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Why the ASBMT?

Membership with extensive cellular therapy experience:
• International professional society with over 2200 members (physicians, scientists, allied clinicians) dedicated to hematopoietic transplantation and cellular therapies.

Advancement of cellular therapies:
• Provided scientific leadership in cellular therapies for 25 years
• Co-Parent of FACT (with ISCT)
• Advocated for the reimbursement frameworks (e.g., coding)
• Partner of Registry (CIBMTR) and SCTOD
• Co-sponsor, with CIBMTR, of annual BMT Tandem Meetings
• Developed a questionnaire (ASBMT RFI) used by most payers to assess centers for network inclusion
• Partner to NMDP/Be The Match on patient access issues

And simply – this is a game changer for the field.
ASBMT Activities Thus Far

- **Heavily involved membership**
  - Cellular Therapy standing committee; Task Force
  - CAR T research, trials, administrative implementation

- **Assessing Value in Engineered T Cell Therapies** *(May 25, 2017)*
  - Forthcoming conference proceedings and manuscript *(9/17)*

- **Coding/reimbursement projects**
  - Interim guidance on coding
  - Assessment of needed new codes
  - Advocacy with CMS re: codes, NTAP status, DRG placement
Future Activities

- Applications for new codes
- On-going education and advocacy
- Strategic planning re: how does CAR T fit within ASBMT?
- Potential joint session with ASCO
- Others as suggested by membership or payers
A (very) brief history of cellular therapy

- **1950s.** Arnold Rich “Literally nothing of importance is known regarding the potentialities of small lymphocytes...one of the most humiliating and disgraceful gaps in all medical knowledge.”

- **1957.** E. Donnall Thomas starts transplanting bone marrow

- **Early 1960s.** J. F. Miller suggests thymus has immunologic function

- **1968:** J.F. Miller, R.A. Good suggest that B and T cells are separate lineages of lymphocytes (also 1st successful allo-SCT for SCID)

- **1970s.** Characterization of separate subsets of CD4+ and CD8+ T cells and mechanisms of antigen recognition.

- **1985.** Donor derived CMV-specific T cell therapy for alloSCT (Riddell, NEJM)

- **1990.** Clinical evidence that T cell depletion increases relapse rates after alloSCT.

- **1998.** First evidence that human thymic function persists.

- **2011.** First trials of CAR-T cells in advanced CD19+ malignancies (June, STM)

- **2017.** BLAs filed by Kite and Novartis for CD19-specific CAR-T therapies.
- An Immune System Trained to Recognize Cancer (NYT, Sep 2011)
- Setting the body’s ‘serial killers’ loose on cancer (NYT, Aug 2016)
- Science Breakthrough of the Year, 2013
Patient T-cells are transduced with a lentiviral vector to target CD19.
## Disease Targets w/in HCT Realm

### Current:
- Diffuse Large B-Cell Lymphoma (DLBCL)
- Follicular Lymphoma
- B-cell Acute Lymphoblastic Leukemia (B-ALL)
- Primary Mediastinal B-cell Lymphoma (PMBCL)

### Soon-ish:
- Multiple Myeloma
- Non-Hodgkin Lymphoma
- Mantle Cell Lymphoma

### Horizon:
- Acute Myeloid Leukemia
- Pediatric Neuroblastoma
- Chronic Lymphocytic Leukemia

First FDA approvals expected Summer 2017
Allogenic CAR T:
Specific and/or Universal

Pursuing Companies

Cellectis-Pfizer
Kite
Celyad
Fate Therapeutics
Cell Medica
Regeneron

Early Win

MIT Technology Review

Rewriting Life
Two Infants Treated with Universal Immune Cells Have Their Cancer Vanish

In a medical first, the children were treated with genetically engineered T-cells from another person.

by Antonio Regalado January 25, 2017
Home Brew: On-site CAR T

- Centers are beginning to manufacture their own, non-branded product on-site for selected patients

- TBD in terms of success and access beyond early trials
  - Payer authorization/reimbursement?
  - FDA approval needed?
  - Consistent manufacturing capabilities?
  - Cost – cheaper?
Ok, but what is it??

Differing Perspectives:

- Cellular Therapy – similar to HCT:
  - Very similar components – apheresis, cell manipulation, infusion, monitoring for post-infusion symptoms, specialized teams and beds
  - But, purposes differ – immune reconstitution (primary) vs. antineoplastic

- Biologic (aka Drug):
  - Early indications from FDA and CMS are that they are thinking of this as a ‘personalized biologic’ – similar to Dendreon
  - Pharmaceutical vs. medical benefit?

- Hybrid Vigor?
  - Specialized care episode with personalized product
Access Concerns: Medicare & Medicaid

- CMS:
  - Primary payer for DBLCL
  - Will not be a separate MS-DRG for at least 2 years
  - Will not be coded/paid as an Auto HCT – likely general lymphoma stays ($10-35k)
  - Unclear whether will qualify for New Tech Add-on Payment
  - Potential for coverage limitations or CED?

- Medicaid
  - Significant payer for B-ALL
  - All state decisions – no uniform adoption
  - Frequently difficult to get clearance to travel out of state
  - Removal of Essential Health Benefits and/or implementation of per person caps will make CAR T very difficult for Peds patients to access
Access Concerns: Cost & Coding

- Cost predictions: $250k+ for just the product
  - Hospital stay = 5-7 days if uncomplicated
  - Complications = 15+ days, multiple rounds of Tocilizumab ($20k/per), ICU
  - The CAR T care episode will be bookended by other expensive care

- Variations in apheresis models – i.e. bill separately from rest of episode vs. include
  - Increase in cost/billing for leukapheresis?

- Currently, the patient travels to the future site of infusion for apheresis vs. use of a local site
  - Will incur additional travel and lodging costs for the additional visits

- CMS just approved new ICD-10-PCS code for CAR T; goes into effect October 1, 2017
  - No other good CPT or ICD-10 codes exist.
  - Will be 2020 before appropriate new CPT codes can be finalized
Access Concerns: Limited Facilities

Industry Network
- Manufacturer qualified
- Previous trial experience
- FACT accredited?
- Exclusionary to one product?

Payer Network
- FACT accredited
- HCT experience
- Contracted rate?
- Multiple CAR T products covered?

N = 40?
N = 20?

N = ?
Data Dilemma: Outside of CIBMTR?

- Manufacturers are not currently required to report to CIBMTR
  - Some companies are in discussion to contract for that purpose
  - CIBMTR launched cell therapy reporting in 2016

- Extended analyses for purposes of long-term health outcomes, health services research, cost effectiveness or patient-reported outcomes will need a global data view, not short-term product-specific information

- Payers have the most leverage here – could require reporting
### Beyond CAR T: Choose your own adventure?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HCT</th>
<th>CAR T</th>
<th>HCT + CAR T</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Cord blood expansion</td>
<td>• Auto</td>
<td>• Sequencing?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Cord blood universal bridging</td>
<td>• Allo</td>
<td>• Certain patient subsets?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• GVHD-focused “add-backs” and suicide switches</td>
<td>• Last line vs. first line?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Universal donor</td>
<td>• New indications?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• ‘Any’ donor products</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Haplo donors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Innovation across all platforms at once will be difficult to decipher into best practices, guidelines and coverage policies.**

- **Key concern: Tracking and integration of data**
Summary

- CAR T is an extremely exciting technology that carries significant clinical risk and high cost.
- Until complications like CRS and Neurotoxicities can be routinely predicted and managed, CAR T should take place in specialized facilities.
- ASBMT feels that FACT Accreditation and reporting to CIBMTR will be very important for long-term learning and safety.
- Payer-Provider learning partnerships would very beneficial to all as the use of the technology grows.
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