



1 Institutes of Health sponsored “head to head” trial comparing Avastin and Lucentis for the  
2 treatment of “wet” AMD to begin in 2008; and

3  
4 **WHEREAS**, none of the issues cited by Genetech should interfere with an individual  
5 physician’s well-established ability to weigh the risks, benefits, and available evidence of a  
6 specific off-label use as part of the “practice of medicine”; and

7  
8 **WHEREAS**, while individual physicians and hospitals will still be able to purchase Avastin, the  
9 added “hoops” necessary for a physician to obtain and provide the drug to a compounding  
10 pharmacy seem obstructionist at best; and

11  
12 **WHEREAS**, Genentech’s action would appear to be more motivated by lost profits from the  
13 substitution of Avastin for Lucentis than any legitimate concern about patient safety and  
14 welfare; therefore be it

15  
16 **RESOLVED:** That CMA oppose Genentech’s intent, as outlined in a letter to physicians  
17 dated October 11, 2007 and effective November 30, 2007, to prevent  
18 compounding pharmacies from directly purchasing Avastin (bevacizumab) in  
19 the interest of patient access to off-label treatments as a “practice of  
20 medicine” issue; and be it further

21  
22 **RESOLVED:** That CMA’s opposition be made known by means including but not limited  
23 to sending a letter to Genentech’s CEO and Board of Directors, and by  
24 issuing a press release; and be it further

25  
26 **RESOLVED:** That CMA reaffirm Resolution 506-99, which “affirm[s] the right of  
27 physicians to prescribe drugs and devices for off-label indications when they  
28 fall within the community's standard of medical care," and support efforts to  
29 ensure that ability; and be it further

30  
31 **RESOLVED:** That this matter be urgently referred for national action (preferably  
32 introduced at the AMA 2007 Interim Meeting).