

## VP22 Cancer Drugs Fund Allocation Under The National Institute for Health and Care Excellence (NICE): The First Six Months

### AUTHORS:

Daniel Liden, Anson Pontynen, Ashley Jaksa, Judith Rubinstein ([Judith.Rubinstein@contextmattersinc.com](mailto:Judith.Rubinstein@contextmattersinc.com))

### INTRODUCTION:

As of July 2016, funding from England's Cancer Drugs Fund (CDF) is dispensed based on the results of National Institute for Health and Care Excellence (NICE) technology appraisal guidances instead of independent CDF appraisals (1). NICE can recommend providing temporary CDF funding for drugs that have potential to demonstrate cost-effectiveness after further data collection (2). This analysis examines drugs considered for temporary CDF funding since the start of this new process in July 2016.

### METHODS:

We collected all final NICE oncology technology appraisal guidances completed before the end of 2016 and noted whether each drug was considered for or awarded CDF funding and which factors impacted the decision to give or withhold CDF funding (3).

### RESULTS:

We identified twenty-one NICE oncology reviews completed between July 2016 and the end of 2016. Of these reviews, only one was recommended for temporary funding under the CDF because further data collection had the potential to significantly reduce incremental cost-effectiveness ratios (ICERs). Three further reviews were considered for temporary CDF funding but ultimately received negative decisions. In all three cases, NICE found no potential for further data collection to sufficiently improve ICERs. The evaluations also noted that the manufacturers either did not intend or did not have sufficient time to prepare a case for CDF funding.

### CONCLUSIONS:

NICE focused strongly on evidence maturity in making CDF funding decisions. The only drug recommended for CDF funding had immature trial data with uncertainties that could be resolved by further data collection. The three drugs that did not receive CDF funding had relatively mature evidence that would not be improved through further data collection. Timing was also an issue: two reviews specifically noted that the manufacturers had insufficient time to prepare strong cases for CDF funding. The CDF historically had significant budget issues, so NICE may be trying to be more judicious in allocating CDF funding.

### REFERENCES:

1. "Cancer? Cancer Drugs Fund." Accessed January 11, 2017. <https://www.england.nhs.uk/cancer/cdf/>.
2. "Cancer Drugs Fund | NICE Technology Appraisal Guidance | NICE Guidance | Our Programmes | What We Do | About | NICE." CorporatePage. Accessed January 11, 2017. <https://www.nice.org.uk/about/what-we-do/our-programmes/nice-guidance/nice-technology-appraisal-guidance/cancer-drugs-fund>.
3. "Published | Guidance | NICE." Accessed January 11, 2017. <https://www.nice.org.uk/guidance/published?type=ta>.

---

## VP24 The Development Of A Quality Management Tool For Health Technology Assessment Agencies In Spain

### AUTHORS:

Sergio Márquez-Peláez ([sergio.marquez.ext@juntadeandalucia.es](mailto:sergio.marquez.ext@juntadeandalucia.es)), Iñaki Gutiérrez-Ibarluzea, José Asua, Teresa Molina-Lopez, José Luis Castro-Campos, Sandra Garcia-Armesto, María Bono-Vega, Rosendo Bugarín-González, Janet Puñal Riobóo, Setefilla Luengo-Matos, Ana Brezmes-Delgado, Victoria Serra Sutton, Jillian Margaret Reynolds, Jesús