

# Guide to Valuation of Pharmaceutical Licensing Deals

Edited by Taskin Ahmed and Heather Cartwright

SYNDICATED ANALYTICS PHARMADEALS



# Guide to Valuation of Pharmaceutical Licensing Deals

Edited by Taskin Ahmed & Heather Cartwright



Copyright © 2013 IMS PharmaDeals

Published by IMS PharmaDeals 210 Pentonville Road, London N1 9JY, UK

Copyright © 2013 IMS PharmaDeals

Published May 2013 Published by IMS PharmaDeals 210 Pentonville Road, London, N1 9JY, UK

ISBN 978-0-9574768-4-4 Electronic ISBN 978-0-9574768-5-1 Printed

Cataloguing-in-Publication data applied for.

All copyright and intellectual property rights in this report and its contents belong to IMS PharmaDeals. Distribution and commercialisation rights are solely vested in IMS PharmaDeals. All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted, in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording, or otherwise, without the express permission in writing of IMS PharmaDeals. Enquiries concerning the sale and reproduction of this title, including translation rights, should be sent to IMS PharmaDeals, at the address given above.

Disclaimer: IMS PharmaDeals does not accept any responsibility or liability for any damage or loss arising from the direct or indirect use of this work, and all warranties, expressed or implied are disclaimed. This report has been prepared based on information taken from a variety of sources including public domain sources deemed to be reliable by IMS PharmaDeals including proprietary databases. While every effort has been made to ensure the accuracy and completeness of this report, IMS PharmaDeals cannot accept liability for errors or omissions. Material contained in this report is for general information only and is not intended to be relied upon by individuals or companies in making (or refraining from making) any specific investment or alliance decisions. For detailed information contact IMS PharmaDeals at the address given above.

http://www.pharmadeals.net

# Contents

### 1

Introduction			
1.1	Dealmaking in the Pharmaceutical Industry	7	
1.2	Understanding Value Creation	8	
1.3	Purpose of the Report	9	

### 2

Valu	Valuation Methods 10			
2.1	Integra	ated Methodologies 10		
2.2	Why L	Ise eNPV and Benchmarking?11		
2.3	Other Methods 12			
	2.3.1	Internal Rate of Return 12		
	2.3.2	Payback12		
	2.3.3	Real Options 13		

### 3

Ben	chmarl	king 17
3.1	Introdu	ction to Benchmarking 17
3.2	Feasibili	ty 18
3.3	Data Ga	athering 20
	3.3.1	Avoid the Benchmarking Pitfalls
3.4	Approxi	imate Valuation23
3.5	Refinem	nent of the Valuation
3.6	Example	e Deals: Cancer
	3.6.1	Phase I Benchmarking Example
	3.6.2	Phase II Benchmarking Example 27
	3.6.3	Phase III Benchmarking Example
	3.6.4	Summary29

### 4

Ехр	Expected Net Present Value			
4.1	The Ba	sics	. 33	
	4.1.1	Cash Flows	. 33	
	4.1.2	Relevant Costs	. 34	
	4.1.3	Real vs. Nominal Figures	. 34	
4.2	Opport	unity Cost/Time Value	. 35	
	4.2.1	Example NPV Calculation	. 37	
4.3	Risk of	R&D Failure	. 39	
4.4	Decisio	n Tree Analysis	. 40	
	4.4.1	Example eNPV Calculation	. 41	
4.5	eNPV S	ummary	. 43	

4.6	5 Example Valuation		. 43
	4.6.1	Input Data and Assumptions	. 45
	4.6.2	The Spreadsheet Model	. 45
	4.6.3	More Complex Models	. 46
	4.6.4	Binomial Model	. 49
4.7	Further	Refinement of the eNPV Model	. 51
	4.7.1	Sensitivity Analysis	. 51
	4.7.2	Monte-Carlo Simulation	. 52
4.8	Option	Contracts – Which Method to Use?	. 55

### 5

### 

5.1	Value S	Split	57
5.2	Risk Sh	naring	58
5.3	Deal C	omponents	59
	5.3.1	Upfront Payments	59
	5.3.2	R&D Funding	59
	5.3.3	License Fees	59
	5.3.4	Milestones	60
	5.3.5	Royalties	60
	5.3.6	Shared Costs or Benefits	61
	5.3.7	Equity	61
5.4	Prefere	ences (utility)	63
5.5	Examp	le Deal Structure	64

### 6

# Valuation of Technologies686.1Drug Delivery Technology686.1.1Enabling Technology686.1.2Enhancing Technology69

- 6.2 Drug Discovery Technology......71
- 6.3 Example: Valuation of Delivery Enhancement... 74

### 7

Conclusion	79
------------	----

Appendices		
A.1	Example Benchmarking Deals: Cancer	80
A.2	Reference Deal Tables	93

# **Figures**

1	Total licensing activity in the pharmaceutical industry7
2	Average upfront and headline value by year and phase
3	Integrated valuation methods10
4	Binomial lattice modelling of Brownian movement in value14
5	eNPV decision-tree model with scenario analysis for commercial risk15
6	Ideal benchmarking deal cluster
7	Non-ideal benchmarking cluster
8	PharmaDeals® v4 Agreements Database21
9	Example pharmaceutical deal valuation force field24
10	Attrition by phase and therapeutic area40
11	Example decision tree40
12	Pharmaceutical product decision tree41
13	Example decision tree42
14	Monte-Carlo simulation for PRI-12353
15	The effect of time and risk on the value of deal components
16	A rough guide to NPV split ratios57
17	Frequency of equity investment as financial component62
18	Enhanced revenues due to delivery technology69
19	Enhancement of patent life70
20	Drug discovery decision tree model72
21	Extended drug discovery decision tree model72
22	Drug discovery eNPV model73
23	Value of the PRI-123 delivery technology 78

# **Tables**

1	Pros and cons of benchmarking and DCF-based methods11
2	Benchmarking methodology overview 17
3	Sources of benchmarking information 22
4	Useful websites
5	Approximate benchmark valuation
6	Refined benchmark valuation25
7	Phase I small molecule deals26
8	Phase II small molecule deals27
9	Phase III small molecule deals
10	Cost of capital (COC) for pharmaceutical firms
11	Example NPV calculation – part 1: Contribution
12	Example NPV calculation – part 2: NPV
13	Selected examples of data sources providing estimates for success and attrition in drug development
14	Example eNPV calculation42
15	Cumulative probabilities
16	Example valuation – summary
17	eNPV spreadsheet valuation of PRI-123 44
18	Quarterly eNPV spreadsheet for PRI-12348
19	Valuation of PRI-123 using the binomial method
20	Sensitivity analysis of the PRI-123 model52
21	PRI-123 deal structure and eNPV share 65
22	PRI-123 eNPV valuation and deal structure spreadsheet model66
23	aNID) / model for anhanced

A.1.1	Exelixis and Sanofi	80
A.1.2	Onyx Pharmaceuticals and Ono Pharmaceutical	82
A.1.3	Array BioPharma and Genentech	83
A.1.4	Amgen and Takeda	84
A.1.5	Seattle Genetics and Millennium	85
A.1.6	Pfizer and AVANT	87
A.1.7	Spectrum Pharmaceuticals and TopoTarget	89
A.1.8	Astellas and AVEO Pharmaceuticals	90
A.1.9	Active Biotech and Ipsen	91
A.2.1	Discovery and Preclinical Deals	93
A.2.2	Phase I Deals	101
A.2.3	Phase II Deals	103
A.2.4	Phase III Deals	108
A.2.5	Registered Deals	111
A 2 6		
/ \.2.0	Launched Deals	113
A.2.7	Launched Deals Option Deals	113 114
A.2.7 A.2.8	Launched Deals Option Deals Drug Delivery Deals	113 114 119

# 1 Introduction

### 1.1 Dealmaking in the Pharmaceutical Industry

The discovery and development of new therapeutic agents is an expensive, lengthy and highly risky activity. Few companies have the capability of developing products all the way from the discovery of a new molecular entity to delivering the approved drug to patients. Even those that have the capability may not have the capacity to have pipelines that are broad enough to provide a smooth flow of new drugs. The high, but unpredictable, attrition of products in development and the huge size of those programmes mean that companies frequently encounter gaps in their development portfolios. These gaps have to be filled by products from small companies that are proficient at drug discovery but lack the capabilities to bring the new drug to the market.

Figure 1 illustrates the scale of licensing activity within the pharmaceutical industry in the last decade. More than 1,000 product deals (most of them licensing deals) were recorded each year in the PharmaDeals® v4 Agreements database since 2003. Total deals in the figure refer to a broad spectrum of transactions ranging from licensing, collaborative research and development (R&D), technology access for the discovery or improvement of therapeutic products, to manufacturing and supply agreements, and mergers and acquisitions. Despite having declined to its lowest point in 2010, the proportion of product deals has been increasing in the last two years.

Pharmaceutical licensing deals rarely, if ever, involve a simple one-time payment. They encompass multiple payments and royalties, and require long-term cooperation. There is a significant period of technology transfer and frequently both parties are involved together in research and/or clinical development. Deal structures must be employed that provide an appropriate allocation of the risks and rewards.



**Figure 1 – Total licensing activity in the pharmaceutical industry.** (Source: IMS PharmaDeals® v4 Agreements)

# 2 Valuation Methods

A variety of methods are available that purport to provide valuations of products and/or technologies. These range from arbitrary or traditional rules of thumb, through analyses with various levels of rigour, to somewhat esoteric methods that can obscure rather than illuminate the value creation process.

No single method is sufficient alone. However, two methods in combination – the Benchmarking Method and the expected Net Present Value (eNPV) Method using Discounted Cash Flow (DCF) and Decision Tree Analysis (DTA) – often suffice to provide managers, negotiators and decision makers with the information they need to value projects whether it is for portfolio management or for deal-making purposes (*Figure 3*).

### 2.1 Integrated Methodologies

The benchmarking and eNPV methods should not be used alone, but employed together in an integrated manner ensuring that each is used to inform and cross-check the other.

The value of a product or technology depends on a large number of factors. These include the target market size for the final therapeutic product, the anticipated clinical qualities of the drug and the extent of competition for the drug; both current and in the future. In addition, the value depends on the need that exists in other companies for the product or technology and the number of competitors offering similar products.



Figure 3 – Integrated valuation methods.

### Valuation methods

Substantial research is required to obtain answers to all of these questions. The figures obtained can be used to project future costs and potential revenues. In addition, part of the research will include looking at deals that have been done in the past for similar products. These will provide a guide to the value placed on similar products by the market in the past.

Reliance on either benchmarking or eNPV alone is unwise. Historical deals indicate what the market saw as the value in the past. Values agreed then may look attractive, but it is possible that the market for a particular technology has been saturated and that such valuations are no longer viable. Alternatively, any individual deal may actually have been quite poor for one or the other party and not necessarily be an adequate guide for the future. If conducted carefully, the eNPV method is much more robust and accurate. However, it has the drawback of being theoretical. Benchmarking provides concrete data on what companies have actually been willing to pay and accept. The integration of the two approaches avoids the pitfalls of either one alone.

### 2.2 Why use eNPV and Benchmarking?

There are a number of advantages to the use of the benchmarking and eNPV methods. Not least among these is the fact that they are both readily comprehensible to all those involved in dealmaking and portfolio analysis. Benchmarking is based on historical fact and, whilst the eNPV method involves making many assumptions, these too are based on fact or on third party verifiable estimates.

Additional benefits of the eNPV approach are derived from the necessity of building a comprehensive spreadsheet model. The spreadsheet makes all assumptions explicit, thus requiring them to be extensively researched and justified. It also permits the sensitivity of the value to each variable to be analysed by assessing different scenarios and asking 'what if'. The spreadsheets also assist cash flow planning and the prioritisation of investment decisions when portfolios of projects are assessed. Table 1 summarises the benefits and disadvantages of the two methods. Clearly, neither is ideal alone but in combination they become extremely powerful tools.

	Advantages	Drawbacks
Benchmarking	Rapid (low cost) Require less information Built on historical facts	Approximate Incomplete picture Backward-looking
DCF-based valuation	Rigorous Gives full picture Forward-looking	Slow (high cost) Require more information Conjectural

Table 1 – Pros and cons of benchmarking and DCF-based methods.

# 3 Benchmarking

### 3.1 Introduction to Benchmarking

Value is established through trade and is dependent on market supply and demand and other factors. Essentially value is the amount that both the buyer is willing to pay and the seller is willing to accept. Both sides will be interested to achieve the best deal and will want to know what other buyers might pay or sellers accept. Similar products or technologies that have been traded recently might provide an indication of the expected value.

We are all familiar with benchmarking in everyday life, for example, when buying or selling a house or used car. The principles of the benchmarking methodology are well understood in these transactions. When benchmarking pharmaceutical deals, the same principles will be applied, albeit market data may be less readily available. In addition, there are many more factors influencing the value of every pharmaceutical product and technology compared to car or house sales, and thus benchmarking is usually much more complex and difficult to apply. However, if used thoughtfully, the method is a very important part of the process of establishing value in the industry.

Benchmarking methodology consists of four steps as listed in Table 2. Firstly, it is necessary to establish whether sufficient relevant deals exist for the benchmarking to be feasible; secondly, all the data on each of the comparator deals must be collected and analysed; thirdly, an initial assessment of the value can be made; and, finally to refine the valuation taking account of the differences between the new, potential deal and the benchmark deals used in the valuation.

- Step 1 Feasibility search
- Step 2 Information gathering and analysis
- Step 3 Approximate valuation
- Step 4 Refinement of valuation

### Table 2 – Benchmarking methodology overview.

It should not be forgotten that, in addition to providing some indications regarding value, benchmarking also provides important guidance to deal structures that other companies are willing to accept for such products and technologies. A study of the deals entered into by specific companies with whom you are negotiating can reveal useful information about their preferences for certain deal terms and structures. The process can also reveal trends in the industry. For example, it is important to know whether the type of product you are interested in is becoming

# 4 Expected Net Present Value

The benchmarking approach, which was explained in the previous chapter, is attractive because it revealed what the market is willing to pay for similar products or technologies. However, the approach has limitations because it is backward looking and the complexities of pharmaceutical product development are such that it is often difficult to find good comparator deals. Despite these factors, deal benchmarking provides an important sanity check for the numbers generated by forward looking methods.

In contrast to the apparent imprecision of benchmarking, the Expected Net Present Value (eNPV) method, with its reliance on detailed spreadsheet analysis and combined use of discounted cash flows and decision trees, provides beguiling detail. Even in the simplest eNPV model for a product in early clinical development, there will be more than a dozen variables. These will include the phase specific success probabilities, development costs and timelines, the expected market size and market share, and the costs of goods, marketing and administration. Add to these the scenarios of product life cycle and commercial performance based on predicted ethical and/or generic competition and the task of calculating the value appears almost impossible.

However, many of the valuation variables are well understood in the pharmaceutical industry and usually both sides to a negotiation can agree reasonably closely on the numbers. Average historic values for development timelines, costs and attrition rates can be found in academic research reports. Most notable among these are the publications of the Tufts Center (see Section 4.3 for other resources). Some strategic intelligence firms provide raw or analysed data on industry R&D parameters on a service fee basis and most of the fully integrated big pharmaceutical companies keep their own historic R&D statistics. It is usually possible to distil the developmental variables down to therapy area specific figures and, in some cases, to the specific indication or pharmaceutical class. Annual revenues can be forecasted by a simple top level estimation of total expected market size and market share, or by way of a detailed bottom-up approach starting with epidemiological data. Information on market size can be found in industry publications or from service providers, and market projections in financial analyst reports. Market share can then be estimated by looking at the target product profile and the possible competitive landscape at the time of commercialization. Market share and sales of similar products and market dynamics of similar indications should always be analysed to provide a reality check for the estimated revenue figures. Commercial variables, such as cost of goods sold (COGS) and sales and marketing costs, can usually be estimated directly. If direct estimation is not feasible, commercial costs can be denominated

### **Expected Net Present Value**

### 4.6.1

### Input Data and Assumptions

The assumptions used for creating the valuation model for the hypothetical drug PRI-123 are outlined below.

The total market for the hypothetical indication was estimated to be worth \$1.9 B in 2013 and it is predicted to grow to \$4 B by 2018 and \$5 B by 2021. Growth between these points has been assumed to be linear in the model and to plateau in 2021 for four years.

PRI-123 is a new drug candidate that has successfully completed Phase I clinical trials. Experts predict that it could achieve an overall market share of 15%, five years after launch. Both this market share and the overall market value are likely to decline from 2030 due to the arrival of generic drugs. The rate of decline is estimated to be 5% per annum for the total market and 25% per annum for the PRI-123 share of that market.

The physiological target and mode of action of PRI-123 are similar to those for many cardiovascular drugs so it has been assumed that the risks of failure in clinical trials are likely to be similar to the attrition rates observed historically for cardiovascular drugs. Therefore, the chance of success in Phase II has been estimated as 57%. The historic figure of 72% success that covers both Phase III and registration has been split into 80% for success in Phase III and 90% for success at registration.

Clinical trials are anticipated to last two years each for Phase II and Phase III with another year being required for registration. The cost of Phase II is \$10 M spread over the two years, whilst Phase III costs are \$30 M and registration costs amount to \$1 M.

The COGS is estimated to be 20% of sales. Sales and marketing costs are 15% of sales plus an additional \$10 M in each of the two years prior to launch. Finally, an allowance of 5% of sales has been made for incremental general and administrative costs. These costs will only be incurred because of this product and hence are allowable in an NPV model. Basic overheads of the company are not included.

### 4.6.2

### The Spreadsheet Model

Many of the assumptions described above are the best estimate for use in the model. The values are generally the average from a range of possible values that could be varied, within certain bounds, for the purpose of modelling different scenarios and assessing the sensitivity of the valuation to each variable. These issues will be discussed later. For the present model, it should be noted that cells in the spreadsheet containing values that may be modified for sensitivity analysis are highlighted in red.

In this model, the sales of PRI-123 have been predicted by using estimates of the future overall market size and the anticipated market share of the drug. It is also possible to arrive at a bottom-up estimate of the cash inflows by calculating total

# 5 Agreement Structure

It will be clear from the discussion of eNPV in the previous chapter that the effects of incorporating into a valuation the proper treatment of risk and discounting to allow for the time value of money have differential effects on the true value of different components in a deal. The numbers quoted in headlines for reports of deals are the simple sum of all readily identifiable payments that may occur. Royalties are usually excluded because it is not obvious what they will be in dollar terms. However, there is often a greater than 50:50 chance that most of the payments will never occur due to failure of the project in development.

Figure 15 illustrates how the combination of greater risk and longer time until their occurrence dramatically reduces the relative value of royalties compared to upfront payments. Milestones are less distant than royalties so are discounted less and, at least some of them, may be payable before all the risk has been eliminated from the project.

This chapter will look at how value and risk are shared between the parties to an agreement and will also review the different deal elements that can be used to achieve this.



Figure 15 – The effect of time and risk on the value of deal components.

### 5.3 Deal Components

A variety of names for each of the components used in constructing deals may be encountered but all will fit into one or other of the categories below. Whatever the title for the payments, the value may be understood by incorporating the payment into the eNPV framework while taking care to treat it appropriately regarding discounting and risk adjustment. What hurdles, if any, must be passed to trigger the payment and when is it anticipated that the payment be paid?

### 5.3.1 Upfront Payments

Payments that are made immediately upon signing and that are contingent on nothing other than the signatures are often referred to as 'upfront payments'. 'Technology access fee', 'signing fee' and 'license fee' may also be used. No discounting or risk adjustment is necessary for these; unlike any of the other deal components they are worth the exact dollar amount specified!

### 5.3.2 R&D Funding

Generally, R&D funding does not actually add value as there is not a significant profit margin. The party paying for the work could either perform it inhouse or at a third party but would always show it as a cost in their eNPV calculations. The party performing the work can show the funding as a benefit but also has to show the costs.

Typically, R&D funding is not contingent upon success. One party may agree to support the other party's R&D for a specified number of years whatever the outcome of that research. Therefore, in the eNPV model the funding (and the costs) is discounted as appropriate for each year but not risk-adjusted.

Occasionally, later stages of the R&D may be contingent on certain levels of success having been achieved in the earlier stages. In this situation both the costs and the funding need to be risk-adjusted using the relevant risk factor.

### 5.3.3 License Fees

One-off license fees that are paid on closure of the deal are upfront payments as discussed above. Regular, ongoing license fees or renewal fees may also occur. The fees must be discounted and risk-adjusted according to the period in which they become due as appropriate for the risk of the technology failing and termination of the licence.

For internal reasons related to accounting practices that require matching of revenue to expense, many biotech companies now prefer to fund their own R&D, but charge higher licence fees or milestone payments instead. The biotech company must still incorporate the R&D costs that are specific to the project in their valuation model.

Technologies are a little more difficult to value than products in clinical development because the risks are less well documented and the costs and timescales are less predictable.

For this reason, it is even more important to benchmark when valuing technologies and to have a thorough understanding of the risks and rewards through eNPV modelling. Therefore, in this section the two standard methods if benchmarking and eNPV analysis are applied to the valuation of some example drug delivery and drug discovery technologies.

### 6.1 Drug Delivery Technology

Drug delivery technologies are making a dramatic impact on the pharmaceutical industry with more and more drugs employing these technologies either to enhance the properties of a drug or to enable the delivery of active molecules that would otherwise fail to reach the market. The approach to valuation is different for each of these two cases as discussed below (*Appendix A.2.8 – Drug Delivery Deals*).

### 6.1.1

### **Enabling Technology**

The valuation of technology that is enabling is the most straightforward. There would be no product to sell without the technology so the provider of the delivery technology is entitled to a share of all the sales of the combined product – in the same way as the provider of the chemical or biological entity itself. Therefore, the first step is to calculate the eNPV for the combined product in the same way as was done for a simple product in Chapter 4. A deal structure then has to be constructed to share the risks and the rewards in a similar way to that described in Chapter 5. The key issue is the relative importance of the active ingredient and the delivery technology.

It can be useful to think of the end product that is provided to the patient as an abstract marketing concept. Pharmaceutical companies define the end product they wish to create in a Target Product Profile, which is what is described to doctors and patients in the package insert. The end product that is being marketed has essentially nothing to do with chemical structures or delivery technologies. As long as patients receive the benefits described and the side-effects are no worse than expected, the patient has no real interest in what is actually in the bottle or how it works. Therefore, if a delivery technology makes the difference between

### Benchmarking example deals: cancer

Deal no.	42430
Title:	Array BioPharma Enters into Oncology Agreement with Genentech
Originator:	Array BioPharma Inc.
Partnering:	Genentech Inc.
Date:	08-Aug-11
Deal terms:	Array BioPharma has entered into an Oncology with Genentech for the development of each company's small molecule Checkpoint kinase 1 (ChK-1) programme. The programmes include Genentech's compound GDC-0425 (RG7602) and Array's compound ARRY-575. Under the terms of the agreement, Genentech is responsible for all clinical development and commercialisation activities. Array will receive an upfront payment of US\$28 M and is eligible to receive clinical and commercial milestone payments up to US\$685 M and of up to double-digit royalties on sales of any resulting drugs. Full financial terms were not disclosed.
Total Deal Value:	USD 713 M
Upfront payment:	USD 28 M
Royalty:	Array will receive up to double-digit royalties on sales of any resulting drugs.
Total potential milestones:	USD 685 M. Array is eligible to receive clinical and commercial milestone payments up to US\$685 M.
Development milestones:	Array is eligible to receive clinical milestone payments.
Commercial milestones:	Array is eligible to receive commercial milestone payments.

Table A.1.3 – Array BioPharma and Genentech

A.2 Reference Deals Tables Tables A.2.1 to A.2.6 present selected deals from PharmaDeals® v4 Agreements database that disclose total deal values, upfront and milestone payments for products launched or in development from 2007 to 2012 (sorted by ascending upfront payments in the different development stages). Tables A.2.7 and A.2.8 present selected option deals and drug delivery deals that disclose financial information from 2007 to 2012.

# **Discovery and Preclinical Deals**

Date Announced	Principal Compan(y/ies)	Partnering Compan(y/ies)	Deal Title	Primary Product Indications	Primary Deal Types	Primary Product Types	Primary Product Phases	Total Deal Value	Upfront Payment	Total Milestones	Territories Included	Territories Excluded
28/07/2009	National Institutes of Health; Leiden University	Can-Fite Biopharma Ltd	License Agreement between Can-Fite BioPharma, Leiden Uhiversity and NIH	Crohn's disease [regional entertits]; Certain disorders involving the immune mechanism	Technology access; Licensing	Drug Delivery Technology; Small Molecule (Therapeutic)	Preclinical	1.25 M USD	0.04 M USD			
22/08/2012	Proteonomix Inc.	Undisclosed	Proteonomix Enters into Global Licence Agreement for Novel Antitumour Technology	Neoplasms	Licensing	Biological; Basic Research/ Discovery; Research Technologies; Stem cells	Discovery	1.03 M USD	0.08 M USD		Worldwide	
05/01/2007	NovaDel Pharma Inc.	Kwang Dong Pharmaceutical Co.,Ltd	Novabel Pharma Enters into Licensing Agreement with Kwang Dong Pharmaceuticals to Develop and Commercialise Zensana <sup>™</sup> in South Korea	Nausea and vomiting	Licensing	Drug Delivery Technology; Small Molecule (Therapeutic)	Preclinical	0.30 M USD	0.10 M USD		Korea	
25/02/2011	ViroMed Co.,Ltd	Enlyton Ltd	ViroMed Enters into Licensing Agreement with Enlyton to Develop Humanised Antibody	Neoplasms	Licensing	Diagnostic; Antibodies	Preclinical	4.70 M USD	0.10 M USD	4.60 M USD	Worldwide	
12/06/2007	UCB Celltech Ltd; UCB Pharma SA	Pacific Beach BioSciences Inc.	UCB Celltech Grants Exclusive Worldwide Licence to Pacific Beach Biosciences for Aniline Derived Compounds	Mycoses	Licensing	Drug Delivery Technology; Small Molecule (Therapeutic)	Discovery	12.10 M USD	0.10 M USD		Worldwide	
21/07/2011	BioSante Pharmaceuticals Inc.	The John P. Hussman Foundation	BioSante Pharmaceuticals Enters into Licence Agreement with John P. Hussman Foundation for Melanoma Vaccine	Malignant melanoma of skin	Licensing	Vaccine	Preclinical	50.10 M USD	0.10 M USD	39.00 M USD	Worldwide	
21/12/2012	The University of Texas at Austin	Synthetic Biologics Inc.	Synthetic Biologics Enters into Patent Licence Agreement with University of Texas at Austin	Whooping cough	Licensing	Basic Research/ Discovery; Antibodies	Discovery	0.77 M USD	0.17 M USD			
20/12/2010	Phylogica Ltd	Pfizer Inc.	Phylogica Enters into Agreement with Pfizer for Peptide-Based Vaccines		Collaborative R&D	Libraries; Vaccine; Peptide/Protein	Discovery	134.50 M USD	0.50 M USD	134.00 M USD	Worldwide	
18/08/2010	Phylogica Ltd	Medimmune LLC	License Agreement between Medimmune and Phylogica for Novel Antimicrobial Peptides	Other bacterial agents as the cause of diseases classified to other chapters	Collaborative R&D Licensing	High throughput screening; Basic Research/Discovery; Libraries; Peptide/ Protein	Discovery	99.50 M USD	0.75 M USD	98.00 M USD	Worldwide	
07/05/2012	ProMetic Life Sciences Inc.	Hematech Biotherapeutics Inc.	ProMetic Life Sciences Enters into Licence Agreement with Hematech Biotherapeutics		Manufacture/ Supply; Licensing; Clinical and commercial	Bioprocessing; Other; Biological	Preclinical	10.00 M USD	1.00 M USD		Worldwide	China



### IMS Health

EUROPE & WORLDWIDE 210 Pentonville Road London N1 6JY United Kingdom Tel: +44 (0)20 3075 5888 THE AMERICAS IMS Health 200 Campus Drive Collegeville, PA 19426 USA Tel: +1 610 244-200 ASIA-PACIFIC 8 Cross Street #21-01/02/03 PWC Building Singapore 048424 Tel: 65-6227-3006 JAPAN Toranomon Towers Office 4-1-28 Toranomon, Minato-ku Tokyo 105-0001 Japan Tel: 81-3-5425-9000

For all office locations, visit: www.imshealth.com/locations

### **ABOUT IMS HEALTH**

IMS Health is a leading worldwide provider of information, technology, and services dedicated to making healthcare perform better. With a global technology infrastructure and unique combination of real-world evidence, advanced analytics and proprietary software platforms, IMS Health connects knowledge across all aspects of healthcare to help clients improve patient outcomes and operate more efficiently. The company's expert resources draw on data from nearly 100,000 suppliers, and on insights from 39 billion healthcare transactions processed annually, to serve more than 5,000 healthcare clients globally. Customers include pharmaceutical, medical device and consumer health manufacturers and distributors, providers, payers, government agencies, policymakers, researchers and the financial community. Additional information is available at www.imshealth.com