Food and Drug Administration (FDA)

Center for Biologics Evaluation and Research (CBER)

Division of Scientific Advisors and Consultants

188th Meeting of the Vaccines and Related Biological Products Advisory Committee (VRBPAC)

Zoom Video Conference

(Open Session)

December 12, 2024

This transcript appears as received from the commercial transcribing service after inclusion of minor corrections to typographical and factual errors recommended by the DFO.

Transcript Produced By: ACSI Translations

1025 Connecticut Avenue, NW, Suite 1000, Washington, DC 20036

https://acsitranslations.com/

Chair

Hana El Sahly, MD	Professor, Department of Molecular Virology and Microbiology and Medicine, Baylor College of Medicine	Houston, TX

Members

Adam C. Berger, PhD	Director, Division of Clinical and Healthcare Research Policy, Office of Science Policy, Office of the Director, National Institutes of Health	Bethesda, MD
Henry H. Bernstein, DO, MHCM, FAAP	Professor of Pediatrics, Zucker School of Medicine at Hofstra/Northwell, Department of Pediatrics, Cohen Children's Medical Center	New Hyde Park, NY
Archana Chatterjee, MD, PhD (Topic II Only)	Dean, Chicago Medical School, Vice President for Medical Affairs, Rosalind Franklin University of Medicine and Science	North Chicago, IL
Hayley Gans, MD	Clinical Professor, Pediatrics-Infectious Diseases, Stanford Medicine Children's Health	Stanford, CA
Holly Janes, PhD	Professor, Vaccine and Infectious Disease Division, Public Health Sciences Division, Fred Hutchinson Cancer Center	Seattle, WA
CAPT Sarah Meyer, MD, MPH	Chief Medical Officer, Immunization Services Division, National Center for Immunization and Respiratory Diseases, Centers for Disease Control and Prevention	Atlanta, GA
Arnold S. Monto, MD	Thomas Francis Jr. Collegiate Professor, Emeritus of Public Health, Professor Emeritus of Epidemiology, School of Public Health, University of Michigan	Ann Arbor, MI
Michael R. Nelson, MD, PhD	Chief, Asthma, Allergy, and Immunology Division, UVA Health & UVA School of Medicine	Charlottesville, VA
Paul Offit, MD	Director, Vaccine Education Center, Professor of Pediatrics, Division of Infectious Diseases, Children's Hospital of Philadelphia, Maurice R. Hilleman Professor of Vaccinology, Perelman School of Medicine, University of Pennsylvania	Philadelphia, PA
Stanley Perlman, MD, PhD	Professor, University of Iowa Distinguished Chair, Departments of Microbiology and Immunology, Carver College of Medicine, University of Iowa	Iowa City, IA

Andrea Shane, MD, MPH, MSc (Topic II Only)	Professor of Pediatrics, Division of Infectious Disease, Marcus Professor of Hospital Epidemiology and Infection Prevention, Emory University School of Medicine	Atlanta, GA

Temporary Voting Members

Karen Kotloff, MD (Topic I Only)	John A. Scholl, MD and Mary Louise School, MD, Distinguished Professor, Associate Director, Clinical Research, Center for Vaccine Development and Global Health, University of Maryland School of Medicine	Baltimore, MD
Sarah Long, MD (Topic I Only)	Emeritus Chief, Infectious Diseases, Section of Infectious Diseases, St. Christopher's Hospital for Children, Professor of Pediatrics, Drexel University College of Medicine	Philadelphia, PA
Allison Malloy, MD, MSc (Topic I Only)	Associate Professor, Department of Pediatrics, Infectious Disease Faculty, F. Edward Herbert School of Medicine, Uniformed Services University of Health Sciences (USUHS)	Bethesda, MD
Tracy Ruckwardt, PhD (Topic I Only)	Staff Scientist and Chief of the Respiratory, Viruses Core at VRC, National Institute of Allergy and Infectious Diseases (NIAID), National Institutes of Health (NIH)	Bethesda, MD

Alternate Industry Representative

Robert S. Janssen, MD	Chief Medical Officer and Senior Vice President, Clinical Development, Dynavax Technologies Corporation	Emeryville, CA

Consumer Representative

Jay M. Portnoy, MD	Professor of Pediatrics, University of Missouri – Kansas City, School of Medicine, Director, Division of Allergy, Asthma, and Immunology, Children's Mercy Hospitals and Clinics	Kansas City, MO

Speakers and Guest Speakers

Fatimah Dawood, MD (Speaker, Topic I)	Team Lead, Epidemiology and Vaccine Assessment Team, Coronavirus and Other Respiratory Virus Division, National Center for Immunization and Respiratory Diseases, Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC)	Atlanta, GA
Pedro A. Piedra, M.D. (Guest Speaker, Topic I)	Professor, Department of Molecular Virology and Microbiology and Pediatrics, Director, Pandemic Threat Technology Center, Director, Respiratory Virus Diagnostic Laboratory, Baylor College of Medicine	Houston, TX
Christine Shaw, PhD (Industry Speaker, Topic I)	Vice President, Portfolio Head, Infectious Disease Vaccines, ModernaTX, Inc.	Cambridge, MA
Matthew Snape, MBBS, MD, FRCPCH, FMedSci, MBE (Industry Speaker, Topic I)	Vice President, Clinical Development, Infectious Diseases, Pediatric and Maternal Vaccines, Moderna Biotech Distributor UK Limited, Harwell Science and Innovation Campus	United Kingdom

FDA CBER Participants

Peter Marks, MD, PhD	Director, Center for Biologics Evaluation & Research, Food and Drug Administration	Silver Spring, MD
Celia Witten, PhD, MD	Deputy Director, Center for Biologics Evaluation & Research, Food and Drug Administration	Silver Spring, MD
Karen Elkins, PhD (Speaker, Topic II)	Associate Director for Science, Office of the Director, Center for Biologics Evaluation & Research, Food and Drug Administration	Silver Spring, MD
David C. Kaslow, MD (Speaker, Topic I)	Director, Office of Vaccines Research & Review, Center for Biologics Evaluation & Research, Food and Drug Administration	Silver Spring, MD
Karin Bok, M.S., PhD	Deputy Director, Office of Vaccines Research & Review, Center for Biologics Evaluation & Research, Food and Drug Administration	Silver Spring, MD
Sudhakar Agnihothram, BPharm, PhD	Associate Director of Office Regulatory Initiatives, Office of Vaccines Research & Review, Center for Biologics Evaluation & Research, Food and Drug Administration	Silver Spring, MD
Tod Merkel, PhD (Speaker, Topic II)	Associate Director for Research, Office of Vaccines Research & Review, Center for Biologics Evaluation & Research, Food and Drug Administration	Silver Spring, MD

Rebecca Reindel, MD	Director, Division of Clinical and Toxicology Review, Office of Vaccines Research & Review, Center for Biological Evaluation & Research, Food and Drug Administration	Silver Spring, MD
Hana Golding, PhD (Speaker, Topic II)	Chief and Principal Investigator, Laboratory of Retroviruses (LR), Division of Viral Products, Office of Vaccines Research & Review, Center for Biologics Evaluation and Research, Food and Drug Administration	Silver Spring, MD
Carol Weiss, MD, PhD (Speaker, Topic II)	Chief and Principal Investigator, Laboratory of Immunoregulation (LI), Division of Viral Products, Office of Vaccines Research & Review, Center for Biologics Evaluation & Research, Food and Drug Administration	Silver Spring, MD
Mark Connelly, MD (Speaker, Topic I)	Team Leader, Clinical Review Branch 3, Division of Clinical and Toxicology Review, Office of Vaccines Research & Review, Center for Biologics Evaluation & Research, Food and Drug Administration	Silver Spring, MD
Designated Federal Officer		
Sussan Paydar, PhD	Division of Scientific Advisors & Consultants, Center for Biologics Evaluation & Research, Food and Drug Administration	Silver Spring, MD
Alternate Designated Federal Officer		
Kathleen Hayes, MPH	Division of Scientific Advisors & Consultants, Center for Biologics Evaluation & Research, Food and Drug Administration	Silver Spring, MD
Director		
Prabhakara Atreya, PhD	Division of Scientific Advisors & Consultants, Center for Biologics Evaluation & Research, Food and Drug Administration	Silver Spring, MD
Committee Management Officer		
Joanne Lipkind, MS	Division of Scientific Advisors & Consultants, Center for Biologics Evaluation & Research, Food and Drug Administration	Silver Spring, MD
Committee Management Specialist		
Lisa Johnson	Division of Scientific Advisors & Consultants, Center for Biologics Evaluation & Research, Food and Drug Administration	Silver Spring, MD

Table of Contents

Opening Remarks: Call to Order and Welcome

Dr. El Sahly: Good morning, everyone, and welcome to the 188th meeting of the Vaccines and Related Biological Products Advisory Committee meeting to the FDA Center for Biologics Evaluation and Research. We will begin the day with Topic I. Topic I will be a discussion of the considerations for RSV vaccine safety in pediatric populations. To kick off the meeting, I would like to invite Dr. Sussan Paydar. Dr. Sussan Paydar will give us some administrative announcements pertaining to the meeting. Dr. Paydar

Administrative Announcements

Dr. Paydar: Thank you, Dr. El Sahly. Good morning, everyone. This is Sussan Paydar, and it is my great honor to serve as the Designated Federal Officer for today's 188th Vaccines and Related Biological Products Advisory Committee meeting. On behalf of the FDA, the Center for Biologics Evaluation and Research, CBER, and the Committee, I'm happy to welcome everyone for today's virtual meeting. Today the Committee will meet in open session to discuss considerations for Respiratory Syncytial Virus, RSV, vaccine safety in pediatric populations. We'll also hear overviews of the Laboratory of Immunoregulation and Laboratory of Retroviruses Research Programs in the Division of Viral Products, Office of Vaccines Research and Review, Center for Biologics Evaluation and Research. Today's meeting and the topics were announced in the Federal Register Notice that was published on October 24, 2024. Next slide, please.

At this time, I would like to acknowledge outstanding leadership of Dr. Peter Marks, Director of Center for Biologics Evaluation and Research; Dr. David Kaslow, Director of Office of Vaccines Research and Review; Dr. Karin Bok, Deputy Director,

Office of Vaccines Research and Review; Dr. Sudhakar Agnihothram, Associate Director of Office Regulatory Initiatives, OVRR; and Dr. Rebecca Reindel, Director of Division of Clinical and Toxicology Review, OVRR. Next slide, please.

I also would like to thank my Division Director, Dr. Prabhakara Atreya, for her excellent leadership, and my team, whose contributions have been critical for preparing today's meeting: Ms. Kathleen Hayes, Ms. Joanne Lipkind, and Ms. Lisa Johnson. Next slide, please. I also would like to express our sincere appreciation to AV team, Mr. Derek Bonner, Mr. Corey Farley and Mr. Deon Wrenn, in facilitating the meeting today. Also, our sincere gratitude goes to many CBER and FDA staff working very hard behind the scenes trying to ensure that today's virtual meeting will also be a successful one like all the previous VRBPAC meetings. Please direct any press media questions for today's meeting to FDA's Office of the Media Affairs at FDAOMA@fda.hhs.gov. The transcriptionists for today's meeting are Myra Angulo and Virginia Diaz from Andean Consulting Solutions International. We'll begin today's meeting by taking a formal roll call for the Committee Members and Temporary Voting Members. When it is your turn, please turn on your video camera, unmute your phone, and then state your first and last name, institution, and areas of expertise. And when finished, you can turn your camera off, so we can proceed to the next person. Please see the member roster slides in which we'll begin with the Chair, Dr. Hana El Sahly.

Roll Call and Introduction of Committee

Dr. El Sahly: Good morning, everyone. My name is Hana El Sahly. I'm an adult ID physician at Baylor College of Medicine and my research focus is clinical vaccine development.

Dr. Paydar: Great. Thank you. Next is Dr. Adam Berger.

Dr. Berger: Hi, my name is Adam Berger. I'm the Director of the Division of Clinical and Healthcare Research Policy at the National Institutes of Health. My background-- I'm a geneticist with additional training in immunology. Thank you.

Dr. Paydar: Thank you. Dr. Henry Bernstein.

Dr. Bernstein: Good morning, everyone. My name is Hank Bernstein. I'm a Professor of Pediatrics at the Zucker School of Medicine at Hofstra/Northwell. My areas of special interest are vaccinology, including vaccination delivery. Thank you.

Dr. Paydar: Thank you. Dr. Archana Chatterjee, she will join us for Topic II, so please, next slide, please. Dr. Holly-- Hayley Gans.

Dr. Gans: Good morning. I'm Dr. Hayley Gans. I'm a Professor of Pediatrics and Pediatric Infectious Disease at Stanford, and my area of research is host pathogen interface, including immune responses to vaccine. Thank you.

Dr. Paydar: Thank you. Dr. Holly Janes.

Dr. Janes: Good morning. I'm Holly Janes. I'm a Biostatistician by training. I am at the Fred Hutchinson Cancer Research Center in Seattle and my specialty is in vaccine evaluation.

Dr. Paydar: Great. Thank you. Dr. Robert Janssen, our Alternate Industry Representative. Dr. Janssen.

Dr. Janssen: I'm Dr. Robert Janssen. I'm Chief Medical Officer at Dynavax Technologies and my area of interest is clinical vaccine research.

Dr. Paydar: CAPT Sarah Meyer. Next slide.

CAPT Meyer: Morning. My name is Sarah Meyer. I'm a Pediatrician and I serve as the Director of the Immunization Safety Office at the CDC.

Dr. Paydar: Thank you. Dr. Arnold Monto.

Dr. Monto: I'm Arnold Monto. I'm at the University of Michigan School of Public Health, where I have been studying respiratory infections, particularly in the community, their occurrence and prevention. Thank you.

Dr. Paydar: Thank you, Dr. Monto. Dr. Michael Nelson.

Dr. Nelson: Hi, I'm Michael Nelson, Chief of the Asthma, Allergy, and Immunology Division at the University of Virginia. I'm a trained allergist and immunologist, and my area of expertise is vaccine adverse events. Thank you.

Dr. Paydar: Great. Thank you. Dr. Stanley Perlman. Actually-- I'm so sorry. Dr. Paul Offit. I jumped him.

Dr. Offit: Good morning, Sussan. I'm Paul Offit from the Division of Infectious Diseases and the Professor of Pediatrics at the Children's Hospital of Philadelphia and the University of Pennsylvania School of Medicine. My interest is in mucosal vaccines and vaccine safety. Thank you.

Dr. Paydar: Thank you, Dr. Offit. Next is Dr. Stanley Perlman.

Dr. Pergam: Hi, I am Stanley Perlman. I'm a Pediatric Infectious Diseases Specialist and a Professor of the Department of Microbiology and Immunology at the University of Iowa, and my expertise is in coronaviruses.

Dr. Paydar: Thank you. Dr. Jay Portnoy, our Consumer Representative.

Dr. Portnoy: Good morning. I'm Dr. Jay Portnoy. I'm a Professor of Pediatrics at the University of Missouri – Kansas City School of Medicine. I'm an allergist immunologist at Children's Mercy Hospital in Kansas City.

Dr. Paydar: Great. Thank you. Dr. Andrea Shane, she will also join us for Topic II. Next we'll do a roll call of our Temporary Voting Members for Topic I. We'll start with Dr. Karen Kotloff.

Dr. Kotloff: Hi, I'm Karen Kotloff. I'm a Professor of Pediatrics and Pediatric Infectious Disease at the University of Maryland School of Medicine, Center for Vaccine Development and Global Health. My interest is in clinical vaccine development and the epidemiology of infectious diseases in the U.S. and in developing countries.

Dr. Paydar: Great. Thank you. Dr. Sarah Long.

Dr. Long: Good morning. I am Sarah Long. I'm a Professor of Pediatrics and Pediatric Infectious Diseases at Drexel University College of Medicine and a recent member of CDC's ACIP, where I chaired the work group on maternal infant vaccine and monoclonal antibody to protect infants from RSV.

Dr. Paydar: Thank you. Dr. Allison Malloy.

Dr. Malloy: Hi, my name is Allison. I'm a Pediatric Infectious Disease Specialist and I work at the Uniformed Services University of Health Sciences and our research focuses on respiratory viruses and mucosal immunology. Thanks.

Dr. Paydar: Great. Thank you. Dr. Tracy Ruckwardt.

Dr. Ruckwardt: Good morning. My name is Tracy Ruckwardt. I'm a staff scientist and Head of the Respiratory Viruses Core at the Vaccine Research Center in

NIAID at NIH. I've been studying RSV for more than 20 years, including work on age-dependent differences in adaptive immune responses and evaluation of immunity following preF vaccination in humans. Thank you.

Dr. Paydar: Great. Thank you so much. Thanks, everyone. For Topic I, we have a total of 16 participants: 15 voting and one non-voting member. Now I'll proceed with reading the FDA Conflict of Interest Disclosure Statement for the public record.

Conflict of Interest Statement

The Food and Drug Administration, FDA, is convening virtually today, December 12, 2024, for the 188th meeting of the Vaccines and Related Biological Products Advisory Committee, VRBPAC, under the authority of the Federal Advisory Committee Act, FACA, of 1972. Dr. Hana El Sahly is serving as the Voting Chair for today's meeting. Today on December 12, 2024, under Topic I, the Committee will meet in open session to discuss considerations for Respiratory Syncytial Virus, RSV, vaccine safety in pediatric populations. This topic is determined to be a Particular Matter of General Applicability, PMGA. With the exception of the Industry Representative Member, all Standing and Temporary Voting Members of the VRBPAC are appointed Special Government Employees, SGEs, or Regular Government Employees, RGEs, from other agencies and are subject to federal conflict of interest laws and regulations.

The following information on the status of this Committee's compliance with federal ethics and conflict of interest laws, including but not limited to 18 U.S.C., Section 208, is being provided to participants in today's meeting and to the public. Related to the discussions at this meeting, all members RGE and SGE consultants of this Committee have been screened for potential financial conflict of interest of their own, as well as those imputed to them, including those of their spouse or minor

children, and for the purposes of 18 U.S. Code 208, their employers. These interests may include investments, consulting, expert witness testimony, contracts and grants, cooperative research and development agreements, teaching, speaking, writing, patents and royalties, and primary employment. These may include interests that are occurring or under negotiation. FDA has determined that all members of this Advisory Committee, both regular and temporary members, are in compliance with federal ethics and conflict of interest laws.

Under 18 U.S.C., Section 208, Congress has authorized FDA to grant waivers to Special Government Employees and Regular Government Employees who have financial conflicts of interest when it is determined that the agency's need for the Special Government Employee's services outweighs the potential for a conflict of interest created by the financial interest involved, or when the interest of a Regular Government Employee is not so substantial as to be deemed likely to affect the integrity of the services which the Government may expect from the employee.

Based on today's agenda and all financial interests reported by Committee members and consultants, there have been no conflict-of-interest waivers issued under 18 U.S. Code 208, in connection with this meeting.

We have the following consultants serving as Temporary Voting Members. Dr. Karen Kotloff, Dr. Sarah Long, Dr. Allison Malloy and Dr. Tracy Ruckwardt. Dr. Robert Janssen of Dynavax will serve as the Alternate Industry Representative for today's meeting. Industry representatives are not appointed as Special Government Employees and serve as Non-Voting Members of the Committee. Industry Representatives act on behalf of all regulated industry and bring general industry perspective to the Committee. Dr. Jay Portnoy is serving as the Consumer

Representative for this Committee. Consumer representatives are appointed Special Government Employees and are screened and cleared prior to their participation in the meeting. They are Voting Members of the Committee.

We have several federal and non-federal guest speakers as well as industry guest speakers today making various presentations on timely and relevant topics. The following speakers and guest speakers were invited for this meeting. Dr. Fatima Dawood, Team Lead Epidemiology and Vaccine Assessment Team, Coronavirus and Other Respiratory Virus Division, National Center for Immunization and Respiratory Diseases, Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, Atlanta, Georgia; Dr. Pedro Piedra, Professor, Department of Molecular Virology and Microbiology and Pediatrics, Director, Pandemic Threat Technology Center, Director, Respiratory Virus Diagnostic Laboratory, Baylor College of Medicine, Houston, Texas; Dr. Christine Shaw, Vice President, Portfolio Head, Infectious Disease Vaccines, Moderna; Dr. Matthew Snape, Vice President Clinical Development, Infectious Diseases, Pediatric and Maternal Vaccines, Moderna.

Disclosure of conflicts of interest for speakers, guest speakers and responders follow applicable federal laws, regulations, and FDA guidance. FDA encourages all meeting participants, including Open Public Hearing speakers, to advise the Committee of any financial relationships that they may have with any affected firms, its products and, if known, its direct competitors. We would like to remind Standing and Temporary Members that if the discussions involve any other products or firms not already on the agenda for which an FDA participant has a personal or imputed financial interest, the participants need to inform the DFO and exclude themselves from the discussion, and their exclusion will be noted for the record. This concludes my reading of the Conflict

of Interest Statement for the public record. At this time, I would like to hand over the meeting to our chair, Dr. Hana El Sahly. Thank you.

Dr. El Sahly: Great. Thank you, Sussan. I would like to invite now Dr. David Kaslow. Dr. David Kaslow is the Director of the Office of Vaccine Research and Review, OVRR, at the FDA. Dr. Kaslow will introduce Topic I to the Committee and the public. Dr. Kaslow.

Overview of Topic I

Dr. Kaslow: Great. Thank you, Dr. El Sahly. And on behalf of the Office of Vaccines Research and Review, let me welcome all to this 188th VRBPAC convening. We're asking the Advisory Committee to consider two topics. Next slide, please. For Topic I, we're asking VRBPAC to discuss considerations for evaluating RSV vaccine candidates in infants and children, specifically in light of recent observations of clinically significant severe to very severe RSV lower respiratory tract infections following administration of investigational RSV vaccines in infants. We're also asking VRBPAC to consider two research programs. One in the Laboratory of Immunoregulation, the other in the Laboratory of Retroviruses, both in the Division of Viral Products. More on that topic later this afternoon. Next slide. Thank you.

A bit of context for Topic I. As discussed at the 2017 VRBPAC meeting, the observation of enhanced respiratory disease in studies of formalin-inactivated RSV vaccines conducted in the 1960s cast a decades-long shadow over RSV vaccine development. However, recent advances, including in various vaccine technologies, structural immunology and plausible mechanisms to explain vaccine-associated enhanced respiratory disease, have facilitated RSV vaccine development and evaluation in adults and in pregnant individuals and in pediatric populations. More recently,

approval of a long-acting RSV monoclonal antibody and a vaccine for maternal immunization, each of which provide passive RSV immunity during infancy, have partially addressed the unmet need for pediatric RSV vaccines. With that current context in mind, we asked VRBPAC to now consider two recent observations. First, five cases of severe to very severe RSV lower respiratory tract disease following administration of mRNA-based RSV vaccine candidates to presumed RSV-naïve infants, noting that the cause and mechanism of this observation have yet to be established. And second, a potential RSV monoclonal antibody RSV vaccine interaction observed after a first dose of RSV vaccine that may impact active immunization in infants and toddlers who are administered RSV vaccines after receiving long-acting RSV monoclonal antibodies. Next slide, please.

With that context and those new considerations in mind, and to frame the VRBPAC discussion on Topic I, we have asked our CDC colleague, Dr. Dawood, to review the epidemiology of RSV in U.S. children, and Dr. Piedra from the Baylor College of Medicine to cover clinical and nonclinical aspects of RSV vaccine safety in young children. We have then asked, and Moderna kindly agreed, to review nonclinical and clinical findings of their investigational RSV and RSV plus human metapneumovirus mRNA vaccines with a focus on infants and children less than two years of age. That will be followed by an FDA presentation by Dr. Connelly. After an additional Question and Answer Period and a brief lunch break, VRBPAC will go into Open Public Hearing Session with four speakers, including two sponsors of RSV vaccine candidates. As always, during the Open Public Hearing Session, the Chair or Committee Member may question a person concerning the scientific content of that person's presentation. Thereafter, 120 minutes have been allotted for VRBPAC to consider two discussion topics. Next slide, please.

First in follow-up to the 2017 VRBPAC, we are asking VRBPAC to have another focused discussion on RSV vaccine safety in pediatric populations based on the currently available evidence, namely the imbalance in severe RSV cases and available immunological data following mRNA RSV vaccination, and whether that evidence indicates a potential safety concern more broadly applicable to the evaluation of RSV vaccines in infants and toddlers, specifically the applicability to the broad range of other vaccine technologies and different antigenic confirmations in development. Then, based on that discussion, we are then asking VRBPAC to discuss whether the current nonclinical and clinical safeguards are sufficient and/or whether any additional nonclinical and clinical information should be considered and/or precautions should be taken when evaluating RSV vaccine candidates in infants and toddlers. Next slide, please.

Second, we're asking VRBPAC to discuss whether the preliminary immunogenicity data after a single dose of RSV vaccine in individuals who had previously received nirsevimab suggest a potential monoclonal vaccine interaction that may affect active immunization in infants and toddlers. And if so, whether any additional factors and data should be considered when evaluating sequential administration of RSV monoclonal antibodies followed by RSV vaccines in infants and toddlers, including potential impact on safety and/or effectiveness of subsequent parentally or mucosally administered RSV vaccines. Next slide, please.

Finally, I would like to draw VRBPAC's attention to this slide, which is slide 26, and Dr. Connelly's FDA presentation. I won't go through the seven items listed on this slide. Rather I wanted to note that first, these are potential considerations if the Committee determines that recent observations warrant for the recommendations beyond those made at the 2017 VRBPAC meeting. Second, and I want to be clear about

this, none of the RSV vaccine candidates based on live-attenuated RSV vectors are currently on clinical hold. And third, this list is not meant to be exhaustive, but rather to be representative of the topics we seek VRBPAC's advice today. I suggest this slide might be helpful as you listen to this morning's presentations and discuss any recommendations on today's Topic I. Next slide, please.

So let me conclude by again welcoming all; by thanking the VRBPAC members, including our four Topic I Temporary Voting Members, for your time preparing for and participating in today's VRBPAC Topic I; by thanking all of today's speakers, both invited and those in the Open Public Hearing Session; by thanking my colleagues here at FDA, who helped prepare for and organize this meeting on very short notice; and by thanking those of you who have joined this Open Public Meeting virtually. We do look forward to another productive VRBPAC meeting today. And with that, back to you, Dr. El Sahly.

Dr. El Sahly: Thank you so much, Dr. Kaslow, for this informative introduction. So, as Dr. Kaslow indicated, we have a rather involved task on hand today and I foresee a very engaging discussion. And to kick us off, Dr. Fatimah Dawood, Team Lead, Epidemiology and Vaccine Assessment Team, Coronavirus and Other Respiratory Viruses Division, National Center for Immunization and Respiratory Diseases at the CDC, will give us an overview of RSV epidemiology in U.S. children. Dr. Dawood.

RSV Epidemiology

Epidemiology of Respiratory Syncytial Virus in U.S. Children

Dr. Dawood: Thank you. Good morning. Next slide, please. During this talk we will review RSV disease burden and seroprevalence in U.S. children. We will review the

lead to a CD8+ T-cell response further indicating that the BLB201 does not induce immune responses that are associated with VAERD. And following the discussion this morning from Dr. Piedra's presentation on the lack of VAERD with Merck formally inactivate vaccine which contained a mixture of both formerly inactive RSV and formally inactive PIV. It is tempting to suggest that a live replicating intranasal vector vaccine such as PIV5, is the ideal candidate because it contains both RC antigen and a live replicating viral vector. Next slide please.

So, in our PhaseI1 clinical study BLB201 induced moderate antibody responses and cell mediate immune responses including CD8+ T-cell response. No Th2-biased response was detected consistent with PIV5 as a life replicating and attenuated virus limited replication of BLB201 was detected in humans. BLB201 was safe, well tolerated and induced a balanced immune response in 33 to 75-year-olds. Importantly, the mechanism of action of a vaccine is not to induce extremely high antibody responses, but instead to efficiently present RSV antigen to the mucosal immune system, targeting mucosal rather than the serum antibody responses further reduces the likelihood of VAERD. Now, Dr. Radziewicz, our CMO, will describe our Phase I and IIa infant RSV trial. Next.

Dr. Radziewicz: Thanks, Dr. He. The primary goal of our study is to evaluate the safety of our vaccine in healthy 6 months to 5-year-old infants and children. We are also evaluating immune responses in serum and nasal secretions. To ensure the safety of participants in our study, we have instituted measures to the design including the use of sentinel cohorts, use of low dose vaccine prior to high dose, enrollment of older children prior to younger age groups. Amongst the other measures shown in the slide. We closely track all medically attended adverse events, any serious adverse event, all

RSV infections, and all lower respiratory tract infections including croup, bronchiolitis and pneumonia, whether related to RSV or other pathogens. Next slide.

The table at the top shows our enrollments to date. As I noted on the previous slide, we enrolled older children and used lower dose vaccinations first, as noted in groups 1, 2, and 3 for safety. We have a completed enrollment of these three groups. Including groups 4 and 6, ages six to 24 months, 25 of 48 plan participants have already been enrolled and received a single dose of high dose vaccine. 23 RSV seronegative participants less than two years of age are enrolled in the study. 11 had their first RSV exposure last season and 12 are being exposed for the first time to the current RSV season. By next March, all 63 infants and young children enrolled in our study will have gone through at least one RSV season.

BLB201 pediatric vaccine has been well tolerated and safe in infants and young children. No vaccine SAE nor any vaccine related medically attended adverse event has been reported. A total of eight symptomatic cases of RSV have been diagnosed. All cases of symptomatic RSV have been graded as mild or moderate with no severe case. No participant has required hospitalization for RSV infection, nor has there been any hospitalization related to any respiratory tract infection to date in our study. We previously unblinded the immune data for groups 1 and 2 seropositive participants. We found serum neutralizing IgG/IgA and nasal IgA antibody response ranging from 60 to 80%. In contrast to mRNA-1345 whose post immunization neutralizing antibody and binding antibody showed 149-fold and 338-fold increases over baseline in Part A of its trial, our vaccine generated modest 8.4 fold neutralizing antibody and 2.5 fold IgG binding antibody after immunization in our seropositive children. We also detected a 2.3-fold rise in nasal IgA mucosal antibody response.

The fact that BLB201 replicates even in seropositives and induces an immune response suggests that it would present sufficient antigen to be highly effective in seronegatives. Based on the clinical data so far, there is a statistically significant reduction in symptomatic RSV cases among our BLB201 vaccinated infants and children of at least 80% over placebo controls. This strongly suggests that the immune mechanisms after BLB201 vaccination are very different from that of formalin-inactivated vaccines and mRNA vaccines indicating that the BLB201 vaccine is unlikely to lead to similar immunologic VAERD. Based on our preliminary result of at least 80% protection, we do not feel that further demonstration of clinical benefit in a seropositive infants and children would bring additional value to assessment of the risk of VAERD. Also, this group is not the primary target population for an effective pediatric vaccine. Next slide.

We believe that it is safe for our BLB clinical trial to proceed and to include additional seronegative participants. We have instituted measures to help ensure safety that are noted further in this slide. We and an independent Data Safety Monitoring Board review any participant with RSV infection in real time and our study uses safety pausing rules that includes severe RSV infection in any single participant. Next slide.

We strongly believe that our live-attenuated replicating virus vectored intranasal RSV vaccine expressing wild-type F protein is not a risk for VAERD. Such vaccines like BLB201 and MEDI-534 have never been associated with VAERD. BLB201 vaccination does not induce a Th2-biased response, neither in animals nor humans and we do not believe that additional animal studies or studies in seropositive infants and children would be helpful. We have enrolled 63 children with no indication of VAERD to date. Most encouragingly, there is an early indication of vaccine protection of at least 80% in our study. Further testing of BLB201 in seronegative children is essential to

confirm the safety and efficacy of this vaccine. While there has been progress in the field of RSV prevention, many children who experience severe infection are still not protected. Developing a safe and effective vaccine remains an urgent public health need. Blue Lake is ready to work with the FDA and VRBPAC to permit continued development of our highly promising vaccine candidate. Next slide.

Thank you very much. Additional information can be found on this website.

Dr. Paydar: Great. Thank you so very much for your presentation. I don't-- I see a hand. Dr. El Sahly has a question.

Dr. El Sahly: I have a brief question to Dr. He. Dr. He, in the 11 seronegatives-- Yes.

Dr. Paydar: AV Team, if you could go back to the slide.

Dr. El Sahly: I don't know, Susan. Your volume went down. We can't hear you.

Dr. Paydar: I would like the slides to go back.

Dr. El Sahly: Okay, so were there immunologic assays performed on the 10 or 11 seronegative children who got your vaccine, in terms of TH1, TH2 biased. I know you showed us data from different other studies.

Dr. He:We have gotten the data from the group 1, 2, 3 and 4 in terms of serum and antibody data, et cetera. We also are working on, and we do collect some PBMC, to look at the T-cell data as well. However, we have not unblind the group 3 and 4, so we don't really know what the results will be, but we have a separate committee looking at the cases then of eight symptomatic cases. So, that's separate from looking at the immunogenicity. The only immunogenicity data we have unblinded was from group 1

and group 2. Those are RSV positive kids who have gotten low and high doses and that's what we have. For the rest, we have data but it's still blinded.

Dr. El Sahly: Okay, great. Thank you.

Dr. He: Thank you.

Dr. Paydar: Thank you so much everyone. El Sahly, can you hear me?

Dr. El Sahly: Susan, your audio is very poor. I don't know. Am I the only one who can't hear Susan?

Dr. Long: We can't hear it either.

Dr. Paydar: Next presenter. Please go ahead with Dr. Sridhar.

Dr. Sridhar: Thank you. I hope you can hear me.

Dr. El Sahly: Yeah, we can hear you very well.

Dr. Srihar: Thank you. So on behalf of Sanofi, I'd like to thank the committee for giving us the opportunity to present an update on Sanofi's pediatric RSV vaccine development today during today's VRBPAC meeting. My name is Saranya Sridhar. I'm a full-time employee of Sanofi. I've been in the Clinical Department of the company for eight years and I'm the head of Clinical Development for Vaccines. Next slide, please.

There is an unmet need for children in their second RSV season, which has significant health and economic impact to children, their families and health services. This slide provides some of the data that underlines the scale of this public health challenge. Global estimates of RSV burden in toddlers stands at 33 million cases every year. In the US alone, this represents approximately 2.1 million children requiring

medical attention each year. 60% of children have multiple RSV infections before they reach 3 years of age with some of the consequences of infection, including pneumonia and otitis media. This health burden is mainly carried by outpatient health services, but one third of all RSV hospitalizations in children under 5 years of age is because of RSV infection in toddlers. These numbers taken together signifies substantial financial and emotional burden on families. Next slide please.

Beyond the numbers, the clinical spectrum of disease caused by RSV in toddlers as illustrated in this slide is notable. Toddlers can suffer from upper and low respiratory tract infection like infants, but also respiratory complications and exacerbations of wheezing, like older adults. As you are well aware, there have been significant advances over the last few years in RSV preventative strategies. In infants, we now have long-acting monoclonal antibodies as well as maternal immunization while three vaccines have been approved for older adults. Thus, it is remarkable that despite the burden and wide clinical spectrum of disease and toddlers, we do not yet have a preventative strategy for this population. Next slide please.

As we heard earlier today, vaccine development efforts for the pediatric population were initiated as early as the 1960s. However, these efforts were set back by the observation of enhanced respiratory disease with a formalin-inactivated RSV vaccine. VAERD was characterized by three observations. First, the numerical imbalance of severe lower respiratory tract disease following vaccination was observed in children naïve to RSV prior to vaccination. Second, these cases were observed in the first year of follow-up after vaccination. And third, the respiratory pathology showed immune complex deposition and eosinophilia in the lung suggesting a Th2-biased response. It is noteworthy that this phenomenon has not been observed in the context of natural infection and subsequent vaccine development has focused on mimicking

natural infection. Live-attenuated vaccines delivered intranasally have been developed with rationally designed genetic modifications to remain immunogenic while ensuring an optimal safety profile and to minimize the risk of enhanced respiratory disease. Sanofi has been in collaboration with the United States National Institute of Health to develop the live-attenuated vaccine platform. Next slide, please.

The US NIH has pioneered the development of a live-attenuated vaccine platform for RSV. 16 different live-attenuated vaccines have been evaluated in a careful stepwise approach to identify safe and immunogenic candidates. The first trial started in adults with careful dose escalation before moving to Phase I studies in RSV experience toddlers. Only after demonstrating safety and suitable attenuation in these populations were studies initiated in RSV-naïve toddlers. Through this careful stepwise approach over the last 30 years, NIH in collaboration with Sanofi identified the SP0125 vaccine candidate as our lead candidate with an optimal combination of safety and immunogenicity. The SP0125 vaccine was evaluated in a Phase I/II dose escalation study in children before entering Phase III evaluation earlier this year. Let me share some of the details of the design of the SP0125 candidate. Next slide please.

The SP0125 vaccine contains three key genetic modifications to attenuate the vaccine and to make sure that these attenuations are stable. First, a deletion in the NS2 gene, which attenuates the virus and removes the risk of NS2 mediated airway obstruction. Second is a deletion in the polymerase gene, which confers temperature sensitivity and restricts replication at a temperature of 38 to 39°C. And third, this temperature sensitive deletion is stabilized by a missense mutation in the adjacent amino acid of the polymerase gene. These rationally designed modifications combined to ensure that the vaccine would restrict replication in the upper respiratory tract, and

we have generated data in over 4,000 toddlers that the infectivity, which mimics natural infection, is not compromised with these modifications. Next slide please.

NIH and Sanofi have generated data on the live-attenuated vaccine platform in approximately 4,000 children. The NIH have run trials with 16 live attenuated vaccine candidates in approximately 800 participants, and over a surveillance one RSV season there has been no evidence of vaccine associated enhanced respiratory disease observed in these trials. Our SP0125 vaccine candidate has been administered intranasally to over 3000 children. No safety concerns have been observed to date by us and our independent Data Monitoring Committee. Next slide please.

These live-attenuated vaccines have not only shown to be safe as a platform but have also shown protective benefits. This is data published by Professor Ruth Karron and colleagues, which compiled the efficacy observed across different clinical trials in children of eight live-attenuated RSV vaccine candidates. In this forest plot, the black lines show the average efficacy of eight different vaccine candidates against medically attended acute respiratory illness caused by RSV. The blue lines represent efficacy observed with a subset of five lead candidates out of these eight. The top two lines present data from all vaccinated children, while the bottom two lines are a subgroup analysis of children who were determined to have a neutralizing antibody response post vaccination.

This forest plot with vaccine efficacy plot on the X axis shows that if you're to the right of zero, there is protection and benefit while to the left would suggest increased risk. As you can see from the graph, a protective effect was observed for these vaccine candidates and for the five lead candidates, the average vaccine efficacy was 67%. The SP0125 vaccine that we are now evaluating in a Phase III trial was among these five

candidates. When the analysis was restricted to neutralizing antibody responders, the blue lines on this graph, we observed similar vaccine efficacy suggesting a link between having an immune response to the vaccine and protection against disease. These results provide evidence of the protective potential and benefit of these live-attenuated vaccines against RSV without any evidence of an increased risk. Along with the safety data from careful stepwise de-escalation, it formed the basis for us to select the SP0125 vaccine to advance to clinical development. Next slide please.

Our SP0125 vaccine candidate was evaluated in a Phase I/II study in children six to 18 months of age. A low dose and a high dose formulation were evaluated and compared to a placebo. The way the data presented here is a classical reverse cumulative curve where you have the neutralizing antibody titers and the X axis, and the percentage of volunteers on the Y axis. This is data from children who were RSV-naïve prior to vaccination. What is key here is that the two formulations induced a nice shift of the curve to the right, reflecting a substantial increase of neutralizing antibody in most volunteers and showed little difference between the load and the high dose formulation in the study. Along with the favorable safety profile, these immune data that were consistent with prior studies provided the evidence to advance our candidate to Phase III clinical development. Next slide please.

Our Phase III efficacy trial initiated in February of 2024 earlier this year is placebo controlled and designed to demonstrate the safety and efficacy of this vaccine against upper and lower respiratory tract RSV disease, including severe disease and hospitalization. The presence of efficacy against severe lower respiratory tract disease will also demonstrate the absence of vaccine associated enhanced respiratory disease.

I'd like to draw your attention to some key elements of the study design. First, the population of toddlers 6 to 22 months of age eligible to participate in the study includes those with previous receipt of nirsevimab in their first year of life. A subset analysis will generate safety and efficacy data in nirsevimab experienced children, which of course is relevant to the discussion today, but will be very relevant at the time of deployment. Second, we are targeting 50 to 70% of our participants to be RSV-naïve at the time of vaccination. This will allow us to generate efficacy and safety data in those who are at highest risk of vaccine associated enhanced respiratory disease. And third, the children are followed for RSV illness over two seasons generating long-term efficacy and safety data. Next slide please.

I'd like to share some aspects of our program, particularly with relevance to safety surveillance. Considering the observation of vaccine associated enhanced disease, we have initiated disease surveillance from our first Phase I/II trial, which has now continued into our Phase III program. This includes both active and passive surveillance for the detection of any RSV in the upper and lower respiratory tract. And in addition to our own safety monitoring team as a sponsor, the program is monitored by an independent Data Monitoring Committee. To date across our program, approximately 900 children have received the vaccine and have completed follow-up over at least one RSV season. No evidence of vaccines associated with enhanced respiratory disease has been observed in these children. Now that we've shared the data we have collected to date on this vaccine, how do we see it working with other prevention strategies for children? Next slide please.

The SP0125 vaccine targets toddlers to protect them against RSV during their second season and aims to work with nirsevimab, which protects infants in their first year of life. As mentioned before in our program, we will be generating data on the

clinical efficacy and safety of the SP0125 vaccine in children who have received nirsevimab. And here is how we see it working in practice. Let's take the example of a baby born in the US in June. They will receive nirsevimab at three to four months to protect them for the whole first season. And at the end of the first RSV season, when they turn nine to 10 months, they will be offered two doses of the RSV toddler vaccine and that is expected to provide protection for the second RSV season. Next slide please.

In summary, the development of RSV pediatric vaccines requires careful stepwise age de-escalation studies to demonstrate safety before initiating a Phase III program. Over the last 30 years, NIH in collaboration with Sanofi have taken this approach to demonstrate the safety and potential benefit of live-attenuated vaccines. These decades of research led to the generation of data to initiate Sanofi's SP0125 vaccines Phase III efficacy trial. The design of the Phase III study allows us to provide a unique set of data to demonstrate efficacy against severe disease and thereby the absence of enhanced disease over the course of two RSV seasons. To date, no safety concerns have been identified in over 3000 children who've received the vaccine and in 900 children followed over one season. We are confident that the development of the SP0125 vaccine addresses an important medical need for infants and toddlers, and in combination with currently available preventive strategies for infants will fill the gap to provide complete RSV protection during childhood. Next slide please.

Thank you for your attention. And I'd like to thank the Committee again for the opportunity to present at this meeting.

Dr. Paydar: Great, thank you, Dr. Sridhar. Can everybody hear me?

Dr. El Sahly: Yes, we can.

Dr. Paydar: Finally. That's a relief when the DFO phone works. Okay. All right. Well, thanks everyone for your patience. I don't see any questions from the Committee for any of the OPH presenters.

Dr. El Sahly: I do.

Dr. Paydar: You do. Oh, I just saw your hand. Okay, go ahead.

Dr. El Sahly: Just a very brief question to Sanofi colleagues. A clarifying question. Is the Phase III clinical trial now fully enrolled per the sample size calculation at the outset?

Dr. Sridhar: It is not yet completely enrolled.

Dr. El Sahly: Oh, okay. Thank you so much.

Dr. Paydar: Great. And I see another question from Dr. Perlman.

Dr. Perlman: Yeah, I just had a question about the live-attenuated vaccine. What kind of studies have been done to prevent or to examine the possibility of reversion and recombination so that one gets back [Indiscernible - 1:59:38] virus?

Dr. Sridhar: Thank you, Dr. Perlman. So, we have done initial studies where we've given the children a vaccine and in fact did pairs in a daycare setting to look at transmission in a daycare setting as well. And in those studies we haven't found any transmission, but we've also looked at reversion and we haven't seen any reversion in the vaccine virus.

Dr. Perlman: Have you monitored for recombination as well?

Dr. Sridhar: I believe so. I can check and let you know.

Dr. Perlman: Okay.

Dr. Paydar: Great. Any other questions from the Committee? If not, thank you everyone once again for participating in today's Advisory Committee and for sharing your views and comments. This concludes the Open Public Hearing Session for Topic I and now I hand over the meeting back to Dr. El Sahly. Dr. El Sahly, you could please start the next session.

Committee Discussion of Considerations for Respiratory Syncytial Virus [RSV] Vaccine Safety in Pediatric Populations

Dr. El Sahly: Yes. Thank you, Sussan for moderating the OPH. Now is the time when we will be discussing as a Committee and asking additional questions pertaining to the two topics of discussion.

The first topic is the more involved one and projecting that it'll occupy the majority of the time. We're allocating an hour and 20 minutes for it, but who knows, it may be a little shorter, a little longer. Sussan, do you mind pulling the first question or both questions on the slide so we can-- Yes. Thank you. So, that's Topic I. I'll read it out loud and in the meantime, please prepare your discussion points and questions and use the raise hand functions so I can call on your name.

Please discuss whether the currently available evidence indicates a potential safety concern more broadly applicable to the evaluation of RSV vaccine candidates in infants and toddlers. Please discuss the applicability to: different vaccine technologies (e.g., live-attenuated RSV, viral-vectored, mRNA and subunit.) And b) different antigenic confirmations (e.g., stabilized preF or other RSV protein prototypes.)

The second part is: Based on the currently available evidence, please discuss current nonclinical and clinical safeguards, and recommend whether any additional nonclinical and clinical information should be considered and/or precautions taken when evaluating RSV vaccine candidates in infants and toddlers. Dr. Gans.

Dr. Gans: Thank you very much. I think this is a very important conversation and I really appreciated the additional information that was provided to us through the open remarks. In terms of what I think really needs to happen is that given that much of the data that we have from previous vaccine attempts is from a time when we didn't actually have the capability to do immunology the way that we can do it now, I think we actually need to go back to what natural disease actually provides in terms of immunity and understand that we still have a lot of circulating RSV, we still have plenty of children who can be categorized as mild or severe, and once we have that, then we can really understand these platforms better. And we know that people who gain their immunity in that way, as their primary immune response, which is the goal obviously for vaccination, would be then protected against more severe outcomes.

And I think that is the process that would be very nice with current modern technologic techniques. I loved the data that individuals presented on the live-attenuated RSV models that they're producing, which did dig into that a little bit more. However, it's not showing again the immune responses as it compares to natural disease, but obviously is showing us some CD4, CD8 data and immune profiles that come from that as well as neutralizing antibodies. I think what we've learned from the presentations today is that you do need a balanced response. So, I think not trying to have a Th2 response isn't the whole picture. Not only trying to have neutralizing antibodies to one form of the S-protein is the picture. So that's why I think going back to having a really clear understanding of what a good regulated immune response means typically it

actually provides many of the different parts of your immune system so that you get a good bump, but then you actually have that turned off. I think it's really important to understand all of that.

I think that the profile that we did see just answered the question a little bit. It was concerning for the messenger RNA, and it appears that other individuals who are looking at different platforms actually haven't shown that. I don't know that the issue that we're seeing with that is actually more global and I think each of these need to be taken separately and understand the immunology separately. The other piece of it that I think really needs to be investigated further is the-- Which we heard a lot about the monoclonal antibody and then the immunization. We need to understand maternal immunization followed by infant or toddler immune responses. I think it's really encouraging that we have the ability to passively protect our very young infants and then immunize them when they're confronted potentially with a second season. So, those are some of my thoughts on the question.

Dr. El Sahly: Thank you, Dr. Gans. Dr. Monto.

Dr. Monto: I think we are confronted by a very complicated situation. We know that passive acquisition of an antibody is protective, highly protective, and does not produce severe disease in any way. We now have a platform which should be only inducing antibody formation, which I think it's pretty much the right antibody, the fusion antibody. I think it's very clear that there is a safety signal and the trials cannot continue, at least in the youngest age group. I don't see this. Based on our understanding and our ability to develop any kind of new markers for severity that we can stop or should stop development of potential vaccines using other platforms because we really don't understand the relationship of the platform to the severity nor different

antigenic confirmations. Certainly, the stabilized prefusion would be the one to follow. Therefore, just cutting to the discussion topic, I think this needs to be done on a vaccine platform by vaccine platform basis and to continue with the very careful age de-escalation and pre-infection, previous infection approach, but to do it with great caution and to make sure that if there is a signal it is caught and appropriately handled. Thank you.

Dr. El Sahly: Thank you, Dr. Monto. Dr. Kotloff.

Dr. Kotloff: Yes. I'll repeat a little bit of what I said before because I think it's so interesting that if you have an mRNA vaccine that makes an antibody to the prefusion F vaccine, you have protection with the monoclonal antibody but not with the antibody to that single protein. So, that to me is very confusing and I feel like it's a message. It's just really a scary slippery slope that we're on because these reactions can be so severe. I actually also wonder if the reactions that we're seeing are in any way related to the kids that we see that come into the ICU that are also off the standard curve, previously healthy kids who get such severe RSV. I think studying those a little bit more would be interesting. But I think for me, the safest path is knowing that maternal antibody and monoclonal antibody are protective. The approach that we heard of giving that to protect kids in the first year, trying to get cheaper antibodies made and then use vaccination for kids after the first year of life to me seems the safest way forward to avoid the safety signals that we don't really understand. Thanks.

Dr. El Sahly: Thank you, Karen. And as I'm reading the discussion topic and the discussions this morning, especially with the CDC colleagues and the other presenters, it is apparent that we are in an evolution time and we do not know where the new baseline is going to be. The data from the clinical trials on the maternal vaccine should

have data on two seasons so far, probably they are being cleaned up to be presented, et cetera. The nirsevimab had a shortage in the first season. This season may be more reflective of the status quo again, and at IDWeek this year we heard of even more products paralleling the nirsevimab approach that are showing data. So, we are in the coming couple of years in a flux situation to understand where the new baseline is going to be in terms of those most in need of a vaccine.

The economic considerations always come up, the cost of healthcare utilization, absenteeism from work for the parents, et cetera. But to me, well what weighs in heavier is really the morbidity and the mortality and understanding where the morbidity and mortality is going to land after all these new measures are in a status quo mode is critical to understanding the risk benefit of how to construct the clinical trial and who should be tested, and what can and cannot be allowed or tolerated I should say. Having said that and hearing the presentation this morning, the manufacturer did what we expected them to do and the data were very reassuring in terms of binding to neutralizing ratio in terms of safety in older age cohorts in terms of Th1, Th2 biases in animal models and in seropositive children who did get the vaccine. It seems that the moment you get into the unexposed infants, the predictive value of all these steps goes down.

So, it remains that these infants, these seronegative infants have no animal model that predicts their response to a degree, nor do their older seropositive counterparts predict their response either. That is a conundrum. It is possible that in six months from now, many of the data that we heard are being generated will give us new information and then potentially new paths forward or additional safeguards can be put before reaching those vulnerable seronegatives. But at the moment it's hard to predict. The preF versus postF situation is-- We thought that we would want mostly the preF,

but this because of its neutralizing component. But this data shows that probably this does not apply to the seronegatives infants, and there is more to the story there that we don't understand.

When it comes to platform, the data and the summary presented from Dr. Karen's paper and the other manufacturers, et cetera, with a live replicating extenuated RSV, I think there has been enough subjects, enough RSV seasons to potentially give a reassurance there that this particular sequential cautious approach may be acceptable. I don't think I've seen data that give reassurance to other platforms or reassurance for a particular path to study the other platforms. So, this is where I think we stand and I really look forward to some of the outstanding data from the immunology of these trials and infants and knowing what happened in the additional follow ups of the other trials. Dr. Ruckwardt.

Dr. Ruckwardt: Thank you. You can hear me?

Dr. El Sahly: Yes, we can.

Dr. Ruckwardt: I want to also thank everyone for really great presentations today. I think this is a really important and interesting topic. I think when thinking about this first question, the A is really where the emphasis is for me. I think with regard to B, we've learned so much over the last 10 years about the importance of preF and optimizing the antigen and what it takes to elicit great neutralizing antibodies. And we know that if you have great preF antibodies, whether it's monoclonal or polyclonal, you can get protection. The problem here becomes more complicated because now we find that even though we couldn't predict in animal models, we can elicit those great neutralizing antibodies. And still in that context, these RSV-naïve infants are really

Dr. Monto: It's just a question of mine not being able to speak to this, and I wonder if people from the FDA would be able to give us some commentary about it.

Dr. El Sahly: Anyone from the FDA familiar with the clinical trial referenced by Dr. Monto?

Dr. Kotloff: Is this a maternal vaccination or an infant?

Dr. Monto: No, it was a child vaccination.

Dr. Beeler: Novafax-

Dr. Monto: -No, excuse me. It was maternal vaccination.

Dr. Beeler: Yes. [Indiscernible - 2:28:28] You're absolutely right.

Dr. Monto: -My mistake. Okay. Sorry.

Dr. El Sahly: That's been released.

Dr. Monto: Now you mention it, it comes to mind.

Dr. Beeler: That one's published. There was no-

Dr. Monto: That was published. Yes, it was.

Dr. Kotloff: Yeah. And it's about 40%-

Dr. Monto: 40%

Dr. Kotloff: Efficacious.

Dr. Monto: Right. But no safety signal.

Dr. Kotloff: Yes.

Dr. El Sahly: But it was in mothers.

Dr. Kotloff: In Mothers.

Dr. Monto: In mothers, absolutely. My mistake.

Dr. El Sahly: And they met the secondary endpoint, but not the primary endpoint

Dr. Monto: If it failed the primary endpoint. But I think I really do believe that other confirmations need to be examined. This is such a complicated problem. I don't believe we'll be able to really predict very well what's going to happen in human use.

Dr. El Sahly: Doctor-- Thank you. Dr. Portnoy.

Dr. Portnoy: Great. Thank you. Oops. Trying to get my video to turn on. There you go. Yeah. I'm really heartened to hear that we're making so much progress in the development of RSV vaccines. Every year, Children's Mercy Hospital where I work fills up with infants who have bronchiolitis. It's the number one cause of hospitalizations in infants. We're staffing up right now in preparation for this year's event. It's just a major problem. And the fact that we're making progress in vaccines is very heartening to me. I'm particularly interested in risk factors for patients who have either adverse reactions after the vaccine or even develop severe RSV in general, because I'm thinking about the Tucson study where all infants were enrolled in a large cohort and then they were followed over time to see if there were things that predicted who was going to have severe RSV infection. And what they found is that there were certain risk factors that predicted severe RSV infection. Some of these infants actually had increased airway hyperresponsiveness at birth. They had increased evidence of Th2

immunology. They had atopic dermatitis, they had a family history of eczema. There were things that predicted it. And those were the infants who had severe RSV disease.

And I suspect that those same patients would be the ones who might have enhanced infection after getting the vaccine. And I think it's really important that we look at these risk factors to determine whether something predicts adverse reactions, because if we can identify those individuals and maybe do something different with them, all of the others who don't have those risk factors could go ahead and get the vaccines and not be at risk of having this enhanced respiratory disease. So, I think it's really important that we look for risk factors for this. In fact, I remember one study where our IgE was developed to RSV. The patients literally became allergic to the virus. Maybe that's part of why they had so much trouble.

My other concern is whether getting vaccinations to a large population can reduce the risk of spread of RSV. Right now, RSV is so prevalent, everybody gets it. But if enough people become immunized, is it possible to reduce the prevalence of RSV so that you have a lower risk of actually being exposed to it, kind of herd immunity? Is that something that can happen? Do these vaccines reduce the risk of spread or do they just reduce the risk of disease, but you're still spreading it like the way COVID vaccines seem to work? Those are issues that I think need to be explored and looked at.

The idea of giving passive immunity followed by active immunity sounds really good. If we want to give injections, and we were worried about a problem with enhanced disease, it looked like the kids eight months and older did fine. It's the one when you tried to go to younger ages. Maybe you give passive vaccination and don't start the active until eight months just to keep it safe. Those are just some of my thoughts.

Dr. El Sahly: Okay. Very good. Thank you. Dr. Long.

Dr. Long: Yes. Hi. I want to reflect on a few things people have said on-- First of all, the unmet need. 3.9 million infants were protected by either maternal immuno-- Were potentially protected by maternal immunization or the more common of them by nirsevimab. And we know nirsevimab efficacy- Effectiveness so far in preventing hospitalizations in the first six months of life is 90%. We don't quite have that data yet for maternal vaccine, but we should have it relatively soon. The early graph of the age at hospitalization that was shown by Dr. Dawood is very important because the risk begins at three weeks of age- two to three weeks of age, and it's most prevalent the highest incidence is at two and three months, and then it begins to fall. And you saw that in the old data by the time you were into your second year of life, 12 months of age, it was not 2% who were admitted to the hospital, but it was 0.2%.

I really think that we need to have those data looked at again about who are those potentially vaccine candidates that are a little older that could benefit from vaccine because we know that respiratory infections and parental vaccines don't do much for prevalence of the organism or protecting the herd or the community. I think we have to be very honest with what the goal of vaccination would be, and it would be to prevent severe disease as it is now of the monoclonal antibody and the maternal and deaths that are predominantly in the otherwise healthy population and predominantly in the first 6 to 8 months of age. So, we would have to see if these vaccines-- I think it's going to be a very long time before these vaccines could be potentially given to very young children. And even if they were very young, I mean it would almost have to be newborn to protect that early group. I do believe that we will have a long and beautiful history with nirsevimab.

We did some due diligence about resistance. And of course we don't have a whole birth cohort having been given nirsevimab, but there was not a significant increase in resistance at the end of the children, the infants on monoclonal antibody experience. And monoclonal antibody as opposed to maternal vaccination goes well beyond six months. They only filed for six months. They only gave data for six months. But we know by looking at the decay of antibodies from nirsevimab, it's different from maternal, but from nirsevimab, that would go well into the second half of the first year of life.

The other thing that we didn't even talk about today, that is another oddity of RSV vaccines is-- Well, first of all, it only protects probably for six months. But the second part of it is that in older US citizens who were studied in the early groups before licensure of the vaccines in adults, they did not boost at six months. They did not boost at 12 months. They did not boost at up to 24 months. So, there is a bizarre second kind of a problem with the RSV vaccines that we have to date, that they have an unusual immunologic handling that would make me concerned.

And then for the attenuated, God love them. It sounds like a great idea, but it would be very difficult to figure out how old an antibody protected baby would have to be before you would be able to give a live-attenuated. And then would that have enough clout in preventing enough disease?

The last thing I'll say is what we learned during the COVID experience was that there was a dearth of RSV infections and all the studies were very under populated because there just weren't any hospitalizations for RSV. And what we learned in the year after that is, although there was a surge in those immunologically indebted babies who hadn't got their primary infection when it was occurring after the age of 8, 9, 10,

11 months, it was not as likely, even though it was primary, it was not as likely to lead to hospitalizations or severe disease. So, I think we need to re-look at all of that so we would understand the benefit as well as the potential risks, which are really, really something to think about now that we've seen the data today that they're not predictable.

Dr. El Sahly: Thank you. Thank you, Dr. Janes.

Dr. Janes: Thank you. Thank you, Hana. I wanted to reflect on the questions asked here, agreeing with others, it seems very clear to me that for the Moderna vaccine data that were shown today that there is evidence of a safety signal. So, I'm reflecting on the second question of what safeguards- what additional safeguards might be put into play as additional vaccines are investigated going forward. And I think the Moderna experience really highlights what was done well in this program and the importance of randomization and blinding and a placebo control, and the importance of essentially continuous safety monitoring to detect an adverse safety signal as soon as possible. And again, it seems to me that those were done very well in this situation and obviously should be carried forward to any future vaccine programs and vaccine research.

The only other attribute of the design that I could think of as it's been highlighted, we really wish we could understand better what participant characteristics and immunological features would predict the development of a vaccine-associated severe disease event. And one of the barriers to doing that investigation in the studies that we were talking about today is that a number of the adverse events happened before the blood draw to measure the vaccine induced immune response. I'm just wondering whether in future studies there would be value, at least in some participants, in staggering the immunizations relative to the RSV season so that the vaccine induced

immune responses could be measured and deeply interrogated before any clinical events occurred. And I don't know the practical considerations around that. Thanks.

Dr. El Sahly: Thank you, Holly. Dr. Monto.

Dr. Monto: It may be off the topic, but is the fact that this is being, the severe illnesses on challenge are occurring with the human metapneumovirus, is that telling us anything? Is that something that it's a virus that we know very much less about and one which we do not have passive immunization available? Should we be concerned about that in terms of this particular platform?

Dr. El Sahly: --I would think so. I mean, three out of 27 vaccinated with hMPV would be off the charts when it comes statistically speaking to historical experience. Right?

Dr. Monto: Yeah, it sounds like it. And it's something that's quite troubling.

Dr. El Sahly: Yes. And there also there is less information because these cases, as I understand, came in later, so we know even less on their immune response and antibodies, et cetera.

Dr. Monto: Right.

Dr. El Sahly: Yeah. Okay. Dr. Malloy. Is someone from Moderna trying to answer something?

Dr. Snape: Yes, if possible. Just to interject. Matthew Snape here at Moderna. I thought it would be useful to comment on the hMPV cases and to remind the committee that hMPV is another pneumovirus. It's very similar to RSV as a virus, and the F proteins themselves have a lot of similar characteristics. So, there's some overlap there, but it also does potentially give us the opportunity to explore baseline immunity

before these children got sick. Because as was being mentioned before about staggering RSV seasons, in effect, we have created a staggered season here because we've had an RSV season and now we've had an hMPV season, so we will have immunogenicity data at one month after the second vaccine before the children got sick. It's just that we don't have that data yet. And that will allow us to interrogate what baseline immunity looked like in the children that got sick and those that didn't get sick, and see if there's any difference there.

And just to say one more thing, it's about the distribution of cases. There were three in the RSV hMPV participants, and there was actually one co-infection with RSV and hMPV in a placebo participant just to, whether that would be RSV or HMV that made them sick is obviously it's hard to tell.

Dr. El Sahly: So what is your best estimate on the ETA of all these data? Are we talking three months, six months?

Dr. Snape: The hMPV data will be weeks. Yeah.

Dr. El Sahly: Weeks and then everything else that, you know--

Dr. Snape: Weeks for availability. And then we need to analyze it and QC and all those kinds of things, of course. But I think in general we should be thinking 2025 for these data coming through.

Dr. El Sahly: Okay.

Dr. Snape: Hopefully early rather than later.

Dr. El Sahly: Alright, thank you. And I don't know, this is something to the FDA colleagues, is that depending on what this data show when analysis is done on these

cases, it may inform the answer to the discussion topic a little better, right? There's quite a bit of unknown so far. I'll go back to Dr. Malloy. Thank you for waiting, Dr. Malloy.

Dr. Malloy: Hi. I just wanted to say that we know that RSV is very much a mucosal infection, whereas influenza and SARS-CoV-2 tend to infect outside the mucosa. And as we think forward, the data so far suggests that mucosal antibodies and mucosal T-cells can be supportive in protection against infection. And the consideration for adding some of these to our guidelines for how we're deciding safety and efficacy for some of these vaccines would be fantastic. And so, while T-cell in the mucosa are difficult to test, we've gotten so much smarter at looking at mucosal antibodies for both IgG and IgA and adding those to platforms for how we're designing safety and efficacy endpoints might be really useful for these vaccines as they move forward. And even in the idea of nirsevimab, if we can look at what the mucosal response is, do those kids that do well with nirsevimab have a higher mucosal immune response or antibody response would be really helpful. So, taking that as a sort of place where we might gain some more information about how we would look at the efficacy and safety of some of these might be really useful in these platforms that we already have and endpoints that we could already look at.

Dr. El Sahly: Well, that depends on whether the sponsor collected nasal washes or nasal swaps or--

Dr. Malloy: Yeah.

Dr. El Sahly: Thank you. Dr. Berger.

Dr. Berger: Thanks. I just wanted to follow up on Dr. Jane's comments and really focus on question two a little bit, which is asking what additional safeguards need to be put in place. I want to really stress the monitoring here worked. This is exactly what we expect and want to have happen. The safety signal was identified, the sponsor halted the study. This is exactly the type of safeguards you want to see happen. So, I'm not necessarily sure that there's additional safeguards as opposed to additional evidence needs. As Dr. Gans was noting on the front end of this session or this part of the session itself. I do think it's important to understand what that evidence base is around natural disease so you can have that comparator for understanding the immune response that's elicited naturally versus vaccine induced. I think all of that, just taken together, I think what is already in place is working. I think we just don't really have a good understanding of the mechanism that is driving the safety signal.

That said, I mean I do think there's a couple of good things that I just want to highlight. It looks like there's a possibility of having a vaccine that could be developed here. We see at least in "1a" live-attenuated doesn't seem to have any of these issues. That's a good sign for development processes. What kind of prompted me to ask the question I asked earlier in the day though, is about those other 11 clinical development programs. And I think this might be the one area that could potentially be more helpful for us because it's great and I'm thrilled to see that Moderna came forward with this and has been willing to be so open about the study itself. Not understanding what's going on in those other 10 though it's hard for me to make a judgment that it's a platform issue, and so I can only make a judgment based on the one study I'm seeing.

I think it'd be great to have some additional measure that allows for better understanding while those studies are ongoing, if they're seeing signals that we can combine. Because I get the sense, at least from the way this question is phrased in "1a",

it's looking at technologies and mass, and I don't think we can make a generalized answer to a technology based on just having one study. I fully agree there's an absolute safety signal here and the steps that we're taking I would support, but I'm not sure I can actually apply that to all mRNA programs. So, going back to what Dr. Monto had said, Monto had said early on, I think we do have to look at these at a platform basis, but at this point I think we need to look at them at a platform basis and a per clinical development program basis unless we can get better coordination of being able to get evidence from those other programs that are in developments. And I recognize that there's issues in terms of confidential information sharing and whatnot, but I do think that's the one gap that I'm missing to be able to answer "1a" well, which is that generalized vaccine technology platform question. So, thanks.

Dr. El Sahly: But would you agree, Dr. Berger, it's that the predictive model that we are using, which is largely based on what happened with the formalin inactivated vaccine and how we understand the immunologic basis of the enhanced disease there. So, we took what we learned from that particular incident and we applied it and established the safeguards whereby all other platforms should move, right? age de-escalation, Th1, Th2, the histopath upon rechallenge, all of these safeguards were put in place. Looks like the vaccines are passing these initial safeguards and however, once they come to the relevant population, it seems that these safeguards did not really predict the outcome. You know what I mean?

Dr. Berger: Yes. And I think that's why I was noting earlier and agreeing with Dr. Gans's points. We need better evidence about what's actually driving the immunological response. The general safeguards that are put in place around the clinical studies themselves seem to be working. We're identifying that there is a safety signal and halting the study. What we don't have a good handle on is the evidence-based or the

evidence that's driving that ideological difference here. And we take what we're learning from the past, but I think we are missing a bit to understand what's going on currently with these newer types of technologies that are being employed. I'm just not sure I can apply it across the entirety of the technology. I don't know if all mRNA programs are all going to have this problem or not. That's really my point that I'm trying to make. I don't know if I can extend that to all of a specific technology as opposed to a particular clinical development program until we have better evidence around it. That's why I'd like to see better coordination or collaboration around driving that evidence base between clinical development programs and also having a better evidence base about what's actually happening in response to natural disease so we can understand the vaccine-induced immunology.

Dr. El Sahly: Karen, if you can wait just one second because we have two experts who can speak to the natural infection, immune responses and answer, potentially, some of Dr. Berger and Dr. Gans questions. We have Octavio Ramilo and Tony Piedra. If I can ask one or both of them to weigh in on gaps in knowledge pertaining to protective immune responses after natural infection. We have Tony and we have Octavio.

Dr. Piedra: Octavio.

Dr. Ramilo: You go for it, Tony.

Dr. Piedra: Sounds good. So an area that was mentioned that we have basically very little knowledge of is resident T-cells and what's happening in the lungs or in the mucosa. We don't have evidence or good information on infants or young children following RSV infection. We have it more on adults who undergo the experimental challenge with RSV. But this is an area that is, I would say, needed to better understand down the road. We are getting now with newer technology, a better understanding of the

type of antibody repertoire that infants develop with primary infection and is oftentimes age dependent and whether it's under or after the umbrella of maternal antibodies. And nirsevimab is going to be, I think, a very important question to address as well where it may look different from maternal antibodies, even though maternal antibodies are going to be high in antibodies that target the prefusion sites.

So, I would just say that in infants, the antibody response and repertoire is quite different from that of an older child or an adult and you don't have the same level of avidity and you don't have the same broad repertoire that occurs in individuals with repeated infections. And so with that, the cellular immune response, I'm less informed other than what I read and Octavio can probably shed additional light. What I will say is that the innate immune response, we know a bit of the type of response that we see following infection in infants and toddlers. Octavio has developed a bit of that information we have as well. And it kind of goes initially against the paradigm that a very, let's say robust or exaggerated cytokine response was detrimental. What we have observed in others is that an early robust response- Cytokine response that is associated with innate immunity actually plays a favorable response for the host in, I won't say clearing viral infection, but in ameliorating disease severity.

Dr. El Sahly: Thank you, Tony. Octavio.

Dr. Ramilo: Thank you for the opportunity. My name is Octavia Ramilo. I work at St. Jude Children's Research Hospital and our research group has been working on RSV, especially in infants for the last 25 years. So, thank you for the opportunity to contribute to the meeting. We have a very incomplete understanding of RSV immunity despite 60 years of research. I've been brought by the DSMB committee to help understanding these findings. So, I've been exposed to this data for the last month and a half. And

obviously the first thing is being humble because everything we thought we knew about how to make a vaccine and how to leverage the animal models to understand what happening in kids, it was incomplete. That's very important. And the history of RSV has always been like this. We take us-- Unless we do a very scientific driven approach, our ability to protect and develop protected aspects against RSV has been very limited.

Now, if I may, it's important that we use markers of protection, pref antibodies and neutralizing antibodies, but we measure them in the blood. The virus infects the upper respiratory tract. So, Dr. Malloy mentioned we should focus more on what happens when the virus infects through the mucosa. And I think it's going to be very important. It has been suggested by a number of the Committee that maybe a suggestion that is not too complicated is to include measuring of mucosal antibodies in the context of these vaccine trials. We know, we haven't published this yet, it has been presented in meetings, that young infants we can detect in the mucosa maternal antibody, it's totally IgG, it's not IgA. After they develop the response, the IgA is really high and the IgG as well in the mucosa, but this is age dependent. My colleague Dr. Mejias and I have studied very carefully the age effect on development of antibodies in the natural infection and in the first few months of life, the response is very weak. It begins to be a bit sustainable, I'm talking about preF and neutralizing antibodies, after six months with natural infection.

So, it's going to be difficult because the vaccine, whether it's mRNA vaccine or live-attenuated vaccine, we want to be better than the natural infection. And because the natural infection is really bad. Looking at the innate immunity, we found out that the innate immunity you are under six months or after six months is totally different. The interferon response is so limited that number one under six months, it does not protect the acute situation, but probably does not help telling the B cells what to make a more

productive and effective response. The third, Tony alluded to the paradigm of understanding how viral replication and mucosal cytokine response protect or not protect. 25 years ago, we were convinced that the kids who got in the ICU were hyper inflamed. Now, there is a lot of data suggesting that actually the innate immune response is weak or disorganized.

We learned that if you have a lambda interferon or IP-10 in the mucosa, you're well protected. But if you have IL-6, you tend to be more hospitalized. So, understanding how the regulated immune response works and how our vaccines can develop such a protective response is going to be very important. I really encourage that we incorporate more immune profiling for me to say from academia and what is doable. Because the challenge is how we enroll kids and we are not too aggressive about collecting too many samples, but maybe in the mucosa it can be done.

Finally, there's another paradigm that Dr. Piera has seen and we have seen that when we think about viruses and we talk about CMV, HIV, hepatitis C in the blood, the correlation between viral titer and disease severity is clear. That's not the case in RSV. We see that kids hospitalized with RSV have lower viral load than kids who are managed as adult patients. So, it's another paradigm understanding how viral replication, the immune protection in the mucosa, I mean the immune response to the mucosa, both innate and adaptive, play a big role.

I think there are a lot of gaps in our knowledge and, if I can complain, there's very little NIH funding to study RSV natural infection for the last few decades. Some of the members of the committee will [Indiscernible - 3:00:21] that. So, my advice to all the colleagues who are passionate about developing an RSV vaccine, and it's important to remind that from six months to two years, after six months you can have half the

hospitalizations. And I mean Dr. Long was alluding what is the landscape. And you too, Dr. El Sahly. And I think it's important to realize that a lot of the morbidity that occurs, even if it's not hospitalization, is very real and causes long-term implications for their way and long-term sequela. So, I don't think we should be happy to just prevent hospitalization. Thank you for the opportunity to contribute to this meeting.

Dr. El Sahly: Thank you, Dr. Ramilo and Dr. Piera. Back to Karen.

Dr. Kotloff: Okay, thanks. Thanks, Hana. I just wanted to emphasize that there seems to be a green light if I'm understanding it for the live-attenuated vaccines. And I think one very important step is that we need to have a good safety base for kids who are seronegative that don't come in with good immunity from their moms because we may have a false sense of security. And then also, I think it's true that the guardrails worked in terms of detecting the severe cases, but they didn't work obviously in predicting what those severe cases are. And I think that that should be an area-- And I think we just heard about that and it was really good to hear about what we know about pathogenesis. And I do think that we learned for pertussis that there's a very characteristic pertussis lung that's associated with mortality, very characteristic histopathology. And I do think that the kids who die from RSV are also different and understanding the immune profile in response to vaccination and in response to infection, better understanding that would be very important in helping us to understand the safety of vaccines.

Dr. El Sahly: Yes, great point. Thank you, Karen. Dr. Gans.

Dr. Gans: Thanks everyone for this amazing conversation and Octavio for coming on and sharing with us the immune responses. I just wanted to caution people to be very-- Again, I feel like we can access antibodies and we do them very well. They're not the whole story. And if we're going to get anything that actually is an immune

profile that we really want to see, it has to be robust. There is data that even in the presence of maternal or any passive acquired antibody, that T-cell function is actually fine, while there may be differences in humoral immunity. So, there's a little bit of a disassociation, and we can't just say that because we have one, we actually have the other. I think we need to be very careful in infants how we're looking at both of the arms. Well, including innate immunity as Octavio has really well identified because all of these are limited in different ways. And I think it's very much the way that natural immunity is supposed to be acquired over time so that it's not actually too robust. It doesn't cause tissue damage. It's limited in a way that actually is probably pretty biologically sound. And so we have to be very careful about that.

But I also just want to dispel the notion that you can't immunize infants in the presence of passive antibodies. I mean studies that have been done in the context of that and the developing world have actually shown that, for instance, measles immunization, same type of process that would inhibit humeral immunity, actually is a survival advantage for those infants, not only in terms of measles disease but just overall survival. So, there are many ways of looking at this and I think we need to not-- We know that antibodies can prevent the virus from actually attaching to the cell. We know it's good for the extracellular. These viruses have many different compartments that they actually infect, and we need the full immune system to actually be present for us to actually be able to handle these viruses.

I just want us to be comprehensive rather than myopic about not only spaces, we've already said there's lots of lymphoid tissue that's within our respiratory tract. We should be able to do nasal washes on children who are in, if we want to look at immunity, we can do these now on small sample sizes. We've really progressed in our ability to do that. We don't always have to just work with PBMC. I think there's just a

lot of also immunologic diagnostic advantages that you can do on small samples and that shouldn't be restricting us at this point in time. I really appreciate the conversation. I just wanted to add those points.

Dr. El Sahly: Great. Thank you. Dr. Nelson.

Dr. Nelson: Yes. Thank you for giving me the opportunity to comment on these discussion items and be a part of this conversation. It's been very enlightening. And also put a plugin for the appreciation to Moderna for being so transparent and volunteering to present their data to this Committee for their adoption. What I would like to state is that I too agree that the system worked, the safety signal was reached, a proper pause was put in place. I'm not totally convinced that the finding of the safety signal means that the signal is real, and the reason is that for some of the reasons that have been just articulated over the last hour, we haven't achieved enough understanding of the exact immune response of study participants. And in particular, I don't think we've learned enough from those who experienced the severe adverse events and some more attention to be investigating what happens to them in real time, I think could be incorporated in future clinical trials as well.

So, the safeguards that this Committee and the FDA recommended and put in place actually I think did work. I think we need to put a little bit more emphasis on the understanding of host factors. I mean, this is a unique situation and with RSV age de-escalation, we were actually headed into a headwind of Th2 bias, which we know exists as most prominent in the younger age groups. In addition, I noted that for Part B of the Moderna trial, it was conducted entirely in Panama. And we do know that there are ethnicities, genetic and epigenetic and environmental social determinants and health factors that can impact the immune response of individuals. Yet I don't think we've

understood or even asked the question about the participants in these trials and how generalizable they are. That's not at anybody's fault, but should be a future thought process as we conduct and design future clinical trials. I think there's the opportunity to learn more about our participants in these trials before the intervention and to certainly assess in more detail what happens afterwards.

I'll put in one other plug on 1.1a with respect to platform. As an Allergist Immunologist, I'm always concerned about our population that has inborn areas of immunity and primary immune deficiency. So, yes, newborn screening has certainly unearthed and identified or diagnosed kids at a much earlier age, but there are multiple conditions that don't come to life until later. Most live vaccines with the exception of rotavirus, are held off until one year of age. As we look to introduce live viruses into children below the age of one, that risk to this undetected population does increase. So, really identifying the proper risk factors and being able to screen out those at risk from a live-attenuated platform, I think it's going to be essential. Thank you.

Dr. El Sahly: Thank you. Clarifying question to Dr. Connelly or to Moderna. Are all the severe cases in Panama? I thought that was the hMPV and the other ones were mixed.

Dr. Snape: It's Matthew Snape here. I can talk from Moderna. All of Part B-- There were 81 children recruited to Part B. 80 of those were in Panama and one was in the UK. And so all of the children that got sick were in Panama given-- In B. This was planned as an international study, I mean as many of these vaccine studies that are done for seasonal viruses are planned to be done across hemispheres. We're going to be recruiting-- To respond to one of the questions earlier about them all being in Panama, actually, we actually had approvals to be doing this study in eight different countries as

it happened the way the RSV seasons worked, that Panama was the one that was in the best place to recruit at that particular time.

Dr. El Sahly: Okay, got it. Thank you. Dr. Meyer.

CAPT Meyer: Yes, thank you. I agree. This has been a really great discussion, a lot of great points by my colleagues and I don't have too much new to add. I just kind of wanted to summarize my thinking around this issue. I think my takeaways from today are that we had some very well thought out safeguards put in place that were based on prior experiences of vaccine candidates. Multiple global groups looked at this issue, all came to kind of similar recommendations around how to study these vaccines. This was a very well thought out process. But again, as others have pointed out here, we are talking about a safety signal and we don't really understand the mechanism why. So, for me, it makes it very difficult to comment on the second question about what additional safeguards or what new ways to study this we can put in place without really understanding what we think may have happened here or why the safeguards we put in place didn't necessarily predict severe outcomes.

So, I'm really hopeful that some of the additional investigations that Moderna has discussed can shed some light on this and some of the other studies that my colleagues have recommended. For me, it makes it very difficult to really comment on that one.

In terms of the first question though, I mean I'll add my input on this. I do think we saw some data presented today during the Open Public Hearing around the live virus vaccines. And I think if I understood our Sanofi colleagues correctly, thousands of children have already received a vaccine in those trials and not found a safety signal. And I found that reassuring because where we have detected safety signals, it's been in

pretty small numbers of kids. And so, I think that was good signs that we can develop that there are different vaccine technologies that may have different outcomes. I think I would agree that we need to look at these and yeah, that's what I'll add at this point. Thanks.

Dr. El Sahly: Great, thank you. I'm going to go through the participant list, make sure I heard from everyone and if I didn't, I'm going to call your name, sorry. That would be-- Where's the list? Okay, so that would be Dr. Offit and Dr. Bernstein. We didn't hear from either. Did I miss someone else? No, I think everyone else weigh-in.

Dr. Offit: Sure. You want me to comment? Can you hear me okay?

Dr. El Sahly: I can.

Dr. Offit: Yeah. So, I agree with what's largely been said. I think the frustration in this is one, this involves a handful of children. Two, the things that were in place that we felt were predictive regarding formal-- Formalin-inactivated vaccine, or formalin-inactivated whole virus. And this sort of pre versus postfusion protein doesn't seem to apply here. So, we're not sure what applies here and I'm not sure how much we're going to learn moving forward. We certainly were right to stop the trial. So, having stopped it, I'm not sure how much we're going to learn moving forward. It is a little frustrating. I mean, it is possible. This was brought up by one of the commenters that this is just a spurious association. I mean we in the rotavirus vaccine trials for example, which was a prospective placebo-controlled trial that involved 70,000 children, there were nine cases of seizures in the vaccine group two in the placebo group, which was statistically significant but didn't hold up. And there were five cases of Kawasaki's disease, the vaccine group, and none in the placebo group that was statistically significant but didn't hold up.

So, sometimes there's a tyranny of small numbers, although of interest there were five cases of arm and leg fractures in the placebo group and none in the vaccine group, which is to say the rotavirus vaccine prevented arm and leg fractures. I don't think Merck got an indication for that. But in any case, this is the problem with small numbers. So I do, I'm a little frustrated by the fact that one, I don't think it's clear what the pathogenesis of this is, and two, it's not clear to me how well we're going to learn it moving forward. But that's all.

Dr. El Sahly: Thank you Paul. And Dr. Bernstein, if you don't mind.

Dr. Bernstein: No, of course. Sorry about that. But first of all, I thought, well the presentations and the discussions were quite educational for me. I thank all the speakers and people around the table. I mean this all seems like an incredible conundrum with lots of unanswered questions remaining. So, lots to still learn. Indeed there does appear to be a true safety signal in young children. And I did wonder, just as Dr. Nelson and you, Dr. El Sahly, said. I wondered about the fact that all the children were from Panama and not in the United States or elsewhere. It does appear we need more studies of potential vaccine candidates by platform and pediatric age groups and by more than one RSV season. It's particularly confusing to me what the additional benefit is for a pediatric vaccine in children under a year, given the availability of antepartum RSV vaccine and nirsevimab.

On a related topic, I think it'll really be important to determine how vaccination of pregnant women with each pregnancy as we do with Tdap impacts RSV epidemiology in young children. And I was concerned about the addressing of decreased monoclonal antibody effectiveness with the possibility of mutation as one of our colleagues mentioned. And I guess I'll end with the fact that this meeting and its

presentations, and all these robust discussions highlights very well how valuable science is in making an incredible difference in public health. And we hope that that message comes across loud and clear going forward. Thanks.

Dr. El Sahly: Thank you. So, I think-- Any other hands? Dr. Monto.

Dr. Monto: I will follow up with Dr. Offit's comments. Being an epidemiologist, I'm always afraid of making conclusions from small numbers. However, we also look at biologic plausibility and when you see this kind of situation with both RSV and human metapneumovirus, I think it's plausible that this is a real event. Now, we're not-- Given the fact that our predictive models haven't been working, the problem is either we go forward very carefully with clinical trials where we may be able to get an answer or we continue to observe natural infection in which over 50 odd years we haven't really been able to identify anything that would help us in answering the questions that are currently being raised. And that's one of the reasons why I believe that it is important to continue and to cross pollinate, as Dr. Berger said, so we get some better predictions of what will happen and gather numbers. So, we're convinced that they are happening and we do not just shut down programs over the current findings, real though they are. Thank you.

Dr. El Sahly: Thank you, Arnold. But we have to-- I mean, shutting down programs of course across the board is not the goal and that's why we're meeting,

Dr. Monto: I know that's why I'm saying this because we heard from Moderna that they are changing their goals.

Dr. El Sahly: Yes, but the other, on the flip side, there's the issue of risk benefit human subject.

Dr. Monto: I understand. The dilemma is that we don't know how severe the severe cases would be if we continue to evaluate the vaccines. So, it's a very hard decision and that's why we're being asked the questions that we're being asked.

Dr. El Sahly: And the final comment is from Dr. Janssen before I try to summarize the discussion

Dr. Jenssen: As an epidemiologist also, it's a potential safety signal, but I think it's absolutely the right thing to do and not at all surprised by Moderna's decision. The question is how did the other programs get off clinical hold. And I really haven't heard anything offered different that would allow them to get off hold unless the FDA decided to go ahead platform by platform. Also, I think the other thing to consider is the route of administration may matter as was mentioned earlier. I think the one thought I have, I'm an adult physician, I'm not a pediatrician. I haven't done enough studies XUS to comment on medical care in Panama or other countries. But potentially it would be important for FDA to require studies being done under IND, to be done in the United States with access to children's hospitals. It's the only thing I can think of without adding anything else here.

Dr. El Sahly: Thank you so much. Okay. So this was a rather involved and very stimulating discussion to a very, I guess, vexing question, given the small numbers, the data being not finalized in terms of the evaluation of these adverse events, et cetera. The sense of the Committee that these potential safety signals, although small in numbers, however, RSV associated severe LRTI and hMPV severe associated LRTI in an hMPV/RSV vaccine is rather compelling as opposed to the fracture or the Kawasaki. So, the potential safety signal, especially in the history of the 1960s is rather compelling that the signal is likely true but not final, but likely true and should have been addressed

with the urgency that it was addressed with in terms of the sponsor and in terms of the FDA.

The Committee after review of the data of the mishap or the tragedy of the 1960s, the predictive model was followed however, did not really predict what the outcome would be once the vaccine moved into the seronegative infants who do have a predilection of differing immune response with potentially a Th2 bias in general. What does it mean for different vaccine technologies? Certain technologies like the live attenuated have a track record in the thousands already and within various, I guess, minor changes to the constructs and in various medical institutions or centers. So, there is a reassurance that potentially it can carry its own weight, so to speak, given the existing data and moving it forward would be, I guess, less anxiety provoking than subunit vaccines.

Subunit vaccines have been tested in humans of all ages, whether it's the recombinant prefusion, the one that is just recombinant F, there were no safety signals in adults. A couple are already licensed, but to my knowledge, none were in seronegative infants. How do the events of the last few months change what needs to happen for these particular vaccines to go into that sliver of the population? I am not sure. However, maybe the additional data that is forthcoming from the collected samples can guide-- If they do shed light onto what was different in the immune response there. Different antigenic confirmations are a little harder. The stabilized preF is the one that is in the constructs under consideration today. And it didn't seem to predict the preF/postF ratio was of course in favor of the preF, but it didn't seem to have abrogated this particular signal. And based on the currently available evidence, when it comes to the clinical information, for example, the clinical trials that will be resuming, I'm assuming at a minimum they're replicating ones, the safeguards in place seem to

catch such an occurrence. I'm pretty sure all the DSMBs of those trials are on the lookout, even more so now. But what additional nonclinical information should be considered is unknown at this phase. It is something that potentially can be amended once more data from these infants and toddlers are forthcoming.

And then we touched upon the new lay of the land, which is to understand the risk benefit which all RBS need to know going forward when they review these vaccine studies. We commented that this is an evolving field and our colleagues in the CDC, and colleagues in the FDA who will see the subsequent seasons data from the clinical trials also will be analyzing those data. And this will also be informative of the risk benefit going forward. Did I miss any major or- Major issues? There were a whole slew of other great ideas along the way, but these I think are the highlights of the discussion. And with that, I'd like to move to Topic II or question 2. Topic I. We have, but just so everyone knows, we have 31 more minutes.

Sequential administration of RSV monoclonal antibodies followed by RSV vaccines in infants and toddlers. Please discuss whether currently available evidence suggests potential RSV mAb, such as nirsevimab, and there may be more coming down the pike, RSV vaccine interactions that may affect active immunization in infants and toddlers. And: Based on the currently available evidence, please discuss and recommend whether any additional factors and data should be considered when evaluating RSV mAb - RSV vaccine interactions, including potential impact of administration of RSV mAb on safety and or effectiveness of subsequent parental or mucosal administration of RSV vaccines.

I invite everyone in the Committee to use the raise-your-hand function to comment on this particular question. Okay. We have first Dr. Gans.

Dr. Gans: I guess I didn't fully realize there was a full question on this. Sorry to not prepare because I think we've already discussed it a little bit. So, I think--

Dr. El Sahly: Maybe some additional thoughts or--?

Dr. Gans: Yeah, so I think that one of the important components that comes into play when we're thinking about any kind of passive immunity and then trying to elicit active immune responses to a vaccine is that we need the full picture. So, I think we've alluded to not having a complete understanding of immunity under any of the conditions in which we're sort of thinking about, but particularly with this particular thing, because I have studied it, it really behooves us to understand all components of the interaction with the passive antibody and whatever antigen exposure we're giving, we need to know and innate and adaptive immunity in those circumstances. Typically humoral immunity is blunted, but it can be boosted with additional exposures and things like that. So, that's what has to be understood and it still should be considered a very viable option despite seeing slightly diminished humoral immune responses. I think that that's just part of the picture. We know very well that people who show that profile actually are protected against disease, particularly disease severity. So, we have that understanding from other antigens and that should be considered and studied further.

The only other thing I would say is, again, we have nirsevimab, which has been very impactful and wonderful and we do hope it stays part of our management for these individuals. Again, I think the question needs to be expanded to maternal immunization and that effect on not only protecting our infants in their early infancy in those few months, but then also how that impacts subsequent immunization of that pairing. That is something that we're interested in doing because of what was discussed earlier, the diversity of the immune response that the mothers can pass on to their infants not only

during pregnancy but also during if they choose to breastfeed and other ways in which they can continue to help protect their infants in an active immune if they are actively contributing to the baby's immunity. And then obviously subsequent immunization on the child's part.

Dr. El Sahly: Thank you, Dr. Gans. Dr. James?

Dr. Janes: Thank you. I'll be brief. I think I agree with a lot of what Dr. Gants just mentioned. To me, I don't think we saw enough data here for this vaccine to definitively establish whether or not prior passive immunization affected the immune responses induced by this vaccine. There were just insufficient numbers to answer that question. And moreover, the prior discussion really just highlighted the fact that we don't know really the full profile of what a desirable immune response here is in terms of inducing protection. So to me, this just really highlights the importance of this question going forward. And as Dr. Gans mentioned, both preexisting passively acquired immunity by virtue of antibody administration as well as passively acquired antibody from the birthing parent. Thank you.

Dr. El Sahly: Okay. So, when it comes to this particular issue, we have small numbers, nine infants who got nirsevimab, six infants who got no nirsevimab. They were both given the mRNA vaccine and those who were recipients of nirsevimab eight months prior, at least, I think the range was 8 to 12, had no increase in their RSV A neutralizing antibody titers or RSV B, for that matter. While the infants who had no nirsevimab at birth had a 60 fold increase in their nirsevimab, in their neutralizing antibody titers against A, and 19 against B. The numbers are small, obviously, as a result of the halt of the product development. And however, again, it is striking that there was absolutely a flat response. Having said that, it seemed that the nirsevimab-exposed infants did have

preexisting titers, so it is possible they did have-- Yeah, and they were neutralizing. So, it is possible that they are in the tail-end of their nirsevimab, they're still protected maybe, and we went and vaccinated them too early. So, there aren't enough permutations in the time to understand the role of-- The time of vaccination relative to the nirsevimab receipt. It is possible that this is a time-dependent variable, but could not be studied because the study went on hold as a fallout from that. So, we don't know how the time since injections is going to affect the response, but also what it means to other platforms that want to study their vaccine post-nirsevimab. Nirsevimab, again, this would be season two that it is administered and in season one there was a significant shortage at many medical institutions and healthcare providers.

So, the durability of the protection of nirsevimab remains to be seen, and it's waning and to how much-- It's possible that it all goes away, but maybe there's a degree of protection that remains afforded by this particular intervention that we need to evaluate as time goes on. And I'm pretty sure in a year we'll be having a different discussion around this issue. So, until we have those data, it's hard to extrapolate to what other manufacturers should do, etcetera. But at a minimum, having an understanding of when a vaccine would be needed given what we know about nirsevimab, what we will know about nirsevimab and other monoclonal antibodies, and the manufacturers, and the sponsors to take that into accounting in terms of the time variables and the population they will study. That's how I see Topic 2, and you will be asked to comment on it. So, be ready. And we begin with Dr. Monto.

Dr. Monto: I think the only certainty here is that the live-attenuated vaccine is going to have to be evaluated in terms of when it can be used. In the past, following the administration of the monoclonal antibody, the duration of protection that has been seen may actually force a delay in the use of the live-attenuated vaccine. In terms of what

we've seen with the mRNA vaccine, I wouldn't be concerned with the kind of blunting of the immune response that has been seen because the immune response was so robust. We don't know about the efficacy of the immune response given the small numbers and the safety signal. So, aside from pretty clear conclusions about the live-attenuated vaccines, I don't think we're in a position to really comment with any kind of certainty about the current situation.

Dr. El Sahly: When you say comment on the current situation, meaning the mRNA or generally speaking, when to administer?

Dr. Monto: I think it's premature to talk about that. I think it needs to be studied, and that's something that's fairly easy to be studied in the United States, and that's almost certainly why studies have gone outside the United States in order to be able to find populations which are not at least recommended to receive the immunoglobulin-- The monoclonal antibody, I should say.

Dr. El Sahly: Oh, okay. So, your comment is really in reference to--

Dr. Monto: I think that becomes one of the practical considerations in going outside the United States. And if we're going to say that the vaccine-- The trial should be done for safety reasons in the United States, then we have a problem in evaluating a significant number of children who do not receive the monoclonal antibody.

Dr. El Sahly: Definitely. That's a conundrum. However, I think here--

Dr. Monto: Yeah. Many conundrums.

Dr. El Sahly: Yes. The topic, I guess, here for Question 2 is specifically following nirsevimab, not how to avoid nirsevimab. Assuming somewhat the kid got nirsevimab, and so how do you maneuver that?

Dr. Monto: Well, yeah, but you'd like to have a comparator.

Dr. El Sahly: Yeah. Okay. Dr. Ruckwardt.

Dr. Ruckwardt: Hi. Yeah, so I guess I'll just weigh in on my thoughts on this one, which are largely as everyone else's. I think there's very little evidence here to base anything on, specifically for nirsevimab and the single dose of mRNA, which was all that was given here. But at the same time, I don't think it's too much of a limb to say that this would be expected, this blunting would be expected, and there's not any evidence here of a safety issue in this small group of infants. So I think we couldn't-- It's premature to speak about the safety issue, but I think as for the first point, this would have to be evaluated on a platform by platform basis, and based on what we already know, we would expect that this kind of blunting would be probably less apparent with some of the mucosal vaccination approaches. Thank you.

Dr. El Sahly: Great. Thank you. Dr. Berger?

Dr. Berger: I agree with what all has been said. I just wanted to add one additional piece. We also don't know if the blunting would've been even less if we had gone through all three of the doses that were given here. It is just hard to make any definitive decisions or conclusions based on a total of 15 research participants in the study that didn't even get to administer all of the entirety of what was meant to be administered. So, I would be really hesitant to make decisions at this point on this without collecting more additional evidence. Thanks.

Dr. El Sahly: Thank you. I don't see any raised hands, so I'm going to use-- I'm going to ask everyone to weigh in however little or a lot you want to say on this particular topic. And I'm going to go in the order of appearance on the participant list here. Dr. Malloy?

Dr. Malloy: Hi. I think just as everybody has pointed out, we lack really robust metrics for what's a correlative protection. So, we'd be hard pressed to say exactly what nirsevimab is blocking when it's blocking something other than this idea of the peripheral sort of preF antibody response. And so, I think more data is required to really weigh in on when or if you would have to limit the use of a RSV vaccine. And again, it would have to be based on each platform and how it works. So, I think all those things would-- We just need more data in order to understand what we would really need for prevention of RSV and then what the correlates of protection are so that we can use those as metrics to decide whether nirsevimab has to be held or waiting after a nirsevimab administration in order to do that.

Dr. El Sahly: Thank you. Dr. Bernstein?

Dr. Bernstein: Yeah, I mean, nirsevimab may have blunted the immune response, but really in a very small number of patients, and there really are not enough data, as others have said, to draw significant conclusions about RSV vaccination of infants who received nirsevimab. I think that, and agree, that this should be studied by vaccine platform and also the number of doses received by the children.

Dr. El Sahly: Okay. Thank you. Dr. Janes?

Dr. Janes: I don't think I have any additional comments on-- I feel like this is an important further question. We don't have sufficient evidence to make determinations on the answer at this point.

Dr. El Sahly: Dr. Portnoy?

Dr. Portnoy: There you go. Yeah, just thinking about vaccines in general and children who get vaccines, as newborns given vaccines for diseases that they're not likely to catch right away. RSV is almost an emergency. This affects infants at the very earliest of ages, and so they need to be protected right away. While it would be great if we could actively immunize newborns with an RSV vaccine, I think passive immunization is probably the best solution at this point because these infants need to be protected immediately. They're at risk of severe disease right after they're born, if they're born at the wrong time of year. So, the idea of sequentially giving passive immunization and then waiting until they're a little bit older before giving the active vaccine makes good sense. I've seen evidence that it seems to be very effective. There may be some infants who don't respond as well, who may have enhanced disease as a result of the vaccine. I think that those infants probably are different than the other ones, and that there are maybe risk factors that can be identified that could potentially identify who they are and maybe modify their treatment, have them avoid getting the active vaccine. I can't think of a better way of protecting infants from bronchiolitis, which is the clinical disease that they get from RSV other than passive immunization, either from administration to pregnant women or passive immunization at birth. I think that's the way it has to be done right now. And if we can start doing that, I think that that'll really make a big difference in terms of hospitalizations for infants. It's been a great discussion, but I think we really-- The time is now where we really need to start protecting these infants

because the morbidity is huge. The possible benefit of this is huge also, and so it's time to move forward. Thank you.

Dr. El Sahly: Great. Thank you. Dr. Kotloff?

Dr. Kotloff: Sure. So, I think that it's a very good idea for the reasons that we said that you get early protection, that these look very, very effective. The data on nirsevimab in the second half of infancy, there were fewer cases, so it was less clear, but I suspect that there may be longer immunity. I agree that we need to watch carefully for immune escape, but even with vaccines as we know well from COVID, you can have immune escape. So, that's a universal problem. I also think that when we're talking about intranasal vaccines, I don't know the data on developing countries, but the universal purulent rhinitis, I don't know whether that's a consideration as well. So, I think that all live-attenuated vaccine constructs or parenteral constructs on all populations are not the same. And we have to be clear about our approach when we're solving these problems for different populations. So, in terms of the data on whether there was muting of the antibody responses, I think that, from what I remember of the graphs, they went by quickly, but I think that the kids who had gotten monoclonal antibodies had very, very high antibody levels. So, it's much more difficult to see a fourfold rise when you're starting with such high antibodies. That doesn't mean those kids aren't protected. So, I think for that, we need to understand the kinetics better. And for all of this, we need to do studies to answer these questions.

Dr. El Sahly: I have the table pool. They started with 10,000 and ended with 7,000. It's like flat completely, but yeah. Dr. Nelson?

Dr. Nelson: Yeah. Thank you. I agree with my colleagues, certainly not enough as evidence to raise concern over our current approach and use of nirsevimab, and

certainly would recommend continuing our current approach. I would state that going forward, it is going to be difficult to discern a true humoral response. Our humoral immune status and immune response is always going to be a mess with a mix of vaccine response, maternal contributions, natural infections, and now passive monoclonals. So, I would put more emphasis and more resources and effort into the characterization of the cellular immune response and other better correlates of protection, and recognizing that we're dealing with small infants, we're going to have to take advantage of new technology with small samples using transcriptomics, multiplex approaches, and even selective cell activation status using high-dimensional flow cytometry. Could be certain methodologies that could be selectively employed in these trials. Thank you.

Dr. El Sahly: Thank you. Dr. Offit?

Dr. Offit: Yeah, I'm not sure I have anything much to add. I agree with my previous Committee members here who have spoken. We're being asked to make a decision on still relatively small numbers. I think this is obviously an issue of efficacy, not safety. And so as Dr. Monto said, let's keep our eyes open, continue to do studies, gather more data, and then I think we'll be able to speak on this in a more informed manner. Thank you.

Dr. El Sahly: Thank you. Dr. Janssen.

Dr. Janssen: Yeah, just to follow in what Dr. Offit said, I'd just like to see more data, more of the same data would be helpful.

Dr. El Sahly: Thank you. Dr. Meyer?

CAPT Meyer: There I go. All right. So just to echo my other Committee members, I think the data presented there were too few-- It is too small of numbers to really go on. I

think just one comment to echo. I think it was Dr. Gans who said-- I mean, I think we really have to think through the clinical significance. Even if we did find blunting, we've seen this before with some other vaccines like maternal pertussis where we do see some blunting. We don't really know if that's clinically significant, but it is overcome by getting boosters. So, I think any data we do collect on blunting of the immune response, we just have to look at some of those other things too, like if it is actually clinically significant or not.

Dr. El Sahly: Thank you, Dr. Perlman.

Dr. Perlman: Yeah, I think most of what I was thinking has been said. I also think it's a possibility that there's going to be an effect, but whether it matters or not, we have to just figure it out by getting more data. And the second part, whether the antibodies would have an effect on all vaccines, I wonder if we use a protein vaccine or something else, if we ever have any risk of antigen antibody complex formation by having the right ratio of antibody and antigen. But again, it's something that could be easily thought about and measured when the time comes.

Dr. El Sahly: Thank you. I think everyone got an opportunity to weigh in on this question of Topic 1. Did I miss anyone? Okay. So to summarize Question number 2, the observed blunting in this particular clinical trial was observed in obviously a small sample size, 9 versus 6, and the timing from nirsevimab is 8 to 12 months. The comment-- In addition to it being a small sample size, it remains unclear what duration of protection nirsevimab will afford. And because that also has implications for future clinical trials, what time variable will be used to administer those vaccines. This occurred with one platform, how these findings translate to other platforms, of course, it's unknown. So, this will have to be assessed platform by platform. And as more data

comes along, this can be further discussed. Its effect on vaccine safety and effectiveness obviously cannot be gleaned from these data as presented. And however, from earlier in the day, we did point out that the individuals in this particular arm of the study need to be carefully followed through the upcoming RSV season to see if there's any particular immunologic finding that could be of interest to the development of these vaccines. Did I miss a particular point on this question? Okay. Well, we finished two minutes earlier, but thank you all for weighing in with your expertise on this particular topic as little or as much data we have on hand. I have a final question to the FDA before we adjourn this particular-- Or actually, two questions. First, did we answer and discuss the two discussion questions okay? Or are there particular items that we need to address?

Dr. Kaslow: No. So, thank you very much for your deliberations. We'll certainly take back to our internal discussions, your discussions and recommendations, and the goal of which is to have a timely engagement with sponsors of pediatric RSV vaccines. So, thank you very much. I would say mission accomplished.

Dr. El Sahly: Well, the second question, there's a lot that seems to be at play now in terms of immunologic assays, data from CDC, data from sponsors, data from FDA. Again, I guess I don't know, would the follow-up meeting from a year from now be of use or maybe not? I don't know. Maybe my curiosity is acting here, but--

Dr. Kaslow: There is a lot to synthesize. There's a lot to better understand. There are data that are still coming in. I don't think any of us want to stall development of vaccines, the unmet medical needs. And so like today, getting your input is incredibly helpful. As we look going forward in this area, more data, better understanding, there's a likelihood we'll be back to see you again.

Topic I Adjournment

Dr. El Sahly: Alright, very good. Thank you. And at this point, I want to thank four temporary members with us today, Dr. Long, Dr. Malloy, Dr. Kotloff, and Dr. Ruckwardt. So, that concludes your participation on today's meeting. Thank you so much for the time and expertise you lent today. And for the rest of the team, we take a 10-minute break. So that puts us at 3:10.

Topic II

Opening Remarks: Call to Order and Welcome

Dr. El Sahly: Good afternoon, everyone. I would like to welcome the members, participants, and the public who are viewing remotely to the 188th VRBPAC meeting. This is Topic II, open session. I would like to turn over the meeting now to Dr. Sussan Paydar, the designated federal officer who will proceed with administrative issues.

Roll Call

Dr. Paydar: Great. Thank you, Dr. El Sahly. Good afternoon, everyone. For those who didn't attend the morning session, we have completed Topic I and we are about to begin Topic II to hear overviews of the Laboratory of Immunoregulation (LI) and Laboratory of Retroviruses (LR) research programs in the Division of Viral Products, Office of Vaccines Research and Review, Center for Biologics Evaluation and Research. Next slide please. AV Team? Next slide, please. Great.

Once again, I would like to thank CBER Senior Leadership, Dr. Marks, Dr. Kaslow, Dr. Bok, and Dr. Agnihothram. Next slide, please. I would also like to thank Senior Leadership that were closely involved in topic II. Dr. Karen Elkins, Associate

Director for Science, Office of the Director, CBER; Dr. Todd Merkel, Associate Director for Research, Office of Vaccines Research and Review; and Dr. Jerry Weir, Director, Division of Viral Products, Office of Vaccines Research and Review. Next slide please.

The attending members for Topic II are Dr. Hana El Sahly, the Chair; Dr. Adam Berger; Dr. Henry Bernstein; Dr. Archana Chatterjee; Dr. Hayley Gans; Dr. Holly Janes; Dr. Robert Janssen, our alternate industry representative who will be attending only the open portion of this topic; Captain Sarah Meyer; Dr. Arnold Monto; Dr. Michael Nelson; Dr. Paul Offit; Dr. Stanley Perlman; Dr. Jay Portnoy, our consumer representative; and Dr. Andrea Shane. We have a total of 14 participants, 13 voting and 1 non-voting member.

Conflict of Interest Statement

Now, I'll proceed with reading the FDA Conflicts of Interest Disclosure Statement for the public record.

The Food and Drug Administration (FDA) is convening virtually today, December 12th, 2024 for The 188th Meeting of the Vaccines and Related Biological Products Advisory Committee under the authority of the Federal Advisory Committee Act of 1972. Under Topic II, the Committee will hear an overview of the research programs in the Laboratory of Immunoregulation (LI) and Laboratory of Retroviruses (LR) in the Division of Viral Products, Office of Vaccines Research and Review, CBER. Per agency guidance, this session is determined to be a non-particular matter, which would have no impact on outside financial interests. Hence, for Topic II, no external affected firms or entities were identified, and members were not screened for this topic. After the open session is completed, the meeting will be closed to permit

discussions where disclosure would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy 5 U.S.C. 552b(c)(6).

This concludes my reading of the Conflict of Interest Statement for the public record. At this time, I would like to hand over the meeting to our Chair, Dr. El Sahly. Dr. El Sahly?

Overview of Research/Site Visit Process, CBER

Dr. El Sahly: Thank you, Sussan. To kick us off, Dr. Karen Elkins from the FDA will be giving us an Overview of Research and Site Visit process at CBER. Dr. Elkins is the Associate Director of Science at the Office of the Director, CBER, FDA.

Dr. Elkins: Thank you very much, Dr. El Sahly. Yes, I'd like to give you just a short overview of CBER's Research Program and how it relates to our regulatory responsibilities just to give you some context for your consideration of today's Site Visit Report. Next slide, please.

As this Committee well knows, CBER is responsible for regulation of biological products and specifically vaccines, in this case. Next slide, please. And we have a rather unique approach to our regulatory responsibilities in that CBER's Research and Review are integrated, and our research staff conduct regulatory reviews, specifically chemistry, manufacturing and control product reviews, and I'll say a bit more about that in a second. And we've been doing business like this for a very long time, pretty much since the beginning of CBER over 75 years ago. We conduct investigator-initiated research that is directly related to the products that CBER regulates, and we are looking specifically for gaps in knowledge and gaps in tools that limit product development. And so the topic of our research may range from something that looks fairly basic, if

that's the major gap, to something that looks very targeted, if that's the major gap. One way or the other, our research studies inform regulatory decision-making and policy development. Next slide, please. And research is such an integral part of the way in which we operate, that it is one of four explicit goals that are part of CBER's strategic plan. Next slide, please.

We have robust laboratory facilities on the White Oak Campus in Silver Spring. We have about 450,000 square feet of space that houses about 150 laboratories ranging from BSL-1 to BSL-3 labs. We have about 65 PIs currently, and about 425 total research staff. We have some excellent research core facilities that provide common services like flow cytometry and molecular biology services, and we have a state-of-the-art vivarium. Our funding comes primarily from annual congressional appropriations. We also have some funding from targeted CBER funds and FDA-wide programs and a few external grants. And our staff is a mix of permanent principal investigators, permanent staff scientists who are subordinate to PIs, technicians and research fellows that are typically temporary. Next slide, please.

Our researchers function as part of regulatory review teams and typically their main assignment is CMC or product review. They're responsible for critiquing the scientific rationale for a particular product and any data that is submitted in support of proof of concept of that product. They're responsible for everything about the product, the way in which it is made, the techniques that are used for manufacturing and the facilities in which it is made, and for all aspects of product quality control testing, both in the intermediate and final lot release test. Most clinical trials have clinical samples obtained from patients that are assessed in laboratory settings, and our researcher reviewers are also responsible for critiquing the clinical assays that assess those samples. So, the CMC reviewers function as part of a larger team typically comprised of

a regulatory project manager who manages the file and provides oversight, a clinical reviewer who focuses on clinical trial design and monitors the progress of the trial itself, a pharma and tox reviewer who focuses on those aspects, and a statistical reviewer who helps with analysis of data but coming from both the product side and the clinical trial itself. Next slide, please.

So, we think that operating this way has a number of advantages. It directly develops knowledge and tools that support development of classes of products. It also develops the hands-on, state-of-the-art understanding of the techniques that are the source of data that we see in our regulatory submissions. It facilitates recruitment and retention of highly trained scientists and it prepares us for the future review of innovative products and public health challenges, as we just lived through. Collectively, we think a Researcher-Reviewer model ensures efficient, effective and credible review and decisions that are based on sound science. Next slide, please.

So, we evaluate our research continually in a number of approaches. Projects are reviewed annually by direct supervisors and all layers above them. New projects come under specific scrutiny by the Office and the Center. We have Horizon Scanning efforts both at the Office level and at the Central level, and the results of those feed into the topics under consideration for the research portfolio. And we have a process known as the Site Visit that is the subject of today's discussions. This is a periodic review by an external Committee of subject matter experts that should take place every four years. We've had some deviation from that schedule thanks to the pandemic, and there have been longer gaps between site visits as you'll see today. Next slide, please.

The evaluation criteria will be familiar to most people. We expect our science to be excellent. We expect it to be widely disseminated in the form of publications,

presentations, occasionally technology transfer, impact on guidance documents, and one way or the other to have excellent uptake by the scientific community and impact for our regulated stakeholders. And we expect it to be relevant to our mission, to align with our goal, and to support product development and to provide review capability. Next slide, please.

Within CBER, we have eight offices. Currently, three of those conduct laboratory-based research. The offices are divided into divisions, and divisions divided into units that are called either labs or branches, those terms are interchangeable. And the site visit process is at the level of a lab. And there are two labs that will be under discussion today. For site visits, PIs provide written reports about their progress and plans. Those are received by the Review Committee who convenes for one to two days of presentations, oral presentations, discussion and questions about the presentations and the material report itself, and individual interviews with PIs. And also during the site visit itself, reviewers confer to critique the strengths and weaknesses of each PI's program with a view toward generating a report of their findings. Next slide, please.

We ask reviewers to comment on the quality and relevance of the science, its progress and productivity since the last site visit in the context of the work's nature, its resources and regulatory assignments to the individuals involved. The review is primarily retrospective, but we also ask for comment on the future research direction and any comments on the lab organization, its management and mentoring are also welcome. Next slide, please.

The site visit culminates in a report that's generated by the Review Committee. It is a draft report until it is presented to you, and that is our activity today. There are three possible outcomes of the presentation of the report. You may choose to accept it

and approve it as is, you may choose to amend the report yourself and then consider it for approval, or you may choose to reject the report and send it back to the original Site Visit Committee for further consideration. Two of the members of the VRBPAC served as Chair and Co-chair of the Site Visit Team itself, which was then comprised of ad-hoc reviewers, and so I'm sure they will be available to answer questions about the event itself. When you vote on it, it is then finalized upon your approval. The final report is used in many ways. Obviously the feedback goes to the PIs and their staff, and used to improve the progress of their research. It's used internally to review individual scientists' progress, and it's used throughout the center to consider program adjustments, resource allocation, and consider the nature of the work in the context of the overall CBER Research Portfolio. Next slide, please.

So with that, I'd like to thank you very much for your deliberations. Site visits are a really important part of our research activities. They really help maintain high-quality research programs. This external review really is critical to fulfilling our regulatory mission, and I'm happy to answer any questions that you might have. Thank you very much.

Overview of Research/Site Visit Process, CBER – Q&A

Dr. El Sahly: Thank you so much, Dr. Elkins. I invite the Committee members to use the raise-your-hand function if you have questions for Dr. Elkins. I know we did a couple of those in the last three months, so maybe you explained the process clearly to them.

Dr. Elkins: Thank you. And my colleagues will drill down further for information directly related to the labs under review today.

Dr. El Sahly: Great. Thank you for your time, Dr. Elkins.

Dr. Elkins: Thank you all.

Overview of Research Conducted in Office of Vaccine Research and Review, CBER and Division of Viral Products

Dr. El Sahly: I'd like to invite now Dr. Merkel. Dr. Tod Merkel is the Associate Director of Research, Office of Vaccine Research and Review. He will give us an Overview of Research conducted in Office of Vaccine Research and Review, CEBER and Division of Viral Products.

Dr. Merkel: Alright, thank you. Could I have the next slide, please? So, the Office of Vaccine's mission is to protect and enhance the public health by assuring the availability of safe and effective vaccines, allergenic extracts, and other related products. We regulate vaccines, allergenic products, live biotherapeutic products, and phage. Next slide.

Our core activities are to review, evaluate, and to take appropriate action on INDs, BLAs, amendments and supplements for vaccines and related biological products. And we also participate in the inspection of manufacturing facilities. We develop policies and procedures governing the pre-market review of regulated products. And as you've heard, we conduct research related to the development, manufacture, and evaluation of vaccines and related products, and also research to better understand the pathological processes of the agents that the vaccines are directed against. Next slide.

The OVRR's Research Program is designed to complement and support our regulatory mission by focusing on issues related to the development of safe and effective products. Next slide. The Research Program contributes to our regulatory

efforts in really important ways. We have a very strong emphasis on safety in OVRR because our products are often designed for mass use, often universal use. Many of our products go into every child that's born in the United States, and our recipients are healthy individuals. And as I said, often children, hence our emphasis on safety.

Our products, vaccines in particular, undergo a high level of scrutiny by the public, both groups that are skeptical of vaccine effectiveness and groups that are anxious to have new vaccines brought to market as quickly as possible. And because of this high level of scrutiny, our regulatory decisions have to be based on excellent science. We also need to keep pace with technology. New manufacturing technologies are rapidly evolving and coming online and new and powerful research approaches are constantly being developed, and it's important for us to keep our finger on those advances. We need to be flexible and respond rapidly to public health threats. We have a continuing evolution of antibiotic resistance and concerns about emerging agents.

As Dr. Elkins pointed out, our ability to respond rapidly to the COVID-19 pandemic, I think largely grew out of our excellent research program. Generating-- The results we generate are placed in the public domain. So, our research benefits not just an individual company but the entire industrial sector, and therefore American consumers. And our research program allows us to recruit and retain expert scientists to support our regulatory review. Next slide.

Our Research Program is very broad, although we can't cover everything, we do try to cover as much as possible within the scope of our responsibilities. It's very collaborative. Our scientists collaborate to a very large extent, both internally but also externally with scientists around the country and around the world, and this allows us to leverage our investments in research. Our research is excellent. It is published and

broadly cited and used. And our research scientists, importantly, are members of the broader scientific community and many are well-known experts in their fields. And our research is investigator-initiated and flexible. And this is important because it allows our researchers to anticipate regulatory needs and redirect their research program to address those needs when necessary. Next slide.

The OVRR is made of-- In addition to the Office of the Director, it has four divisions. Two of those divisions, the Division of Review Management and Regulatory Review and the Division of Clinical and Toxicology Review are focused primarily on regulatory review of files. Our two Research Divisions, the Division of Viral Products and the Division of Bacterial Parasitic and Allergenic Products, in addition to conducting regulatory review, conduct research. And the subject of today's activity is the review of two laboratories within the division of Viral Products, which is directed by Dr. Jerry Weir and Deputy Director Robin Levis. Next slide.

DVP's mission is to regulate viral vaccines and related biological products to ensure their safety and efficacy for human use, and to facilitate the development, evaluation and licensure of new viral vaccines that positively impact the public health. Next slide. Their major responsibilities are the review of Investigational New Drugs applications, Biological License Applications, and other pre-marketing activities focused on viral vaccines. Review of BLA supplements, lot release, and other post-marketing activities. The inspection of manufacturing facilities, both pre and post-licensure. Consultation with other public health agencies, for example, the WHO, the CDC and NIBSC. And to conduct research related to the development, manufacturing, evaluation, and testing of viral vaccines. Next slide.

The role of the research program in DVP is to research and laboratory activities that complement the regulatory mission. They address issues related to regulated viral vaccines and they anticipate and address issues related to the development and evaluation of new viral vaccine products, both general issues that are applicable to many products, for example, cell substrate issues or improved testing methods, as well as specific product issues. For example, developing correlates of protection and animal models. Next slide.

The Division of Viral Products is directed by Dr. Jerry Weir and Deputy Director Robin Levis. It consists of seven laboratories. The two laboratories that are subject of today's meeting are the Laboratory of Retroviruses and the Laboratory of Immunoregulation. Next slide. I'd just like to thank you and take any questions.

Overview of Research Conducted in Office of Vaccine Research and Review, CBER and Division of Viral Products – Q&A

Dr. El Sahly: Thank you Dr. Merkel. Any questions from the Committee members? Okay, I don't see any raised hands. Oh, we do. Dr. Perlman?

Dr. Perlman: Yeah, so this is not quite relevant for what we're doing today, but these laboratories have really overlapping laboratories within them. So, the names are not so applicable anymore, in my opinion. If you agree, is there any chance of renaming them so they're more consistent with what they do?

Dr. Merkel: Yes. I mean, the reality is that over time, what they do changes and the names don't, which is where this comes from. Changing the laboratory name isn't as simple as just changing the name. I mean, there are underlying protocols that would

have to be followed, but at this time we're in the process of renaming several of the laboratories, so we have noted this comment in the past.

Dr. El Sahly: Great. Dr. Perlman will share the Committee on naming. Any other questions? Hearing none. Thank you, Dr. Merkel.

Overview of Laboratory of Immunoregulation

Dr. El Sahly: I would like to invite now Dr. Weiss. Dr. Carol Weiss is Chief and Principal Investigator, Laboratory of Immunoregulation, Division of Viral Product at OVRR, CBER. Dr. Weiss will give an Overview of Laboratory of Immunoregulation. Dr. Weiss?

Dr. Weiss: Okay. Good afternoon, everyone. And I thank the Committee for their help in reviewing our Research Programs. Next slide, please. So, in this overview of the Lab of Immunoregulation, I will briefly mention the staff structure, our regulatory activities, the research programs at a very high level, and just highlight a few research results and their impact. So, next slide, please.

So, the Lab of Immunoregulation has two principal investigators, Dr. Ira Berkower and me. In my lab, I have one lab manager who is responsible for lab ordering budgets and general lab maintenance for both my lab and Dr. Berkower's lab, and as well he's an integral member of our research team. I also have two staff scientists or staff fellows who share responsibilities in both doing investigator-initiated research and regulation. And generally, I have one to two either post-baccalaureate or post-doctoral fellows that I get through awarded competitive grants. Dr. Berkower's lab has on average one to two post-baccalaureate or post-doctoral fellows.

In my Research Program, I also work with many lab collaborators and from many different institutions. So, for our COVID-19 response efforts, we have been very much involved with various HHS agencies including NIH, CDC, BARDA and ASPR. We've also had many collaborators in the Department of Defense and the Uniformed Services Universities where we've been helping with the investigations of the clinical trials and vaccine trials that have been undertaken by the Department of Defense for antigenic cartography studies. We also collaborate with investigators at NIAID. And as well, for very specific influenza and SARS-CoV-2 studies, we also collaborate with many of the PIs in our own division. Next slide, please.

So, as you've heard, our primary responsibilities are to provide expert scientific review of FDA submissions for both experimental and licensed vaccines for preventing viral infectious diseases. As our programs are lab-based and we are active researchers, our primary focus is really product review. That's the CMC review that you heard about where we focus on product quality, purity and potency as well as manufacturing process consistency. Dr. Berkower and I have also been involved with clinical review, which involves review of clinical protocol safety, immunogenicity, and efficacy data. And that has been focused primarily on experimental HIV vaccines for treatment and cure strategies that often involve complex trial designs with antiretroviral treatment interruptions. Next slide.

So, our regulatory activities involve primarily the review of the submissions, and this includes all types of files and their associated meetings with the sponsors. So, this is PreINDs, INDs, Master Files, BLAs and BLA supplements for post-approval manufacturing changes. So, once a vaccine is on the market, there are very frequent manufacturing changes and we need to look at the comparability studies to make sure there's effect on the product. We've also been involved with inter-center consults. Our

review portfolio includes experimental vaccines for HIV, influenza, and coronavirus, and approved vaccines for influenza and papilloma virus. We've also been involved with advisory meeting preparations. This has included discussions with vaccine stakeholders. We have directly contributed data for some of these discussions as well as contributed data and efforts in preparing briefing materials for the Advisory Committee meetings. Next slide.

We've also been involved in other public health activities that bear on the regulation. So, for the COVID-19 response efforts in particular, my team was very much involved with the Operation Warp Speed, Therapeutics Research Team. We've also been involved with the HHS Interagency Working Groups where we've contributed data, presentations, and risk assessments. This has been working groups that involve COVID-19 testing, assays, therapeutics, and vaccines. Also, the NIH SARS-CoV-2 variant evolution program for responding to the latest SARS-CoV-2 variants. And I've also been involved in a couple risk assessments that have involved the use of therapeutic COVID-19 antibodies, as well as a reevaluation of the biosafety level for use of live SARS-CoV-2. I also-- My team also participates in regular working group meetings with our collaborators over the Department of Defense and the Uniformed Services University. In addition, some of our work has involved international work on international biological standards and regulatory harmonization efforts. So, this has included WHO International Standard for anti-SARS-CoV-2 immunoglobulin and a reference panel for SARS-CoV-2 variants of concern. We've also been involved in many inter-laboratory SARS-CoV-2 assay comparison studies involving several different consortia including Duke, NIH and the Uniformed Services University. We've also participated in the FLUCOP study, which was a cross laboratory comparison of

hemagglutinin nation inhibition and microneutralization assay performance for seasonal influenza vaccines. Next slide.

So, really our laboratory expertise informs all components of the product review. And so, especially as virologists, it's important for viral vaccines, so we review all manufacturing process steps to assure product safety and consistency. As examples, we look at virus growth steps, purification steps, ensure that the methods that are used are valid. We're interested in methods for detecting adventitious agents as well as product comparability studies when there's been manufacturing changes. We review, also as an example, important steps in viral inactivation to assure product safety. So, we look very carefully at the inactivation procedures for inactivated vaccines and also for adventitious agents. And then as a corollary, also the methods for detecting residual infectious virus to ensure that it's appropriate and sensitive. We review assessments of replicating vector stability and antigenicity to ensure safety and potency. We review potency assays to assure product lot-to-lot consistency and potency, and finally review and participate in assessments of immunogenicity measurements and assays that actually directly support licensure. Next slide, please.

So, the Laboratory of Immunoregulation has two research programs run by each PI and these are independent research programs. So in my program, the overall theme is both basic and applied studies of virus entry into cells and its neutralization by antibodies. So, since the last site visit, we were finishing up before the pandemic some influenza studies that included antibody correlates of protection during an H3N2 influenza outbreak in military recruits. We also compared antibody responses elicited by the different approved seasonal vaccines that are manufactured using eggs, cells, or recombinant protein methods. And we also generated a novel antibody targeting a conserved stem region of the influenza hemagglutinin and characterize its escape. But

most of the time since the last site visit really has been spent on SARS-CoV-2 studies and our focus had been variant characterization and immune escape as well as mutations that confer resistance to therapeutic antibodies as well as post vaccination sera. Dr. Berkower's lab program focuses on live-attenuated rubella vector for antigen delivery and protection, as well as vector prime boost vaccine strategies focused on HIV protection and cure. Dr. Berkower's program was not reviewed in this site visit cycle, so I will not be mentioning it further. Next slide.

So, here I'm just pulling out just a few selected highlights of our studies in this past cycle. So, for the influenza studies, we looked at the 2018-2019 seasonal influenza vaccines and found that both the egg and the cell-based vaccines elicited very similar neutralization titers against all of the vaccine viruses, and that the titers elicited by the recombinant HA vaccine were actually slightly higher against all these viruses as well. For the SARS-CoV-2 studies, based on our prior very basic research on HIV as well as influenza, we were able to quickly establish a safe pseudovirus neutralization assay for characterizing SARS-CoV-2 variants and measuring antibody neutralization. We also identified mutations that confer resistance to therapeutic antibodies and post-vaccination sera. We also showed that primary mRNA COVID-19 vaccination series elicited broader and higher neutralization responses against the variants than infection alone by a single variant. And we also characterized antigenic changes in variants that inform decisions about the variant composition update to COVID-19 vaccines. Next slide please.

So, I just from a high level emphasize the overall research contributions that really cover many different aspects. So, firstly and importantly, they provided laboratory expertise for supporting scientific regulatory review. As I mentioned, the assessments of all the manufacturing processes and testing methods. It also gives us

credibility and important contributions in our technical communications with the vaccine developers. And as well, as shown by our SARS-CoV-2 studies, having broad-based current research methods gives us agility for adapting to changing priorities for the Center. We've also generated materials and methods for actually facilitating the development of vaccines. We developed some new cell lines, and one of them was supported high level transduction of SARS-CoV-2 pseudoviruses which have been shared widely in the scientific community and are available in a repository. We helped develop assays and harmonized assays, as well as reference materials as I mentioned, as well looking-- Participating importantly in these multi-laboratory harmonization methods of methods that are used for vaccine evaluation. And finally, we have contributed data directly for the science-based regulation. The data has been used in both internal discussions and with meetings with vaccine stakeholders, and also have been widely disseminated in peer-reviewed scientific journals for the broader community. And with that, I'm over. I've finished my talk and I'm happy to take questions. Thank you.

Overview of Laboratory of Immunoregulation – Q&A

Dr. El Sahly: Great. Thank you so much, Dr. Weiss. Any questions from the Committee members? That was a whirlwind of a lot of work. Use the raise-your-hand function should you have any questions. Okay. I guess no questions today. Thank you so much, Dr. Weiss.

Dr. Weiss: Thank you.

Overview of Laboratory of Retroviruses

Dr. El Sahly: Know we asked a lot of questions during our meeting a couple of months ago. I'd like to invite now Dr. Golding. Dr. Golding, Hana Golding, is Chief and Principal Investigator, Laboratory of Retroviruses in the Division of Viral Products, Office of Vaccines Research and Review. Dr. Golding will give an Overview of Laboratory of Retroviruses. Dr. Golding?

Dr. Golding: Thank you very much and I want to thank again both the side visit team and the current members of the VRBPAC for their input to our research program. Next slide, please.

So, we have two units in the Laboratory of Retroviruses, the Unit of Viral Immunology and Pathogenesis, and the overall title of the program is Development of New Immunological Assays and Animal Models Evaluate Vaccine Safety and Efficacy. In addition to myself as the PI and the Lab Chief, I have two senior staff scientists at the high level, Marina Zaitseva and Surender Khurana that carry on both the mentoring of the independent project as well as regulatory work. And we are assisted by Jody Manischewitz, Lisa King and David Acosta, and we, during the years, have mentored between five to six post-doc, post-bacc, and contracts per year. Next slide.

The unit headed by Arifa Khan is the Unit of Molecular Retrovirology and the emphasis of the project is Development of Sensitive Virus Detection Assays for Safety of Vaccines and Other Biologics and Evaluation of their Potential Threat for Human Infection. In addition to Dr. Khan, the lab includes several staff scientists and staff fellows. Hailun Ma, Andrea Kennard, Sandra Fuentes, and Pei-Ju Chin, and they have always mentored between two to four post-doc, post-bacc, and contracts. Next slide, please.

I like to always introduce our program, similar to what Dr. Merkel mentioned, and that's a famous slide by Dr. Fauci that keeps reminding us the arena, and that there are constantly newly emerging diseases and it's sort of a moving target. All of those in red are newly emerging, while the blue are emerging, and in the last four or five years we had to deal with many of these, including of course, coronavirus, monkeypox, and the reemerging H5N1. Next, please.

And as Dr. Merkel mentioned, the goal of our program is to identify regulatory and scientific gaps in knowledge methods for vaccine release and correlates of protection. LR researcher-regulators provide CMC expertise and readiness to redirect their scientific programs to meet the challenges of the emerging diseases, including the use of new cell substrates, manufacturing platforms, novel immunogen and adjuvant design, and clinical protocols. How do we do it? By developing advanced technologies for improved analysis of known and emerging viruses for evaluation of cell substrate and product safety, humoral immune responses post-infection, immune response to novel viral vaccines, adjuvant safety and mode of action, vaccine potency assays, and animal models for preclinical evaluation of vaccines including safety and effectiveness. Next slide, please.

The type of regulatory work is actually-- Our regulatory portfolio is extremely diverse. It includes vaccines against the following human pathogens: HIV, influenza, RSV, SARS-CoV-2, and many, many adjuvanted vaccines across both the Division of Viral Product and our sister, DPEP, as well as across the multiple centers. The platforms that we are looking at are as diverse as the viruses. They include non replicating and replicating viral vectors, Poxviruses, NDV, PIV, DNA vaccines, mRNA vaccines, live-attenuated vaccines, recombinant proteins, peptide-based vaccines and nanoparticles. Novel adjuvants are one of the large responsibilities of LR, as well as a vaccine delivery

system and routes, universal influenza vaccines, and novel cell substrates and detection of adventitious agents using next generation sequencing technology, which is led by Dr. Khan, that include mammalian tumorogenic and non tumorogenic cell lines, insect cell lines for baculovirus expression vectors, and avian cell lines. Next slide, please.

The regulatory work that's kind of detailed here has increased significantly since the last site visit, and if you look in the right for both labs, the increase in the numbers of original IND amendment and pre-IND including BLA, increased between 150% to 250%. Next slide.

In addition to the direct regulatory work, we members of LR have been involved in guidance documents. Dr. Khan, particularly in ICH, WHO, EDQM and USP guidelines on the implementation of NGS technologies for enhancing safety of vaccines and cell substrate. We are involved with WHO guidelines on nonclinical safety evaluation of vaccine adjuvants and adjuvanted preventive vaccines for infectious disease indications, and FDA guidance for industry on pharmacogenomic data submissions. There were multiple WHO consultations and BARDA presentations as well as cross-office and cross-center consults. Next slide, please.

So, the scientific project in my lab was quite diverse and very much reflected our response to emerging and reemerging diseases. Elucidation of humoral immune response following Ebola and Marburg infection and vaccination was led by Dr. Khurana; SARS-CoV-2 pathogenesis; antibody responses following SARS-CoV-2 infections versus vaccination in different cohorts that included adults, pediatrics, including MISC as well as immunocompromised individuals; elucidation of humoral immune responses following RSV infection and vaccination in different age groups; influenza vaccines, seasonal, pandemic and next generation/universal vaccines; mucosal

vaccines; and adjuvant safety that included in vitro human cell-based assays for testing of novel adjuvants including primary monocytes, differentiated macrophages, and broncho-epithelial cells grown under Liquid-Air-Interface that was led by Dr. Zaitseva. Next slide.

I just wanted to outline some of the methods that have to be implemented to respond to all these pathogens. First of course, virus neutralization assays for influenza. We looked both at hemagglutination inhibition and microneutralization assays using all available vaccine strains using the CDC protocol, and we were part of the FLUCOP and the [Indiscernible 00:47:30] to demonstrate the added value of standards for some of these assays. RSV (A/B), we developed an RSV luciferase reporter-based neutralization assay in addition to PRNT. And for SARS-CoV-2, similar to Dr. Weiss, we are using the lentivirus based pseudovirus neutralization assay against all circulating strains and variants of concern. Next slide.

One of the important technologies that was introduced by Dr. Khurana in the lab is the generation of whole-genome phage display libraries. This technique basically subjects the genome to limited DNA's digestion that generates both large and smaller fragments. The larger fragments are expected to express some important conformational epitopes and after polishing, it's been cloned as a fusion protein with the extracellular gIII fusion protein of phage. And after electroporation, we are generating a very large library of phages, each expressing a unique epitope on this extra cellular. Next slide, please.

These kinds of phage display libraries have been generated chronically during the years against avian influenza, seasonal influenza, filovirus including Ebola and Marburg, Zika, and most recently the SARS-CoV-2. This type of technology really gave

us an opportunity to look at the unique repertoire of different polyclonal antibodies in multiple infections as well as post-vaccination. And what was interesting in the case of COVID, most recently, we were able to demonstrate the independent evolution of mucosal IGM, IGG and IGA repertoire compared with serum in asymptomatic versus symptomatic patients. In particular, we noticed that a significantly higher number of phages were bound by mucosal IGA in asymptomatic versus symptomatic patients. Dr. Khurana also looked at the repertoire of young children at pediatrics that were infected with COVID-19, either moderate cases or severe cases, as well as MIC, and found a significant number of differences between the repertoire of these different subpopulations, suggesting that you can really learn a lot by don't just looking at one particular region, but asking the virus and the sera to tell us what else is recognized. And that may even lead to identifying protective epitopes as well as diagnostic epitopes. Also, in the RSV field, we looked earlier at very young children right after their first infection versus older children and adults, and noticed significant differences in the repertoire during the aging. Next slide.

Another very important, I think, contribution of Dr. Khurana was the use of kinetics-- The ability to use biocore to measure real-time kinetics of antibodies affinity, and that has been demonstrated here by looking at the red and the blue curves. You basically look at the same post-vaccination sera with tenfold difference. The important thing to notice is that the on rates are affected indeed by the total antibodies as well as the maximum binding, but the dissociation is parallel between the two curves, suggesting that the dissociation rate is mainly reflecting of the overall or average avidity of the antibodies. And using the heterogenous sample model software, we are able to measure the average avidity of the antibodies.

Of course, this technology requires a very careful use of only-- Properly for the proteins that are on a chip density that allow single binding to each protein. We were able to use this technology to measure total antibody binding, isotype distribution, and antibody off-rates and avidity. And again, during the years, we were able to show that measuring affinity of antibodies either post-infection or post-vaccination can provide a very important additional insight in trying to understand symptomatic versus asymptomatic infections. For example, in the case of COVID, following the added value of adjuvants to vaccines, we were able to show that the adjuvanted vaccines with oil and water adjuvants not only led to epitope spreading, but also to significant increase in a affinity maturation which correlated directly with the breadth of cross neutralization. Similar types of studies were recently done following COVID vaccination, either alone or together with infection, and the increase in avidity was the main correlate with a broader cross neutralization of variants of concern, including some variants that happened later.

So, I would like, with that now, to move to Dr. Khan's program. Next slide. Evaluation of high-throughput/next-generation sequencing as technologies for adventitious virus detection in biologics. Generating reference materials for validation of high-throughput sequencing. Development of WHO virus standards for viromics; development of virus-infected cell standards for genomics and transcriptomics; and refinement and annotation of the Reference Virus Database. Determining the sensitivity and breadth of virus detection by short-read and long-read HTS technologies. Investigating adventitious agents and endogenous viruses for safety of cell lines used for manufacturing of biologics, including Sf9 insect cells used for baculovirus-expressed products and Chinese hamster ovary cells used for recombinant protein production. In vitro cell cultures and in vivo animal models to assess potential outcomes

of simian foamy virus infections in humans that involve characterization of SFV expression in infected human A549 cell clone; identification of SFV microRNAs as potential biomarkers or virus infection; in vitro studies of SFV replication and genome analysis to elucidate factors influencing virus expression. Next slide.

Some of the most outcomes of Dr. Khan's program. First of all, the development of reference viruses for HTS implementation. That included creation of CBER NGS Virus Reagents to support NGS development and advancement, and the first WHO International Reference Panel for Adventitious Agent Detection in Biological Products for NGS qualification and validation studies. Thus, reference reagents are publicly available for distribution free of charge. Secondly, providing a Reference Virus Database or RVDB for detection of known, emerging and novel viruses by HTS with the high diversity of viral sequences for broad virus detection, with reduced nonspecific cellular hits resulting in less computational time and reducing cost of unnecessary follow-up work to verify a true virus signal. This is also freely available. Next slide.

Generation of in-house data and by external collaborations to fill knowledge gaps for using HTS as a routine assay that included developing optimized protocols for analyzing HTS short-read and long-read platforms. Determining LOD for virus detection by HTS in different matrices relevant to biological materials during manufacturing for developing general regulatory and industry expectations. Developing virus-infected cell standards for HTS genomics and transcriptomics including all cell substrates, cell therapies, and unprocessed bulk harvests. Introduced HTS in international guidelines including ICH and new pharmaceutical European chapters to replace-- Very importantly, to replace the in vivo assays and PCR assays and to replace or supplement the in vitro cell culture assays. Dr. Khan organized international HTS trainings, webinars and workshops to facilitate establishment of HTS in Low-Medium

Income Countries and other regions considering use of HTS to replace the conventional assays for adventitious virus detection. Many of those trainings took place in 2024. With that, I will finish my presentation and both myself and Dr. Khan are available to answer any questions.

Overview of Laboratory of Retroviruses – Q&A

Dr. El Sahly: Wonderful. Thank you so much, Dr. Golding, for the presentation and importantly for all the work that this lab and Dr. Weiss's lab have been doing, preparing us for pandemics that happen and pandemics that did not happen. So, I invite the Committee members to use the raise-your-hand function to ask the investigators questions or comments, or anything they may have on the-- Okay, I don't see any raised hands functions. Thank you, Dr. Golding and Dr. Khan and the team. And we will be moving to the next session.

Dr. Golding: Thank you very much.

Open Public Hearing

Dr. El Sahly: Okay. Dr. Paydar, do we go to the OPH or does it have to be 25 minutes after the hour?

Dr. Paydar: No, we could go to OPH but there are no OPH-- So, you need to end. Yeah, we need to end--

Dr. El Sahly: Alright. So, the next item on the agenda is the Open Public Hearing Session. There were no Open Public Hearing Session requests. So, that ends the Open Public Hearing Session. I would like to hand the meeting over to-- First, I would like to

ask Dr. Janssen, who is the Industry Representative, to drop down. I want to thank you for being with us all day long for these important discussions.

Dr. Janssen: Yep. Thank you. Bye, everybody.

Transition to Closed Session

Dr. El Sahly: Thanks. And we hand the meeting over now to Dr. Marks and Dr. Kaslow before we move to the next session.

Dr. Kaslow: We'll wait to see if Dr. Marks has joined us. Oh, okay. So, as we go into the Closed Session, I'd like to thank VRBPAC for your service today. As always, your discussions and recommendations are critical input to our internal deliberations, especially when there's incomplete or just preliminary information to take a regulatory action. And Topic I today I think is an example of how VRBPAC discussions contribute to our deliberations. So, I'd like to thank all of today's temporary voting members, speakers for both Topic I and Topic II, as well as the FDA staff from OBRR and DSEC and our technical staff that ran yet another flawless virtual VRBPAC meeting. And a big thank you to you, Dr. El Sahly, for another beautifully chaired VRBPAC meeting. Back to you.

Dr. El Sahly: Thank you all. So, that ends the Open Session. We will now move to the Closed Session. So, I think now the electronic thing has to happen, right?

Dr. Paydar: No, I believe Dr. Marks just joined the call.

Dr. El Sahly: Yes, Dr. Marks.

Dr. Marks: I'm sorry. I was on and I dropped off for a moment. Sorry about that. I just wanted to echo what Dr. Kaslow said. I want to thank you very much. I think the discussion was really quite outstanding earlier today for Topic I and we appreciate all of

the work that goes into all of the laboratory evaluations and comments. So, I just want to say thank you so much for everything to the members. I think this Committee is incredibly important for helping to be transparent about what we do with the products that we regulate. This issue, I think, is important because there is a lot of complexity in the area of vaccines. But one thing I would just say so that anyone listening understands this, although there has been a very high-level discussion today of some very complex topics, the underlying principles of the products that are regulated, the soundness of vaccines and the principles of active immunization are unambiguous. So, really, I thank this Committee for the transparency that they help us provide to the public and for this scientific input to very complicated topics. I just really appreciate it and appreciate everyone. I think Dr. Kaslow already called out Sussan and all of the members, and you, Dr. El Sahly, thank you so much for everything. We also appreciate everyone who's tuned in today to listen to this, so I won't belabor things anymore. Thank you so much.

Dr. El Sahly: Thank you, Dr. Marks. So, I guess now we end the Open Session of the meeting and we will electronically move to the Closed Meeting, so no one logs off. Please, just stay where you are.