



**ANSI Committee on Education**  
**Standardization Case Studies**

**ACCOMPANYING QUESTION AND ANSWER WORKSHEET**

As appropriate, please suggest recommended study, test or quiz questions / answers to accompany the case study proposed above.

<b>Proposed Question</b>	Discuss the advantages versus the risks for countries with lax regulations for conducting clinical trials that involve human subjects.
<b>Proposed Answer</b>	Discussion should address availability of devices/medicines to patients, potential for economic advantage, safety risks, and device/medicine performance/effectiveness.

<b>Proposed Question</b>	How does ISO 14155 as an international standard confront the ethical issues of medical tourism?
<b>Proposed Answer</b>	Explanation should describe how the standard can ease trade restrictions, provide governments with a technical base for health, safety and environmental legislation and conformity assessment, and safeguard consumers, at minimum.

<b>Proposed Question</b>	The United Kingdom believes that regulators, not manufacturers, should define regulations for conducting device clinical trials. German physicians believe that regulations should not take power from the physician investigators. How does the expertise of these two groups compare to manufacturers who participate in setting these trial standards in the US?
<b>Proposed Answer</b>	Answering this question may take research as well as thought. Physician investigators best understand the medical aspects of the trial. Regulators may best look out for the welfare of the subjects and the ultimate ability to translate findings into acceptable data. Manufacturers will understand the requirements for producing safe, high quality devices. Discussion should include ethical and commercial implications of each groups strengths.