition: pediatric and methodological expertise absolutely essential
- Design of clinical trials and assays: novel designs to reduce risks, burden and sample size.
Major Modifications

- Risk, burden, benefit and their weighing: detailed and special considerations of burden
- Interpretation of the criterion “minimal risk and burden in comparison with the standard treatment”: examples and specifications of standard treatment
Summary

- The current schedule expects EU 536/2014 to enter into force October 2018 at the latest. More reliable details are expected 3rd quarter of 2016. UATs will start soon.
- There are many subgroups and working parties in charge of aligning innumerable documents to the EU 536/2014.
- Many of these documents shall be ready for public consultation, starting in April 2016.