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The problem(s)

• Misalignment of financial incentives and public health
  ⇒ Largely due to the patent-based system
  ⇒ Geared towards profit-driven research priorities
  ⇒ Monopolies leading to high prices, issues of access to medicines
  ⇒ Massive – and sometimes illegal – promotion practices

• Conflicts of interests
  ⇒ Companies design their trials and test their own products, with the risk to maximising benefits and downplaying harm
  ⇒ Proximity with authorities, influence power, industry-friendly rules
“(...) are the incentives provided by the patent system appropriate...? Sadly, the answer is a resounding “no”


“Objectionable corporate strategies are the product not of rogue corporations, but rather of systemic market incentives”

Overview

• The price of certain “new” medicines has exploded…

• Whilst the number of clinically superior drugs is small…

• And costs of pharmaceutical research remain a black box…

• Patent monopolies are undermining competition, leading to high prices …

• Whilst regulatory mechanisms suffer from conflicts of interests…

• Alternative models of innovations exist but lack political foothold…

Ways forward?
Drug prices: Burden on healthcare systems

• 2000-2009: public pharmaceutical expenditure has increased on average by 76% in the EU.
  => 2011: 3rd post in EU Member States’ health care budgets

• The rise in expenditure of patented medicines has outpaced savings due to promotion of generics’ use

• Influential oncologists have recently described current prices of new patented cancer medicines as ‘astronomical, unsustainable and even immoral’

1 Kanavos, P. et al. Differences in costs of and access to pharmaceutical products in the EU. Policy department economic and scientific policy, Brussels, 2011
Cancer drug price increases
1980 - 2013

Rapid Rise
Median Monthly Price between 1985-2010: +1330%

Source: Memorial Sloan-Kettering Cancer Center; 2013.
“Are we the pharmaceutical companies out of touch with reality? (…) Pharma must bear all the research costs. But this is not a license for pharmaceutical companies to demand excessive prices. Especially now that our government has fiscal difficulties”

Julien Brabants, Director of GSK-Belgium
De Standaard, 20 May 2015 (translation)
Myth of high prices to recoup R&D investment

• Prices set according to what the market is ready to pay

• Industry estimates of average R&D costs for a new molecule ($2.6bn) highly inflated and controversial

  ⇒ not-for-profit estimates are 15 to 20-times less¹

  ⇒ “… companies have been spending only 1.3% of revenues on basic research to discover new molecules, net of taxpayer subsidies”²

• The real costs of R&D remain unknown

• Companies spend more on marketing than on R&D


² Light D. & Lexchin J., Pharmaceutical research and development: what do we get with all that money?, British Medical Journal, BMJ 2012; 344: e4348
Drug prices related to R&D costs?

“The $1 billion price tag [for developing a single new medicine] is one of the great myths of the industry”

Andrew Witty, GSK chief executive
Reuters, 14 March 2013

“There is a tremendous amount of waste in the system”

Joe Jimenez, Novartis chief executive & new president of EFPIA
The Financial Times, 7 June 2015
Example of Sovaldi Hepatitis C

• Between €25,000 - €56,000 for 12 week course in EU
• Costs of R&D limited (buy-out, few trials, public R&D)
• Manufacturing costs between $68 - $136 per treatment
• Even rich countries can’t afford it at this price tag
• Rationing in the vast majority of EU countries (advanced liver cirrhosis)
• Same trend for combinations & competitors’ medicines
## Hepatitis C Treatments

**Table 11. Prices for 12 weeks of treatment**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>SIM</th>
<th>SOF</th>
<th>SOF/LDV</th>
<th>Viekira Pak®</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Original</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>currency</td>
<td>currency</td>
<td>currency</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>USA</strong></td>
<td>$ 66 360**</td>
<td>$ 84 000**</td>
<td>$ 94 500</td>
<td>$ 83 319</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$ 31 500**</td>
<td>$ 45 612**</td>
<td>$ 69 636**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Canada</strong></td>
<td>$ 55 000</td>
<td>± $ 49 730</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Egypt</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>$ 900</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>France</strong></td>
<td>€ 56 000</td>
<td>± $ 71 630</td>
<td>€ 48 000</td>
<td>± $ 61 400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>€ 41 000*</td>
<td>± $ 52 440*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Japan</strong></td>
<td>$ 11 244</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Spain</strong></td>
<td>€ 25 000*</td>
<td>± $31 980*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Switzerland</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>CHF 57,600</td>
<td>± $60 390</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>United</strong></td>
<td>£ 22 398</td>
<td>± $ 36 560</td>
<td>± $ 57 100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Kingdom</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>£ 34 983</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Negotiated for government reimbursement scheme. ** Lowest reported price negotiated by the USA Department of Veterans. Conversions to US$ based on average exchange rates for Quarters 1–3, 2014 (OANDA).
Public R&D

• “The public sector now has a much more direct role in the applied-research phase of drug discovery”

• Public sector’s share (discovery, tax discounts) really taken into account in the industry R&D estimates?

• “44% of innovative drugs recommended for marketing authorisation in the EU originated from small or medium sized enterprises, academia, public bodies, and public-private partnerships”

⇒ Importance of publicly-funded research, upstream but also downstream (clinical trials)


• Total global investments in health R&D (both public and private sector) in 2009: US$240 billion.

• Of the US$214 billion invested in high-income countries, 60% came from the business sector, 30% from the public sector, and about 10% from other sources (including private non-profit organisations).

R&D effectiveness

• “By the 1980s drugs were less than four times better than placebo; by the 1990s, twice as good, and by the 2000s just 36 percent better than a placebo”¹

• Non-inferiority trials merely showing the drug is not worse than existing ones (but not necessarily superior)

• Neglected areas of R&D despite of public health importance
  ⇒ Antibiotic resistance
  ⇒ Combination of drugs (patents!)
  ⇒ ....

¹ Olfson M. & Marcus S., Decline In Placebo-Controlled Trial Results Suggests New Directions For Comparative Effectiveness Research, Health Affairs, June 2013 vol. 32 no. 6 1116-1125
New medicines – few benefits 2000-2013

Prescrire’s ratings 2000 to 2013
Percentages per category
N=1345

- Nothing new (51%)
- Possibly helpful (20%)
- Offers an advantage (7%)
- A real advance (2%)
- Bravo (0%)
- Not acceptable (14%)
- Judgment reserved (5%)

Source: Prescrire International
New medicines – few benefits II
1981-2010

Negative Added Therapeutic Value

Positive Added Therapeutic Value

Neutral Added Therapeutic Value

Corporate influence over clinical research: considering the alternatives, Rev Prescrire April 2012; 32 (342): 311-314
Problems linked with patenting

• Profit-driven innovation model

⇒ secondary patenting (‘me-too’) with little therapeutic advance
⇒ Some priority health needs are not or insufficiently addressed
⇒ Investment protection mechanism, “broken social contract”
⇒ Resources wasted in patent litigations

• High prices

⇒ Lack of competition (monopoly)
⇒ Practices to delay entry of generics into the market
⇒ Cumulative patenting on single drugs

“Citizens waited more than seven months after patent expiry for cheaper generic medicines, costing them 20% in extra spending.”

“The inquiry showed that originator companies use a variety of instruments to extend the commercial life of their products without generic entry for as long as possible.”

“The inquiry also confirms a decline of novel medicines reaching the market”

“Overly restrictive intellectual property rights actually slow new discoveries, by making it more difficult for scientists to build on the research of others and by choking off the exchange of ideas that is critical to innovation”

Alternatives to patent models

2003
Resolution WHA56.27
*Intellectual property rights, innovation and public health*

Commission on Intellectual Property Rights, Innovation and Public Health

2006
Resolution WHA59.24
*Public Health, innovation, essential health research and intellectual property rights: towards a global strategy and plan of action*

Intergovernmental Working Group

2008
Resolution WHA61.21
*Global strategy and plan of action on public health, innovation and intellectual property*

Expert Working Group on Research and Development: Financing and Coordination

2010
Resolution WHA63.28
*Establishment of a consultative expert working group on research and development: financing and coordination*

Consultative Expert Working Group on Research and Development: Financing and Coordination

*Public health, innovation and intellectual property rights*

*Research and Development: Coordination and Financing*

*Research and Development to Meet Health Needs in Developing Countries: Strengthening Global Financing and Coordination*
Among the WHO Experts recommendations

• Need for alternative biomedical R&D models that de-link the cost of R&D from the price of medicines

⇒ Various ‘push’ and ‘pull’ mechanisms proposed: public and indirect (tax-based) funding, inducement prizes, patent pools, …

⇒ Principle of open knowledge innovation: generating knowledge free of restrictions, publication of data, transparency

• EU has recognised the need for new biomedical R&D models in *Horizon 2020* (including prizes)

---


Way forward

• The pharma industry should be held accountable to their corporate responsibility to respect human rights

⇒ “In order to identify, prevent, mitigate and account for how they address their adverse human rights impacts, business enterprises should carry out human rights due diligence process”¹

• Needs-driven, open models of innovation that can bring more affordable medicines for unmet medical needs

⇒ Models promoting the ‘de-linkage’ of R&D costs from price of medicines
⇒ Increased public funded health R&D that should result in public good and medical products that are suitable, more affordable and accessible

Way forward II

• Independence, transparency and accountability of decision-making processes and bodies
  ⇒ Reinforce public health and consumers’ trust in medicines policy
  ⇒ Transparency (R&D costs, access to data)
  ⇒ Patients organisations

• Refrain from increasing monopoly protections
  ⇒ IP and beyond patenting (data exclusivity, trade secrets, …)
  ⇒ Promote the use of existing flexibilities to improve public health
Thank you

www.haieurope.org
www.bernedeclaration.ch