



ITHS

Institute of Translational Health Sciences
ACCELERATING RESEARCH. IMPROVING HEALTH.

NED 2020

Networking to Enhance Development

A Conference By and For Research Coordinators

iths.org/ned2020



NED 2020

Networking to Enhance Development

ITHS

Institute of Translational Health Sciences
ACCELERATING RESEARCH. IMPROVING HEALTH.

Single IRB: The Promise and the Reality

Adrienne Meyer, MPA, CIP
Assistant Director of Reliances
Human Subject Division
University of Washington

Learning Objectives

- 1 Understand what single IRB review is
- 2 Recognize what kinds of studies must comply
- 3 Explain the overall process for obtaining single IRB review
- 4 Plan for single IRB review for a multi-site research study

A little history....

how *Institutional* Review Boards came to be

1953: NIH Clinical Center starts in-house, group peer review for ethical integrity for some research

1966 – 1971: In-house, group peer review model is extended to all DHHS conducted research

1974: First version of what is now called the Common Rule. Introduces the term “*institutional* review board”. Presumption is that a similar, in-house group peer review model will be required for all DHHS conducted or funded research.

1981: Common Rule is adopted by most federal agencies

The Idea of a Single IRB Review is Not New

Regional ethics organizations for protection of human research participants

- ▶ Anne Wood, Christine Grady & Ezekiel J Emanuel, *Nature Medicine* (2004)

“...we propose an innovative reform to the structure and process of research review: abandoning **institution**-based review and consolidating all independent reviewing, monitoring, training and ethical policy formulation into a system of approximately 20 **Regional Ethics Organizations (REOs)** for the entire United States.

Under this proposal, all activities related to human research participants' protections for one geographic region of the United States would be consolidated under a REO.”

Overarching Rationale

“The use of a single IRB of record...will help streamline the IRB review process by **eliminating the unnecessary repetition** of those reviews across sites. The goal of this policy is to enhance and streamline the IRB review process for multi-site research so that **research can proceed as quickly as possible** without compromising ethical principles and protections for human research participants.”

NIH Single IRB Webpage

Single IRB - Two Mandates

The federal requirement for single IRB (sIRB) review comes from two separate mandates:

Revised Common Rule

The revised federal Common Rule contains a new requirement for single IRB review for *collaborative*, non-exempt human subjects *research* that involve multiple institutions. This applies to all federally-funded or supported research (with the exception of Department of Justice funded projects). It went into effect January 21, 2020.

NIH policy

This is distinct from the Common Rule requirement and applies to most grants and contracts submitted to NIH on or after January 25, 2018 that involve *multi-site*, non-exempt human subjects research. The policy defines *multi-site* research as a subset of *collaborative* research that requires the use of a single IRB. It is important to identify when a project must comply with the NIH policy because there are specific, NIH requirements that must be present in the grant or contract applications for studies subject to this policy that do not apply to studies under the broader Common Rule requirement

NIH Multi-site Research

“Multi-site” means that the same research procedures (i.e., protocol) are being conducted at one or more domestic sites and that each site is under the control of a local participating investigator.

Protocols that address the same research questions, involve the same methodologies, and evaluate the same outcomes are considered to be the “same research protocol.” Additionally, sites that are accruing research participants for studies that are identical except for variations due to local context consideration would be considered to be conducting the “same research protocol.” If a study involves a separate site for study coordination or coordination of data and statistical analyses and the site is conducting the same protocol as the other participating sites, then all sites would be expected to rely on the designated single IRB.

Single IRB – Exceptions

- Exempt human subjects research.
- Veteran's Affairs (VA) sites
- Foreign sites
- Sites involving tribal nations
- Sites for which review by the proposed sIRB is prohibited by a federal, tribal, or state law, regulation, or policy

Single IRB – Exceptions

OHRP issued an exception for all HHS-funded research subject to the Common Rule Single IRB requirement and that was been approved by an IRB prior to January 21, 2020. This means that at least one IRB has approved any part of the study. This exception does not apply if the study must comply with the NIH multi-site policy.

NIH has established a process by which it will consider other requests for exceptions from its multi-site policy if there is a compelling justification, but it has stated that exceptions will be rarely granted.

The Common Rule mandate allows funding agencies to make exceptions, however, at this time, there is no formal process established for requesting an exception from non-NIH funding agencies.

Preparing a Funding Application - Two Roles

Lead Site (Institution)

- Often the Primary awardee for smaller studies
- May also involve a coordinating center or CRO for larger studies

Participating Sites (Institution)

Some studies may not have a clear lead, for example multiple-PI funding structures, however it will be important to identify which site will play the lead in regards to IRB review arrangements.

NIH Mandate – Lead Sites

1. Select the IRB that will serve as the single IRB (sIRB) for the project.
2. Identify and budget for any costs associated with sIRB review. Include any sIRB fees and sIRB-related personnel costs in the grant budget.
3. Obtain preliminary confirmation from all participating sites that they are willing to rely upon the selected sIRB.
4. Provide required information in the funding application. The lead PI must prepare a Single IRB Plan for the grant/contract application and complete the appropriate human subjects forms.

Selecting the Single IRB

In some cases, NIH (or another funding sponsor) may specify the sIRB in the FOA or RFP funding announcement. However, for most funding opportunities, the funding agency expects the lead PI to select the sIRB, subject to the acceptance of the agency.

Any IRB with a federal registration can serve as a sIRB. This includes independent IRBs such as WIRB and Advarra that are not affiliated with any institution that conducts research. The sIRB may or may not be affiliated with any of the institutions involved in the research.

The IRB of the home institution of the PI should not automatically be assumed to be the single IRB.

Selecting the Single IRB

Not all IRBs are willing to serve as a single IRB for all research. In order to be a single IRB, they must have:

- Appropriate IRB member expertise
 - Special populations (children)
 - Special types of research (Exception from Informed Consent)
- Capacity
 - Application system that can accommodate studies with large number of sites
 - Process for reviewing single IRB studies
 - Enough staff to manage requirements of large studies

Identifying and Budgeting for Costs

Two new costs to consider:

IRB Review Fees

The costs for IRB review of research conducted at a single institution by that institution's IRB have typically been considered an indirect cost covered under an institution's Facilities and Administration (F&A) rate. However, many institutions who will serve as single IRBs will charge fees to review other sites. Additionally, fees charged by independent IRBs, such as WIRB or Advarra, will not be paid for by the institution. The fees are the responsibility of the lead site and should be included in the grant budget as direct costs.

Additional Study Personnel

The lead site will have additional responsibilities for coordinating single IRB review and requirements throughout the life of the study which may require additional staffing resources.

Obtaining Confirmation From Sites

NIH requires that the lead PI attest in the funding proposal that all participating sites have agreed to rely on the selected the single IRB (sIRB). In most cases, investigators are not authorized to commit an institution to rely on a particular IRB, instead that commitment must come from the institution's IRB office, or other research regulatory office or official.

Most sites with IRB offices will have a process for obtaining this confirmation – at UW, HSD provides a letter of support.

Providing a Single IRB Plan

- A description of how you will comply with the NIH Single IRB (sIRB) policy.
- The name of the IRB that will serve as the sIRB of record.
- Indicate that all identified participating sites have agreed to rely on the proposed sIRB and that any sites added after award will rely on the sIRB.
- If you are requesting an exception for some or all participating sites, follow the NIH Guidance [Requesting an Exception](#).
- Indicate that all participating sites will, prior to initiating the study, sign an authorization/reliance agreement that will clarify the roles and responsibilities of the sIRB and participating sites.
- Briefly describe how communication between sites and the sIRB will be handled. See [this link](#) for a possible template.

Common Rule – Lead Site

No Guidance from federal agencies on what is require. Strongly recommend PIs still complete the following:

1. Select the IRB that will serve as the single IRB (sIRB) for the project.
2. Identify and budget for any costs associated with sIRB review.
Include any sIRB fees and sIRB-related personnel costs in the grant budget.
3. Obtain preliminary confirmation from all participating sites that they are willing to rely upon the selected sIRB.

Common Rule or NIH - Participating Sites

Typically only role is to obtain confirmation from their IRB or Research Compliance offices that the selected IRB is acceptable.

The Single IRB Review Process

Universal **parts** of the process, however there is no universal agreement on:

- The order of the steps in the process
- Who completes some specific steps in the process
- What specific information is required for each step
- How information is collected (via email, online systems, paper)
- Communication structures

Universal parts of Single IRB review

- 1) Submit overall protocol and template materials for IRB review
- 2) Request reliance from relying site IRB/HRPP offices
- 3) Establish a reliance agreement/arrangement
- 4) Creation of consent materials for sites
- 5) Obtain local context information from sites
- 6) Obtain IRB Review of the participating sites

Submit overall protocol for IRB review

The overall protocol for the study is typically reviewed by the IRB prior to the review of any participating sites. The protocol will need to address how the study will, in general, be carried out across the study:

- Identifying and recruiting subjects
- Consent process
- Study interventions and data to be collected
- How data will be transmitted and stored
- Template materials (consent documents, recruitment materials) for use across all sites

Request Reliance from Sites

Although each site may have already agreed to rely on the single IRB, this does not constitute a formal reliance agreement. For each study, the IRB or HRPP office of each participating site must formally confirm that the study can be reviewed by the single IRB.

Most institutions with an IRB office have a process by which investigators can formally request reliance on an “external” IRB.

May need to provide:

- A written description of the research (protocol, grant)
- Documentation of approval of the overall protocol
- Copies of template consents, for tailoring to the site’s requirements
- Answering other questions about the study

Establish Reliance Agreement/Arrangement

Reliance on an IRB not operated by the institution requires that an institution establish what is called a reliance agreement. Although some institutions have entered into standing agreements, often the flexible terms of these agreements must be clarified on a study-by-study basis

- Establishing a formal reliance agreement
- Clarifying the specific terms of reliance under a Master agreement
- Completing study specific documents, which may include letters of indemnification.
- Clarifying additional institutional roles and responsibilities under the reliance (Genomic Data Sharing certification, Post-approval Monitoring, HIPAA waivers)

Creation of Consent and Recruitment Materials for Sites

When consent materials will be used for the study, they will often (though not always) be generated based off of a template approved by the single IRB along with the review of the overall protocol.

There is no universally agreed process for the creation of these documents for each site

- In some cases, the site study team may be provided with the template and asked to complete it (in consultation with their IRB office)
- In some cases, the site's IRB office will be asked to provide standard institutional language and the site-specific materials will be generated by the IRB or by the coordinating center or CRO
- The site may be allowed to edit all of the consent template, or only specific sections.

Obtain Local Context from Sites

In addition to reviewing the study according to federal requirements, the single IRB must take into consideration “local context”, or information specific to the participating site, this includes:

- State and local laws that impact the research
- Whether there will be any changes to the overall protocol to accommodate how the study will be carried out at the site
- The qualifications of the site study team and resources available at the site
- The outcomes of local “ancillary” reviews (FCOI, Radiation Safety, etc.)

There is no universal standard for how this information is collected.

IRB Review of Sites

After the IRB has reviewed the overall protocol it will review and approve the addition of sites, typically under expedited review. It will need:

- Any documents required as part of the reliance agreement
- All site specific materials (consent documents, recruitment materials)
- A site-specific application
- Local context information

There is no universal standard for how this information is collected and who submits these materials to the IRB.

Challenges for Everyone

No guidance from federal regulators or funding agencies on the Common Rule requirement

- Can budgets contain IRB fees as direct costs?
- Does the funding proposal have to name the IRB?
- What if sites disagree on whether the study is exempt or requires IRB review?
- What if sites disagree about whether the study is subject to the mandates?
- How will this change requirements to release funding as part of JIT?
- How does an investigator obtain an exception? What kinds of studies might qualify?

Challenges for Everyone

Most academic medical center, research institute or hospital IRB's are geared toward reviewing research done by their own institution.

To be a single IRB:

- Revise all policies and procedures to address review of other institutions
- Establish processes for regularly reviewing other institutions (how to collect local context robustly) they are unfamiliar with
- Overhaul application systems to accommodate large numbers of sites and/or need for access to the system by individuals unaffiliated with the institution
- Educating non-institutional researchers on their policies and processes
- Post-approval monitoring considerations

Challenges for Research Teams

Must comply with the reporting requirements of different IRBs

- How will you keep track of what is required for each study?

Must still comply with the reporting requirements of their home institution?

- Does the IRB/HRPP office require any check-ins or updates?
- Will the study team have to report to the Privacy Office if breaches of confidentiality?

May not be able to communicate directly with the reviewing IRB

No consistency of process or roles from study to study



NED 2020

Networking to Enhance Development

ITHS

Institute of Translational Health Sciences
ACCELERATING RESEARCH. IMPROVING HEALTH.

Questions?

ITHS

Institute of **Translational** Health Sciences
ACCELERATING RESEARCH. IMPROVING HEALTH.



NED 2020

Networking to Enhance Development

ITHS

Institute of Translational Health Sciences
ACCELERATING RESEARCH. IMPROVING HEALTH.

Thank You



ITHS

Institute of Translational Health Sciences
ACCELERATING RESEARCH. IMPROVING HEALTH.

NED 2020

Networking to Enhance Development

A Conference By and For Research Coordinators

iths.org/ned2020