

4.0.03 DOC Cmte minutes

Prostate Cancer Committee meeting

Date: 11/10/2017

Location: NICE – Manchester

Minutes: Final



Committee members present:		
Waqar Shah (WS) (Chair)		(Present for notes 1 – 9)
Abi Ademoyero (AA)		(Present for notes 1 – 8)
Pauline Bagnall (PB)		(Present for notes 1 – 9)
Guy Chetiyawardana (GC)		(Present for notes 1 – 9)
Charles Frost (CF)		(Present for notes 1 – 9)
John Graham (JG)		(Present for notes 1 – 9)
Sadaf Haque (SH)		(Present for notes 1 – 9)
Peter Jenkins (PJ)		(Present for notes 1 – 9)
Howard Kynaston (HK)		(Present for notes 1 – 9)
Sanjeev Madaan (SM)		(Present for notes 1 – 9)
Brian McGlynn (BM)		(Present for notes 1 – 9)
Jon Oxley (JO)		(Present for notes 1 – 9)
Jonathan Richenberg (JR)		(Present for notes 1 – 8)
Mark Robinson (MR)		(Present for notes 1 – 9)
Karen Stalbow (KS)		(Present for notes 1 – 9)

In attendance:		
Jean Bennie (JB)	GUT - Technical Analyst	(Present for notes 1 – 9)
Chris Carmona (CC)	GUT - Senior Technical Analyst	(Present for notes 1 – 9)
Jackie Durkin (JD)	GUT - Administrator	(Present for notes 1 – 9)
Rupert Franklin (RF)	NICE - Guidelines Commissioning Manager	(Present for notes 1 – 9)
Les Hayes (LH)	NICE - Business Analyst	(Present for notes 1 – 9)
Adam O'Keefe (AO)	GUT - Project Manager	(Present for notes 1 – 9)
Gabriel Rogers (GR)	NICE – Technical Adviser (HE)	(Present for notes 1 – 9)
Erin Whittingham (EW)	NICE - Public Involvement Adviser	(Present for notes 3 – 9)

4.0.03 DOC Cmte minutes

Observers:	
Alice Biggane	(Present for notes 1 – 7)

1. Introductions and guideline committee working

The Chair welcomed the Committee members and attendees to the first meeting on Prostate cancer. The Committee members and attendees introduced themselves. The Chair informed the Committee that no apologies had been received.

The Chair outlined the objectives of the meeting, which included:

- Introductions; committee & NICE staff
- Role of chair, committee, Guideline Commissioning Manager, Public Involvement Programme, Business Analyst and Project Manager
- Introduction to literature searching, health economics and developing review protocols, evidence reviews and drafting recommendations
- Development of a number of review protocols
- Initial discussion around identifying priorities for health economic analysis

The Chair gave a presentation which was an introduction to guideline committee working including the role of Chair and the committee, and an overview of the process of guideline development.

The Chair asked everyone to verbally declare any interests. The following new interests were declared:

Name	Job title, organisation	Declarations of Interest, date declared	Type of interest	Decision taken
John Graham	Consultant Oncologist & Trust Cancer Lead, Taunton Clinical Advisor, National Guideline Alliance, London	September 2017 – Invited presentation on the use of tamoxifen for the prevention of breast cancer to Medicines and Healthcare products	Personal, Financial, Non-specific	Declare and participate

4.0.03 DOC Cmte minutes

		Regulatory Agency. Honarium of £200 plus travel expenses.		
Jonathan Richenberg	Consultant Radiologist, Royal Sussex County Hospital, Brighton	Organiser of Guerbet sponsored 1 day congress due 9th December 2017 in London on mpMRI in prostate cancer. Guerbet are a contrast media manufacturer but their agent is in no way particular to mpMRI prostate. The course is for educational purposes and to improve quality in mpMRI of the prostate. Financial value tbc expected ~£2000 from ticket sales – not paid by Guerbet.	Personal, Financial, Specific	Declare and participate – See DOI Registry for rationale
Jonathan Richenberg	Consultant Radiologist, Royal Sussex County Hospital, Brighton	Key note speech on CT contrast media in ESUR September 2017. No relevance to MRI. Due a small honorarium for giving the speech.	Personal, Financial, Non-specific	Declare and participate

4.0.03 DOC Cmte minutes

Having reviewed the registry of previously declarations, the Chair and a senior member of the Developer's team noted that the interests declared did not prevent the attendees from fully participating in the meeting.
2. Role of the Guideline Commissioning Manager
The Chair then introduced RF, who delivered a presentation which outlined the role of the NICE Guidelines Commissioning Manager. RF also provided a context for the development of clinical guidelines within NICE as a wider organisation. The Chair thanked RF for her presentation.
3. Public Involvement Programme presentation
The Chair introduced EW, who gave a presentation on the Public Involvement Programme and the role and value of lay committee members. The Chair thanked EW for her presentation.
4. Role of the Project Manager & expenses
The Chair introduced AO, who presented an outline of the Project Manager role and also reiterated some of the key points relating to declarations of interest. JD the advised the committee on how to arrange travel and accommodation and claim expenses. The Chair thanked AO and JD for their presentation.
5. Resource Impact Assessment
The Chair introduced LH as the Resource Impact Assessment (RIA) lead on the guideline, explained the role of the Business Analyst and answered the committee's questions around this.
6. Guideline development
<p>The Chair introduced JB who provided a summary of the scope for the Prostate Cancer Guideline. RP explained that the scope will shortly be published, following a process of public consultation.</p> <p>JB then delivered a presentation which gave an introduction to: formulating review protocols, literature searching; and answering review questions (including drafting recommendations). GR provided a brief introduction to health economics. The Chair thanked JB and GR for their presentations.</p>
7 & 8. Review protocols and review question confirmation
The Chair reintroduced JB, who worked with the committee to finalise the following review questions and consider/agree review protocols for these review questions:

4.0.03 DOC Cmte minutes

Review question 1 'Which of the following, alone or in combination, constitutes the most clinical and cost- effective pathway for diagnosing prostate cancer: Multiparametric/ functional MRI; TRUS biopsy; Transperineal template biopsy?'

Review question 2 'What is the clinical and cost- effectiveness of active surveillance, radical prostatectomy or radical radiotherapy (including brachytherapy) compared to each other for people with localised prostate cancer?'

Review question 3: 'In those deemed suitable for active surveillance, which of the following, alone or in combination, constitutes the most clinical and cost- effective pathway for excluding the progression of prostate cancer in people multiparametric MRI, TRUS biopsy, Transperineal template biopsy?'

Review question 4: 'What is the optimal dose and fractionation schedule for people with localised prostate cancer (T1b–T3a N0 M0) who are treated with radical radiotherapy?'

Review question 5: 'What is the most clinically- and cost-effective scheduling of docetaxel added to standard treatment for the treatment of hormone-sensitive locally-advanced prostate cancer?'

Review question 7: 'What is the clinical and cost- effectiveness of the use of bisphosphonates in people with hormone- relapsed metastatic prostate cancer?'

Due to time constraints, the committee agreed to review and agree the review protocols for review questions 6, 8 and 9 at the next meeting.

The Chair asked for volunteers from the committee to be allocated to each review question. The primary purpose of this was to provide a point of contact for the technical team. It was recognised that, due to the focus of many of the review questions, it might not be necessary or appropriate for all committee members to have any or the same number of questions allocated to them. Review questions were allocated as follows:

Review Question 1	TBC
Review Question 2	Howard Kynaston and Brian McGlynn
Review Question 3	Mark Robinson and Karen Stalbrow
Review Question 4	John Graham
Review Question 5	Peter Jenkins
Review Question 7	TBC

4.0.03 DOC Cmte minutes

9. Health economics: priority setting
The Chair introduced GR, who lead an initial health economics discussion to get a steer from the committee about which area(s) it thinks would benefit most from original HE work. GR explained that it is likely that one model will be built but that it might be feasible for this to add value to more than 1 review question.
10. Any other business
There was no other business.
11. Summary and next steps
AO confirmed the venue, date and time of the next meeting, as detailed below.. The Chair thanked the committee and others present for their contribution to the meeting before closing the meeting.

Date of next meeting: 28/11/2017

Location of next meeting: NICE - Manchester