June 3, 2015
9:00 am – 10:30 am

Department of Health
2585 Merchants Row
Conference Rm. 320P
Tallahassee, Florida 32311

IRB 2 Convened Committee
Meeting Minutes

IRB Attendance:

Sandra Schoenfisch (Chair, substitute, expertise in children)
Jaime Arango (non-affiliated; person whose primary interest is non-scientific; present by phone)
Daniela Chiriboga Salazar (present by phone)
Jamie Forrest
Cheryl Clark (Expertise in children, pregnant women)
Nkechi Ichite (present by phone)
Nina McGrew (non-affiliated; absent)
Daniel Thompson (expertise in children, pregnant women)
Brenda Whittenberg (Expertise in Subpart C: Prisoners, non-affiliated; present by phone)

Other Attendees: Derek Schwabe-Warf, Robert Hood, Ph.D.

Quorum

A quorum was present. A quorum is defined as a majority of members present. The quorum also reflected the requirement outlined in 45 CFR 46.108 as well as 21 CFR 56.107. Please note that the number of members present will not always match the total number of votes on items as the total number votes reflects the number of members present in the room at the time of discussion and vote. At least one non-scientist and at least one non-affiliated member were present.

Members present by phone received all pertinent materials prior to the meeting to allow adequate time for review and request of additional information, if needed. Members present by phone actively and equally participated in the discussion of all protocols.

Approval of Previous Minutes:

Minutes from the May 6, 2015 meeting were circulated by email and modified by member input.

Conflict of Interest:

Conflict of Interest: None Declared

Members did not report any:

- Compensation or payments for services (e.g., consulting fees, lecture payments, bonus, royalties, paid authorship, honoraria, gifts, or in-kind products or services) related to the research of any value, except as otherwise excluded by this policy.
- Compensation or payments for services where an arrangement has been entered into such that the amount of compensation will be affected by the outcome of the research.
- Equity interests (stocks, stock options, security, or other ownership interests) related to the research of any value.
- Equity interests whose value when aggregated for the individual and the individual's immediate family represents more than a five percent ownership interest in any single entity.
- Equity interest related to the research in a non-publicly traded corporation of any value by the individual or a member of the individual's immediate family
- Equity interest related to the research of any amount to the researcher or any member of the researcher's immediate family where an arrangement has been entered into such that the amount of compensation will be affected by the outcome of the research.
- Intellectual property rights and interests (patents, copyrights, royalties, licensing agreements, and any other proprietary interest related to the research).
- Board or executive relationship related to the research, regardless of compensation.
- Involvement or participation in the design, conduct, or reporting of the research, including providing advice on Department registry data systems.
- Serving as the immediate supervisor of a researcher within the last year
- Any other interest that the IRB member believes would interfere with his or her ability to objectively review a protocol.
- Any travel related to research

Education:

Robert Hood presented education on protocol specific justifications when reviewing research involving pregnant women, prisoners, children, and waivers of consent and waivers of documentation of consent. Discussion focused on reports from OHRP and AAHRPP in regards to lack of protocol specific findings concerning vulnerable populations and waivers or alterations of consent. At convened meetings, we will attempt to review all protocols by stopping at each regulatory criteria and discussing if it is met as a group. This will help foster discussion and ensure we are in regulatory compliance.

(1) Protocol Title: MK-1439-018 A Phase 3 Multicenter, Double-Blind, Randomized, Active Comparator-Controlled Clinical Trial to Evaluate the Safety and Efficacy of Doravirine (Mk-1439) 100 mg Once daily versus Darunavir 800 mg once daily plus Ritonavir 100 mg once daily, each in combination with Truvada or Epizicome/Kivexa, in Treatment Naive HIV-1 Infected Subjects

Submission:	**Principal Investigator:**	**Presenters:**
Modification (05-2015)	Jose Montero, MD	Daniela Chiriboga Salazar

Jaime Arango

Meeting Discussion:

This modification places additional restrictions on certain methods of contraception because they can be rendered ineffectual by Ritonavir. It changed the endpoint from 40 to 50 HIV copies/mL because the assay's sensitivity below 50 HIV copies/mL has not been proven with a high level of fidelity. However, this does not impact clinical equipoise because it affects both the control and experimental arms equally. Hepatitis B-infected subjects who would be removed from their normal course of treatment will be removed from the study. No participants have been recruited for this protocol yet.

Reviewers determined the modifications to this greater than minimal risk study did not change the research design or exposure to risks because the study is limiting enrollment from subjects who may be harmed by the procedures. The modifications do not add new risks or change the probability or magnitude of existing risks, which were previously determined to be reasonable. The modification to participant selection continues to be equitable because subjects are selected based on inclusion criteria consistent with protecting patient welfare as opposed to selection based on age, sex, gender, socio-economic status, or race. The modification changes the information present in the consent document, but not the consent procedures which continue to be appropriate. All applicable elements of consent are still present. The modification did not change plans for safety monitoring. There were no modifications to protections for privacy interests or confidentiality protections. There are no vulnerable populations enrolled in the study.

Total votes for approval: Affirmative: 8 Negative: 0 Recusal: 0 Absent: 0

(2) Protocol Title: (MK-1439-007) Multicenter, Double-Blind, Randomized, 2-Part, Dose Ranging Study to Compare the Safety, and Antiretroviral Activity of MK-1439 Plus TRUVADA Versus Efavirenz Plus TRUVADA in Aniretroviral Treatment-Naïve, HIV-1 Infected Patients

Submission:	**Principal Investigator:**	**Presenters:**
Modification (02-2015)	Jose Montero, MD	Nkechi Ichite Jamie Forrest

Meeting Discussion:

This modification serves to notify the IRB that three lots of clinical supplies (pharmaceuticals used in the trial) were missing handling conditions. These handling conditions indicate to the patient to keep the

container/bottle tightly closed and dispense only the original container and store the medication in the original packaging to protect from moisture. There are no product quality concerns due to this labeling error. The sponsor has notified the FDA and their IRB of the supply labeling error. The site was notified of this error on October 28th, 2014. There is one participant in this study who was notified of the labeling error in person at study site on November 3rd, 2014. The site notified the IRB on February 19th, 2015. Since the site did not approve the modification before informing participants of this alteration, the board deemed this event non-compliance in fact but not serious or continuing. The board approved this modification pending internal education on Departmental policies and procedures concerning prompt reporting. In addition, the site must provide minutes from the meeting, which should be signed by the P.I.

Reviewers determined the modifications to this greater than minimal risk study did not change the research design. The modifications do not add new risks or change the probability or magnitude of existing risks because the modification aims to inform participants about this error, which were previously determined to be reasonable. The modification does not change participant selection procedures. The modification does not change the consent procedures, which continue to be appropriate. The modification did not change plans for safety monitoring. There were no modifications to protections for privacy interests or confidentiality protections. There are no vulnerable populations enrolled in the study.

Total votes for approval: Affirmative: 8 Negative: 0 Recusal: 0 Absent: 0

(3) Protocol Title: Emergency Treatment of Coral Snake Envenomation with INA2013 (Deland Site)

Submission:	**Principal Investigator:**	**Presenters:**
Initial Review	Tracy Weiner, DO	Carina Blackmore Dan Thompson Brenda Whittenberg Daniela Chiriboga-Salazar

Meeting Discussion:

This is a new greater than minimal risk study looking at a novel antivenom for coral snake bites. The currently approved antivenom is no longer being produced and available batches are expiring soon. The study will be conducted at the Florida Hospital- Deland. The study plans to enroll up to 50 participants. The study will last for an indeterminate period until the antivenom is FDA approved or withdrawn from clinical trials.

The Committee provided rationale for the basis of IRB approval under 45 CFR 46.111 and 21 CFR 56.111:

Risks are minimized by using procedures consistent with sound science, and are reasonable compared with other drugs in the class. Subject selection is equitable because participants are selected based on the presentation of a snake bite as opposed to race, class, gender or sex. Risks are reasonable in relationship to the importance of the knowledge to be obtained. The researcher has appropriate qualifications and expertise because he is a practicing physician and has completed CITI courses. All applicable elements of consent and parental permission are present. The PI or co-PI obtain consent from the participant or their legal authorized representative in private exam rooms. The PI or co-PI will obtain assent from children when they are over 7 years old. The assent documents are targeted age appropriately. Safety monitoring will be conducted by an independent board and time frames for review are appropriate. Safeguards are appropriate to protect the rights and welfare of children, prisoners, pregnant women, and mentally disabled persons that participate in this study as determined via their respective subparts. No conflicts of interest were reported. The board decided that a Spanish consent form should be constructed to ensure as many people as possible are able to enter the study, consent provided. This will be provided at a later date.

Children

Category 405: The research is greater than minimal risk because it involves use of an unapproved drug. There is the prospect of direct benefit to the children because the unapproved drug has seems to be promising as a treatment for coral snake venom in children.

The risks in the research, from a medication side effects including serum sickness, anaphylactic and or anaphylactoid reactions, are justified by the potential benefit of ameliorating the effects of coral snake venom, which can be fatal.

Permission of one parent is sufficient even if the other parent is alive, known, competent, reasonably available, and shares legal responsibility for the care and custody of the child, because there is a direct benefit to the child that could not be obtained outside the research context and needs to be administered in a timely manner.

Pregnant Women

Where scientifically appropriate, preclinical studies, including studies on pregnant animals, and clinical studies, including studies on non-pregnant women, have been conducted and provide data for assessing potential risks to pregnant women and fetuses. Although the protocol does not describe animal work and Phase I studies involving pregnant women, the risks appear to be consistent with other studies in the drug class and the venom from a coral snake can be deadly.

The risk to the fetus is caused solely by interventions or procedures that hold out the prospect of direct benefit for the woman or the fetus. Risks to the fetus are unknown but the study is likely to reduce risk of maternal death, which could impact the health of the fetus, maternal death.

Any risk is the least possible for achieving the objectives of the research because the design of the research provides alternatives of care.

Consent of the woman is obtained and documented in writing. The consent document provides information such that the mother is fully informed regarding the reasonably foreseeable impact of the research on the fetus or neonate. The research holds out the prospect of a direct benefit both to the pregnant woman and the fetus.

The consent of the woman is obtained because consent of the father may delay treatment.

No inducements, monetary or otherwise, will be offered to terminate a pregnancy because there is no compensation in the research and the researcher has attested no attempt will be made to terminate the pregnancy in the research.

Individuals engaged in the research will have no part in any decisions as to the timing, method, or procedures used to terminate a pregnancy. The researcher attested no attempt will be made to attempt to terminate the pregnancy in the research.

Individuals engaged in the research will have no part in determining the viability of a neonate. This is not a clinical study or study does not occur during labor where such a determination is made and the researcher attested they are not involved in determining the viability of the neonate.

Prisoners

This is a non-federally funded study that does not provide advantages to a prisoner through their

participation in the research, when compared to the general living conditions of prisoners. The risks involved in the research are commensurate with risks that would be accepted by non-prisoner volunteers since everyone receives the same treatment. Procedures for the selection of subjects within the prison are fair to all prisoners and immune from arbitrary intervention by prison authorities or prisoners because the selection criteria are based on a coral snake bite. The information is presented in language which is understandable to prisoners. Adequate assurance exists that parole boards will not take into account a prisoner's participation in the research in making decisions regarding parole, and each prisoner is clearly informed in advance that participation in the research will have no effect on his or her parole. The P.I. attests that **"**Inclusion in this study is based strictly on experiencing a coral snake bite. Inclusion will have no impact on parole boards" and will be discussed during the consent process. If the IRB finds there may be a need for follow-up examination or care of participants after the end of their participation, adequate provision has been made for such examination or care, taking into account the varying lengths of individual prisoners' sentences, and for informing participants of this fact because participants will be treated in the hospital until they are well.

Total votes for approval: Affirmative: 8 Negative: 0 Recusal: 0 Absent: 0

Next Meeting: July 1, 2015

Other Business:

Meeting Adjourned: 10:27 am