

A P3G generic access agreement for population genomic studies

To the Editor:

The Public Population Project in Genomics and Society (P3G) is a not-for-profit consortium that provides the international research community with access to the expertise, resources and innovative tools for the harmonization of health and social sciences research (<http://www.p3gconsortium.org/>). The Generic Access Agreement (GAA; **Supplementary Note**) is a tool P3G has developed for use by population genomic studies (also often called biobanks or resources). Over the past decade, in anticipation of expanding demand for access by researchers and industry, large population studies collecting DNA samples worldwide have been developing access principles and policies to ensure ethical and legal access procedures to their resources that respect participant consent (**Table 1**). These access policies are now being operationalized into agreements that clearly stipulate the obligations of researchers and institutions who wish to access these resources. The access agreement is typically the final step

in the access request process, following the submission and successful review of an application for access¹.

This P3G GAA attempts to address both the sharing of data and the sharing of materials (that is, biospecimens). All studies named in **Table 1** provide data, and some may additionally allow access to the biological samples themselves, under certain conditions. Although many aspects of access apply uniformly between data and materials, certain considerations are unique to materials, such as their limited and depletable nature. Our proposed GAA aims to foster some level of uniformity of access by addressing both data and materials together.

Access agreements must be drafted clearly, so that researchers and their institutions are aware not only of their obligations, but also that “the border between acceptable and unacceptable conduct be clearly delineated and predictable...”². Explicit sanctions are important in order to respond effectively to any breach. These sanctions must be balanced—harsh enough to deter abuse by

researchers and yet not to discourage access.

We have surveyed available literature, policies and access agreements in an attempt to identify access norms, which have been captured by the GAA. Its utility, however, extends beyond suggesting best practices, as it also aims to enhance international harmonization of access procedures. Researchers should not encounter a completely different access procedure each time they apply for access to a study. Mindful of national and cultural heterogeneity, the GAA seeks to promote scientific knowledge as a common good that should be shared, with appropriate protections in place. The adoption of this unique tool will hopefully improve transparency and interoperability in the sharing of data and samples.

It is problematic for population studies to simply rely on existing agreements. First, substantial heterogeneity exists between studies, and existing access agreements often reflect peculiarities. The GAA seeks to harmonize the core conditions that should be considered by all population studies. Second,

Table 1 Existing agreements, related policies and guidelines reviewed

Organization	Document	Version/date
Avon Longitudinal Study of Parents and Children	Management and policy	Version 3.0, December 2011
Avon Longitudinal Study of Parents and Children	Access policy and material transfer agreement	Version 4.1, October 2012
CARTaGENE	Access agreement	NA
Canadian Partnership for Tomorrow Project	Data access policy	March 2012
Electronic Medical Records and Genomics Network Generation Scotland	Data use agreement management, access and publications policy	Version 4.3, March 2010
International Cancer Genome Consortium	Data access agreement goals	August 1, 2009
International Cancer Genome Consortium	Structure, policies and guidelines	April 2008
National Cancer Research Institute	Samples and data for research; template for access policy development	June 2009
P3G Ethics and Policymaking Core	Material and data access agreements, core elements	2008
P3G Ethics and Policymaking Core	Model consent form	February 2011
The Cancer Genome Atlas	Data use certification agreement	March 1, 2010
The Cancer Genome Atlas	Human subjects protection and data access policies	NA
UK Biobank	Access procedures; application and review	Version 1.0, November 8, 2011
UK Biobank	Material transfer agreement for data and/or samples	November 8, 2011
The Wellcome Trust Case-Control Consortium	Data access agreement	Version 18, June 2010
The Wellcome Trust Case-Control Consortium	Access policy; access to genotype data	Version 1, July 2009

NA, not available.

existing agreements are often limited to data and rarely address the use of and access to samples. Third, existing access agreements tend to be conceived in highly legalistic terms. This drafting approach is problematic because it lacks the clarity needed to communicate clear and understandable expectations to researchers as to their commitments. The GAA not only offers a principled analysis of the content of access agreements, but also provides explicit clauses to promote comprehensibility among researchers.

It is essential that these agreements are not developed in isolation. Harmonization, at the current implementation stage of population studies, will reinforce international data and sample sharing norms, promote equitable procedures and improve researcher familiarity with simplified access procedures. Ultimately, some agreement on core bioethical principles³ and the procedures accompanying them will foster an equitable and transparent playing field across population studies and foster their translation into genomic medicine.

The GAA has drawn on a variety of sources. A selection of existing data or material access agreements among P3G members was reviewed to determine common elements. Access-related documents from population studies—such as publication policies, intellectual property policies and consent forms—were also reviewed to ensure coherent integration. General principles were drawn from existing P3G resources developed to encourage harmonization in access^{4–7}. The sources reviewed are listed in **Table 1**.

From the results of our review, a provisional GAA was drafted by the legal team at the Centre of Genomics and Policy of McGill University in Canada. The draft agreement was then circulated for two iterations of comments and revisions among the P3G International Steering Committee⁸. The resulting version of the agreement was then discussed and approved by the consensus of both the International Steering Committee and the Board of the P3G.

A few drafting principles were adopted in the preparation of this document: first, brevity; second, use of clear and simple language (as such agreements will often be read by scientists and administrators with limited legal training); and third, limiting of the template to essential elements so as to encourage uniform treatment of access applications, reduce time for negotiation between the study administrators and researchers, and allow

customization for local needs and laws.

Certain issues arose in the drafting of this document. There was uncertainty concerning the commensurability of procedures for access to data and access to samples. Initially, the team developed a list of “special considerations for samples.” Although samples require unique treatment for their quality, security, liability and disposal upon termination, we found that they could largely be integrated under general conditions used in the GAA.

Extensive discussion also went into the intellectual property terms. Our definition of ‘invention’ was drawn from the European Parliament and Council’s Directive on biotechnological inventions⁹. The discussion reflected the tension between incentivizing research by allowing limited patent protection of inventions and promoting the valorization of the resource by allowing future research to build on the findings of past research. The final solution is to protect the potential for downstream patentability while reserving a robust, open license for future use and sublicense. Thus, protection for downstream inventions is explicitly recognized, with reference to international directives that were judged to offer the best balance of the interests. Finally, certain types of conditions mentioned in existing access agreements were not included. The most common reasons were that these conditions were either overly technical and legalistic or too specific to a certain type of study to merit inclusion in a generic access agreement.

The success of population studies will depend on their ability to adequately balance promotion and regulation of access. Research will suffer if the conditions of access are too strict; participants will suffer if they are too liberal. The GAA aims to strike this essential balance, to ensure equitable and clear conditions of access for population studies. Its successful adoption by the member institutions of P3G will help to establish an international standard for access to population studies. Their effective translation into population health will hopefully be enhanced and promoted.

Note: The Generic Access Agreement is available in the online version of the paper (doi:10.1038/nbt.2567).

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The International Steering Committee of P3G dedicates this article to the late David Cox—a co-author, visionary scientist and friend.

COMPETING FINANCIAL INTERESTS

The authors declare no competing financial interests.

Bartha Maria Knoppers¹, Rex L Chisholm², Jane Kaye³ and David Cox^{4,18} (on behalf of the P3G International Steering Committee), Adrian Thorogood⁵ (ad hoc member; academic secretary), Paul Burton⁶ (Chair), Anthony J Brookes⁷, Isabel Fortier⁸, Pat Goodwin⁹, Jennifer R Harris¹⁰, Kristian Hveem¹¹, Alistair Kent¹², Julian Little¹³, Peter H J Riegman¹⁴, Samuli Ripatti^{15,16} & Ronald P Stolk¹⁷ (P3G International Steering Committee)

¹Centre of Genomics and Policy, McGill University, Montreal, Quebec, Canada.

²Department of Cell and Molecular Biology, Northwestern University, Chicago, Illinois, USA.

³HeLEX-Centre for Health, Law and Emerging Technologies, University of Oxford, Oxford, UK.

⁴Pfizer, New York, New York, USA.

⁵Centre of Genomics and Policy, McGill University, Montreal, Quebec, Canada.

⁶Department of Health Sciences, University of Leicester, Leicester, UK.

⁷Department of Genetics, University of Leicester, Leicester, UK.

⁸McGill University Health Center, Montreal, Quebec, Canada.

⁹C3 Collaborating for Health, London, UK.

¹⁰The Norwegian Institute of Public Health, Oslo, Norway.

¹¹Department of Genetics, Norwegian University of Science and Technology, Trondheim, Norway.

¹²Genetic Alliance UK, London, UK.

¹³Department of Epidemiology and Community Medicine, University of Ottawa, Ottawa, Ontario, Canada.

¹⁴Erasmus Medical Center, Rotterdam, Netherlands.

¹⁵Institute for Molecular Medicine Finland (FIMM), Hjelt Institute, University of Helsinki, Helsinki, Finland.

¹⁶Wellcome Trust Sanger Institute, Hinxton, UK.

¹⁷Department of Clinical Epidemiology, University of Groningen, Groningen, Netherlands.

¹⁸Deceased.

e-mail: bartha.knoppers@mcgill.ca

1. UK Biobank. Access Procedures: Application and Review Procedures for Access to the UK Biobank Resource, v 1.0 <http://www.ukbiobank.ac.uk/wp-content/uploads/2011/11/Access_Procedures_Nov_2011.pdf> (November 2011).
2. Joly, Y. *et al. Hum. Genet.* **130**, 441–449 (2011).
3. Knoppers, B.M. *et al. Genome Med.* **3**, 46 (2011).
4. Fortin, S., Pathmasiri, S., Grintuch, R. & Deschênes, M. *Public Health Genomics* **14**, 104–114 (2011).
5. Pathmasiri, S. & Knoppers, B.M. Samples and data access agreements: core elements and generic clauses. <<http://www.p3gobservatory.org/repository/ethics.htm>> (2008).
6. Wallace, S. P3G sample and data access: core elements. <<http://www.p3gobservatory.org/repository/ethics.htm>> (2009).
7. European Commission. *Biobanks for Europe, A Challenge for Governance*. (European Union, Luxembourg, 2012).
8. Current Members of the P3G International Steering Committee. <<http://www.p3g.org/about-p3g/international-steering-committee/>>.
9. European Parliament and Council. Directive 98/44/EC of 6 July 1998 on the legal protection of biotechnological inventions. <<http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=CELEX:31998L0044:EN:HTML>>