Table of Contents

1.	Section 2 Exhibits	1
2.	2.1 Products used, Manchester, Liverpool and Sheffield V2	2
3.	2.2 UKHCDO Therapeutic Gudance 24.6.83	14
4.	2.3 UKHCDO Therapeutic Guidance December 1984	16
5.	2.4 Hay CRM procurement paper 2013	20
6.	2.5 1988 Therapeutic Guidance	28
7.	2.6 Figure 1 UKHCDO Annual Report 1986	34
8.	Section 3 Exhibits	35
9.	3.1 Craske Pavier Trowell bmjcred00584-0020	36
10.	3.2 Rizza life-expectancy bmjcred00545-0017	40
11.	3.3 1997 therapeutic guidelines	45
12.	3.4 Aledort 1985	60
13.	<u>3.5 Hay 1987 blood</u>	67
14.	3.6 Lancet correspondence 1985	73
15.	3.7 Life expectancy of Haemophilia Mejia-Carvajal et al J Thrombosis Haemostasis	75
16.	3.8 Farrugia Blood Transfus 2018	78
17.	Section 4 Exhibits	88
18.	4.1 GeneticLeaflet	89
19.	4.2 GeneticConsent	96
20.	4.3 Hay et al Didanosine for HIV	97
21.	4.4 Hay et al IL2 suppression by concentrate	102
22.	<u>4.5 Hay et al High Purity VIII and HIV j.1365-2141.1998.00753.x (1)</u>	106
23.	4.6 Initial letter describing rollout April 2003	113
24.	4.7 first DOH WP minutes	115
25.	4.8 Minutes DOH subgroup (procurement)	119
26.	4.9 tender letter to Haem Centres from Prof Hill Re Rollout 2003	121
27.	4.10 Letter Hill to Gutowski 31.7.03	124
28.	4.11 Final recombinant tender letter	126
29.	4.12 summary of awards	129
30.	4.13 Summary of Offers recombinant rollout 2003	181
31.	4.14 Recombinant rollout 2003-4 audit report	184
32.	4.15 Recombinant rollout audit report 2004-5	186
33.	4.16 National Procurement initial DH meeting Aug 2005	204
34.	4.17 Transfusion Leaflet 1990s	208
35.	GRO-B	210
36.		214
37.	4.20 Alprolix-Informationbooklet-1	226
38.	4.21 Elocta-infobookletpt	244
39.	4.22 Elocta-instructions	256
40.	4.23 Idelvion-Resource	257
41.	4.24 Idelvion-Instructions	259

UKHCDO

To all Haemophilia Centre Directors in England

PRIVATE & CONFIDENTIAL

Dear Colleague,

Re: Provision of Recombinant Products for Adult Haemophiliacs in ENGLAND

The information included in this email is privileged information and the bid price of individual companies must under no circumstances be discussed with other companies.

We are attaching a summary of the received tenders and you will notice that these are for the implementation period of 3 years. It had been hoped that by going to national tender for the required recombinant products for adults, that we would bring prices down. This appears to be the case for tenders from two of the four suppliers whose offers are very significantly less expensive than the remaining two. In awarding the contract, we need to consider the following:-

- (1) Nature of product and whether there are added human or animal proteins.
- (2) Rolling out recombinant factor VIII to as many patients as quickly as possible.
- (3) the relative cost of each product.
- (4) Trying to avoid a monopoly supplier.

At this time, we have available for purchase first and second generation products only but a third generation product (Advate, Baxter) is expected shortly to gain a UK product license. With regard to a monopoly supplier, the current situation for those under 22's is that they are supplied by all four manufacturers. This therefore allows us to purchase the second generation recombinant factor VIII from the 2 most competitive tenders without introducing a monopoly, which would also enable the majority of patients to start on recombinant products during the first year.

Alternatively, we could award the bulk of the contract to the most competitive tenders and have a small proportion from the other 2 suppliers. If we assume that the average cost per unit of plasma FVIII is 28p then the price difference between pdVIII and the cheapest rVIII is 17.5p/iu and the difference between the cheapest and most expensive tender for rVIII (including VAT) is a further 16 p/iu. If one translates this into units of recombinant factor VIII that could be purchased from the DoH allocation, the cheapest tender would enable us to purchase twice as many units of rVIII as the most expensive enabling almost twice as many patients to change to recombinant factor VIII in the first year.

For recombinant FIX there is a single supplier (Baxter) and so this would be rolled out on the agreed age banding procedure. The cost of treatment of haemophilia B in this group is expected to increase three-fold because of the poor recovery of Benefix and the price difference of 39p/unit.

Could you consider these issues and reply to me no later than August 2003, so that I can represent your views on how the contract should be placed to the D.O.H. Working Group that is overseeing this implementation process.

Please use the attached reply sheet and email to me (**GRO-C**).

Yours sincerely,

Frank G.H. Hill Chairman – UKHCDO

P.S. If anyone has not returned their patient data, please do so without further delay. Your patients would not be pleased if they are excluded from this treatment improvement. **FGHH.**

Enc: Reply Form

UKHCDO

<u>REPLY FORM</u>

RE: PLACING OF CONTRACT FOR RECOMBINANT FACTOR VIII

Name of Respondent:

Name of Haemophilia Centre:

Options for recombinant factor VIII contract (grade in order of preference 1 to 4):-

						<u>Ranking</u>		
٠	Place complete contract with 2 most (supplying 2 nd generation product)					[]	
Place contract split as follows:								
•	80% 2 cheapest tenders 20% others					[]	
•	70% 2 cheapest tenders 30% others			••		[]	
•	60% 2 cheapest tenders 40% others					[]	

Declarations of Interest (please state):-