RECORD OF TELEPHONE CONVERSATION

Submission Information

Application Type	BLA
STN	125614/0.0
Review Office	OVRR
Applicant	GlaxoSmithKline Biologicals / Lic. # 1617
Product	Zoster Vaccine Recombinant, Adjuvanted

Telecon Details

Telecon Date/Time	24-JUL-2017 12:46 PM
Author	NAIK, RAMACHANDRA
FDA Originated?	Yes
Communication Categories	IR - Information Request
Telecon Summary	CMC IR regarding quality control assays
FDA Participants	Ramachandra Naik, Michael Smith and Carmen Collazo-Custodio
Applicant Participants	Norris Pyle and Jody Gould

Telecon Body: E-mail message and IR attachment pasted below.

RECORD OF TELEPHONE CONVERSATION

From: Naik, Ramachandra
Sent: Monday, July 24, 2017 12:46 PM
To: 'Norris Pyle'
Cc: Collazo, Carmen; Smith, Michael (CBER); Jody Gould
Subject: STN 125614/0: CMC IR regarding quality control assays

Dear Mr. Pyle,

Please find attached a request regarding STN 125614/0 (Zoster Vaccine Recombinant, Adjuvanted). Please provide your responses, in an Amendment to STN 125614/0 by Friday, August 11, 2017.

Please confirm receipt of this message, and let us know if you have any questions or need additional information.
Regards,
Ram

Ramachandra S Naik, Ph.D.
Primary Reviewer/Regulatory Project Manager
Food and Drug Administration
CBER/OVRR/DVRPA/RRB3
10903 New Hampshire Avenue
Building 71, Room 3045
Silver Spring, MD 20993
Phone: (301) 796-2640
FAX: (301) 595-1244

RECORD OF TELEPHONE CONVERSATION

CENTER FOR BIOLOGICS EVALUATION AND RESEARCH
OFFICE OF VACCINES RESEARCH AND REVIEW
DIVISION OF VACCINES AND RELATED PRODUCT APPLICATIONS

Date: **July 24, 2017**

Pages: **2**

To: **Norris Pyle**
North American Regulatory Affairs, Vaccines
GlaxoSmithKline Biologicals
14200 Shady Grove Road
VR1500
Rockville, MD 20850
Telephone: (610) 917-4086 Fax: (240) 238-9822

From: **Division of Vaccines and Related Products Applications**
Office of Vaccines Research and Review
Point of Contact: Ramachandra Naik, Ph.D.
Regulatory Project Manager
10903 New Hampshire Ave., White Oak Bldg. 71
Silver Spring, MD 2993-0002
Telephone: (301)-796-2640 Fax: (301)-595-1124

STN: **125614/0**

Product: **Shingrix (Zoster Vaccine Recombinant, Adjuvanted)**

Subject: **Request for additional information**

Dear Mr. Pyle,

Our review of the information provided in your BLA dated October 21, 2016, for Zoster Vaccine Recombinant, Adjuvanted, is ongoing. We have the following request for additional information:

The following comments pertain to quality control assays:

1. In the validation report for the gE (b) (4) for (b) (4), final container (FC) and reconstituted vaccine (RV) (9000014481 RVM002_001 Version 03), the gE quantification range is expressed in (b) (4). However, the release specifications for gE Potency for the Shingrix FC and RV are expressed as a relative potency. Please amend section 4.5: *Quantification Range* and Table 6: *Validation Results* of the validation report to also include the quantification range corresponding to relative potency. In addition, please include the calculation for determination of

relative gE potency as performed in SOP 9000014481 (translated SOP 9000037069 version 03).

2. We noticed that although the gE (b) (4) for (b) (4), FC, and RV SOP 9000014481 (translated SOP 9000037069 version 03) and the gE (b) (4) for in-process samples SOP 9000036619 (translated SOP 9000040158 version 02) share the same assay (b) (4) is quite different ((b) (4) (with (b) (4) for the SOP for (b) (4), FC, RV compared to (b) (4) (with mean (b) (4)) for the SOP for in-process samples). The variability of the (b) (4) for the gE (b) (4) for in-process samples is much larger than that for testing of (b) (4), FC and RV. Please provide a rationale for the difference in (b) (4) and supportive data as applicable. In addition, please provide Document 9000014481 RVR000_003 (001): (b) (4) *used for the quantification of gE protein by* (b) (4) *: Establishment of* (b) (4) (listed as a reference in validation report 9000014481, page 5 of 57).

3. Regarding the gE (b) (4) for (b) (4), FC and RV, we noticed inconsistencies in system suitability criteria between SOP 9000014481 and validation report 9000014481 RVM002 001 Version 03. For example, in the SOP and the validation report, the (b) (4) of the standard slope is (b) (4), the (b) (4), and the (b) (4), respectively. Please clarify if changes were made to the SOP after the validation and provide a rationale and assurance that any changes made do not impact the assay performance.

4. Regarding the (b) (4), we noticed inconsistencies in system suitability criteria between SOP 9000011531 (translated SOP 9000040045 version 04) and validation report 9000011531 RVM001-01-01 v4. For example, in the SOP and the validation report, the (b) (4) of the standard slope is (b) (4), the (b) (4), and the mean of the (b) (4), respectively. Please describe any changes made to the SOP after assay validation (in 2009 and 2010), and provide a rationale and assurance that any changes made do not impact the assay performance.

Please provide your responses, in an Amendment to STN 125614/0 by Friday, August 11, 2017. We recommend that you restate each item and follow it with your explanation or clarification. Use of this format helps organize the relevant information and provides a self-contained document that facilitates future reference. If you have any questions about this communication, please contact Ramachandra Naik, Ph.D. or Michael Smith, Ph.D. at (301) 796-2640.