

## Technology Appraisal Committee Meeting (Committee B)

**Minutes:** Confirmed

**Date and Time:** Thursday 23 March 2017, 10am to 2pm

**Venue:** Prospero House  
241 Borough High Street  
London  
SE1 1GA

<b>Present:</b>	1. Dr Amanda Adler (Chair)	Present for all notes
	2. Dr Sanjeev Patel (Vice-Chair)	Present for all notes
	3. Professor John Cairns	Present for all notes
	4. Mr Mark Chapman	Present for all notes
	5. Dr Mark Glover	Present for all notes
	6. Dr Sumeet Gupta	Present for all notes
	7. Dr Sanjay Kinra	Present for all notes
	8. Dr Miriam McCarthy	Present for all notes
	9. Mr Christopher O'Regan	Present for notes 18 to 27
	10. Professor Stephen Palmer	Present for all notes
	11. Dr Danielle Preedy	Present for all notes
	12. Dr Marta Soares	Present for all notes
	13. Professor Ken Stein	Present for all notes
	14. Dr Nicky Welton	Present for all notes

**In attendance:**

Dr Melinda Goodall	Associate Director, National Institute for Health and Care Excellence	Present for all notes
Jeremy Powell	Project Manager, National Institute for Health and Care Excellence	Present for all notes
Marcia Miller	Administrator, National Institute for Health and Care Excellence	Present for all notes
Jessica Maloney	Technical Analyst, National Institute for Health and Care Excellence	Present for notes 1 to 17
Ahmed Elsada	Technical Adviser, National Institute for Health and Clinical Excellence	Present for notes 1 to 17

Dr Mary Hughes	Technical Analyst, National Institute for Health and Care Excellence	Present for notes 18 to 27
Jasdeep Hayre	Technical Adviser, National Institute for Health and Clinical Excellence	Present for notes 18 to 27
Dr Steve Edwards	Head of Health Technology Assessment, BMJ Technology Assessment Group	Present for notes 1 to 15
Tracey Jhita	Health Economics Manager, BMJ Technology Assessment Group	Present for notes 1 to 15
Peter Cain	Health Economist, BMJ Technology Assessment Group	Present for notes 1 to 15
<b>Non-public observers:</b>		
Helen Barnett	Editor, NICE	Present for all notes
Edgar Masanaga	Business Analyst - Resource Impact Assessment, NICE	Present for all notes
Sharlene Ting	Technical Analyst, NICE	Present for notes 1 to 17

## Notes

### Welcome

1. The Chair welcomed all members of the Committee and other attendees present to the meeting. The Chair reviewed the agenda and timescales for the meeting, which included the appraisals of cabozantinib for previously treated advanced renal cell carcinoma [ID931] and lenalidomide for the treatment of multiple myeloma in people who have received at least one prior therapy with bortezomib (partial review of TA171) [ID667].
2. The Chair informed the Committee of the non-public observers at this meeting: Helen Barnett, Edgar Masanaga and Sharlene Ting.
3. Apologies were received from Dr Ray Armstrong, Dr Nigel De Kare Silver, Dr Neil Iosson, Mrs Anne Joshua, Mr Nigel Westwood and Dr Stuart Williams.

### Any other Business

4. The Committee were given an update on the progress of other appraisals that have been considered by NICE Technology Appraisal Committee B.

## **Appraisal of cabozantinib for previously treated advanced renal cell carcinoma [ID931]**

### **Part 1 – Open session**

5. The Chair welcomed the invited experts: Dr Steve Edwards, Tracey Jhita and Peter Cain to the meeting and they introduced themselves to the Committee.
6. The Chair welcomed company representatives from Ipsen to the meeting.
7. The Chair asked all Committee members to declare any relevant interests
  - 7.1. Dr Amanda Adler, Dr Sanjeev Patel, Professor John Cairns, Mr Mark Chapman, Dr Mark Glover, Dr Sumeet Gupta, Dr Sanjay Kinra, Dr Miriam McCarthy, Professor Stephen Palmer, Dr Danielle Preedy, Professor Ken Stein and Dr Nicky Welton all declared that they knew of no personal specific financial interest, personal non-specific financial interest, non-personal specific financial interest, non-personal non-specific financial interest, personal specific family interest or personal non-specific family interest for any of the technologies to be considered as part of the appraisal of cabozantinib for previously treated advanced renal cell carcinoma [ID931].
  - 7.2. Dr Marta Soares declared a personal non-specific financial interest as she has participated in an advisory board for Bristol Myers Squibb for the use of nivolumab in non-small cell lung cancer.
    - 7.2.1. It was agreed that this declaration would not prevent Dr Soares from participating in this section of the meeting.
8. The Chair asked all NICE Staff to declare any relevant interests.
  - 8.1. All declared that they knew of no personal specific financial interest, personal non-specific financial interest, non-personal specific financial interest, non-personal non-specific financial interest, personal specific family interest or personal non-specific family interest for any of the technologies to be considered as part of the appraisal of cabozantinib for previously treated advanced renal cell carcinoma [ID931].
9. The Chair asked all other invited guests (assessment group/ERG and invited experts, not including observers) to declare their relevant interests.
  - 9.1. All declared that they knew of no personal specific financial interest, personal non-specific financial interest, non-personal specific financial interest, non-personal non-specific financial interest, personal specific family interest or personal non-specific family interest for any of the technologies to be considered as part of the appraisal of cabozantinib for previously treated advanced renal cell carcinoma [ID931].
10. The Chair introduced the key themes arising from the consultation responses to the Appraisal Consultation Document (ACD) received from consultees, commentators and through the NICE website.
11. The Chair asked the company representatives whether they wished to comment on any matters of factual accuracy.

12. The Chair explained that “representatives of the press and other members of the public be excluded from the remainder of this meeting having regard to the confidential nature of the business to be transacted, publicity on which would be prejudicial to the public interest” (Section 1(2) Public Bodies (Admission to Meetings) Act 1960)” and all public attendees left the meeting.
13. The Chair then thanked the company representatives for their attendance, participation and contribution to the appraisal and they left the meeting.

## **Part 2 – Closed session**

14. Discussion on confidential information continued.
15. The Chair then thanked the Evidence Review Group representatives for their attendance, participation and contribution to the appraisal and they left the meeting.
16. The Committee continued to discuss the clinical and cost effectiveness of cabozantinib for previously treated advanced renal cell carcinoma [ID931].
  - 16.1. A vote was taken. The options were:
    - Option 1: to recommend cabozantinib
    - Option 2: not to recommend cabozantinibThe Committee voted for Option 2.
17. The Committee instructed the technical team to prepare the Appraisal Consultation Document (ACD) or Final Appraisal Determination (FAD) in line with their decisions.

## **Appraisal of lenalidomide for the treatment of multiple myeloma in people who have received at least one prior therapy with bortezomib (partial review of TA171) [ID667]**

### **Part 1 – Open session**

18. The Chair welcomed company representatives from Celgene to the meeting.
19. The Chair asked all Committee members to declare any relevant interests
  - 19.1. Dr Amanda Adler, Dr Sanjeev Patel, Professor John Cairns, Mr Mark Chapman, Dr Mark Glover, Dr Sumeet Gupta, Dr Sanjay Kinra, Dr Miriam McCarthy, Mr Christopher O'Regan, Professor Stephen Palmer, Dr Danielle Preedy, Dr Marta Soares, Professor Ken Stein and Dr Nicky Welton all declared that they knew of no personal specific financial interest, personal non-specific financial interest, non-personal specific financial interest, non-personal non-specific financial interest, personal specific family interest or personal non-specific family interest for any of the technologies to be considered as part of the appraisal of lenalidomide for the treatment of multiple myeloma in people who have received at least one prior therapy with bortezomib (partial review of TA171) [ID667].
20. The Chair asked all NICE Staff to declare any relevant interests.
  - 20.1. All declared that they knew of no personal specific financial interest, personal non-specific financial interest, non-personal specific financial

interest, non-personal non-specific financial interest, personal specific family interest or personal non-specific family interest for any of the technologies to be considered as part of the appraisal of lenalidomide for the treatment of multiple myeloma in people who have received at least one prior therapy with bortezomib (partial review of TA171) [ID667].

21. The Chair introduced the key themes arising from the consultation responses to the Appraisal Consultation Document (ACD) received from consultees, commentators and through the NICE website.
22. The Chair asked the company representatives whether they wished to comment on any matters of factual accuracy.
23. The Chair explained that “representatives of the press and other members of the public be excluded from the remainder of this meeting having regard to the confidential nature of the business to be transacted, publicity on which would be prejudicial to the public interest” (Section 1(2) Public Bodies (Admission to Meetings) Act 1960)” and all public attendees left the meeting.
24. The Chair then thanked the company representatives for their attendance, participation and contribution to the appraisal and they left the meeting.

## **Part 2 – Closed session**

25. Discussion on confidential information continued. This information was supplied by the company.
26. The Committee continued to discuss the clinical and cost effectiveness of lenalidomide for the treatment of multiple myeloma in people who have received at least one prior therapy with bortezomib (partial review of TA171) [ID667].
  - 26.1. The committee decision was based on consensus.
27. The Committee instructed the technical team to prepare the Final Appraisal Determination (FAD) in line with their decisions.