

First Committee Meeting Summary

Application number: STN 125611/0
Applicant: Novo Nordisk Inc.
Product name: Coagulation Factor IX (Recombinant), GlycoPEGylated
Proposed Indication: Indicated for use in adults and children with hemophilia B for:

- Control and prevention of bleeding episodes
- Perioperative management
- Routine prophylaxis

Meeting date & time: June 21, 2016 at 3 P.M.
Committee Chair: Chava Kimchi-Sarfaty
RPM: Edward Thompson

Attendees:

Chava Kimchi-Sarfaty	Anne Pilaro
Tim Lee	Anthony Hawkins
Megha Kaushal	Judy Li
Renee Rees	Aikaterini Alexaki
Pete Amin	Marie Anderson
Grainne Tobin	Kouassi Ayikoe
Iliana Valencia	Edward Thompson

Reviewer name	Role
Edward Thompson	RPM
Chava Kimchi-Sarfaty	Chairperson/CMC Reviewer
Megha Kaushal	Clinical Reviewer
Iftekhar Mahmood	Clinical Pharmacology Reviewer
La’Nissa Brown-Baker	Toxicology Reviewer
Aikaterini Alexaki	CMC Reviewer (Product)
Zuben Sauna	CMC Reviewer (Product)
Kevin Foley	OCBQ/DMPQ Reviewer
Jacqueline Glen	DMPQ/PRB Reviewer
Judy Li	Statistical Reviewer
Ravi Goud	Postmarketing Safety Epidemiological Reviewer
Kristine Khuc	OCBQ/APBL Reviewer
Anthony Hawkins	OCBQ/BIMO Reviewer
Marie Anderson	OCBQ/DBSQC or OVRR/DBABP/LIB Representative
Pending	Consult Reviewer

Discussion Summary:

1. Ensure all reviewers are assigned as appropriate, they have received the appropriate documents or electronic links, and they have a clear understanding of their review responsibilities.

Discussion: Pending further review: a consultant reviewer maybe required from CDER for the accumulation of PEG in the brain

2. Determine if inspections are necessary for:
 - a. GMP pre-license or pre-approval
 - b. Studies performed under the Animal Rule
 - c. BIMO (GCP)

Discussion: BIMO and the clinical reviewer are developing a plan to select site inspections.

DMPQ provided the following update for the inspections:

Based on the ORA database for the NovoNordisk drug substance and drug product manufacturing facility in (b) (4) the site was recently inspected (b) (4) and included coverage of both rFIX/nonacog beta pegol drug substance and product; both inspections were classified as VAI; additionally, (b) (4) the manufacturing facility identified in the FDA Form 356h as the histidine diluent manufacturer, was inspected in (b) (4) (VAI inspection). Therefore, most likely DMPQ will waive the inspection for these facilities.

3. Determine if PREA is triggered and notify the RPM and PeRC Coordinator if appropriate. Note: PREA is triggered when an application for a drug or a biological product is submitted for:
 - a. a new indication
 - b. new dosing regimen (any change in a single dose, maximum daily dose or dosing interval)
 - c. new active ingredient (including a new combination)
 - d. new dosage form (e.g., vial to transdermal patch)
 - e. a new route of administration (e.g., subcutaneous to intramuscular)

Discussion: The product is orphan designated for only one indication and the other two indications do trigger PREA. The clinical reviewer will prepare the paperwork to schedule a PeRC meeting.

4. Recommend Advisory Committee meeting if appropriate.
 - a. If no Advisory Committee meeting is scheduled, per FDAAA Section 918, provide justification in the First Committee meeting summary. (FDAAA requires justification in the approval letter if advisory committee was not held).

Discussion: Decision pending to present at BPAC, depending, primarily, on the consult regarding the accumulation of PEG in the brain.

5. Confirm the review schedule and all future meeting dates.

Discussion: The review schedule was discussed for future meetings (filing, internal mid-cycle, mid-cycle communication with applicant, internal late-cycle meeting and external late-cycle meeting).

6. Confirm the filing meeting has been scheduled via Microsoft Outlook and discuss expectations for the filing meeting.

Discussion: The expectation is that all filing checklists are complete by the filing meeting.

7. Identify at the First Committee Meeting any potential issues, including:
 - a. Identification of data sets submitted incorrectly or use of data standards
 - b. Ensure data tables can be opened appropriately
 - c. Confirm that datasets are present

Discussion: The BIMO representative stated that the applicant followed a CDER model for sending in their data, which is difficult to review with the CBER software. BIMO plans to utilize the Data Analysis Legacy datasets which were already submitted in electronic transport (.xpt) format along with already-submitted, study site-specific (.pdf) data listing datasets to generate individual clinical investigator inspection assignments for the study(ies)/study sites for inspection.

8. Complete filing checklist prior to filing meeting

Discussion: The RPM provided links to the reviewers for their checklist and reminded the committee of the requirements for obtaining Division Director signature.

History:

Prepared by Edward Thompson/ June 23, 2016
Reviewed and Revised by Chava Kimchi-Sarfaty/
Reviewed and Revised by Megha Kaushal/ June 23, 2016
Reviewed: Iliana Valencia/ June 23, 2016
Reviewed: Chava Kimchi-Sarfaty/ June 28, 2016
Reviewed: Mark Weinstein/ June 28, 2016
Reviewed: Chava Kimchi-Sarfaty/ June 29, 2016
Reviewed: Kevin Foley/ July 5, 2016
Reviewed: Chava Kimchi-Sarfaty/ July 8, 2016