DISTRICT OFFICE ADDRESS AND PHONE NUMBER	DATE(S) OF INSPEC	TION
US Food and Drug Administration		-30;12/2-3, 6-9/10
4040 North Central Expressway		
Dalias, TX 75204 214-253-5200	FEI NUMBER	
Industry Information: www.fda.gov/oc/industry	3000717703	
NAME AND TITLE OF INDIVIDUAL TO WHOM REPORT IS ISSU	JED	
TO: Bruce W. Bagley, Center Manager		
FIRM NAME	STREET ADDRESS	
Pharmedium Services LLC	12620 West Airport Blvd. #130	
ATY, STATE AND ZIP CODE	TYPE OF ESTABLISHMENT INSPECTED	
Sugar Land, TX 77478-6200	Outsourcing Pharmacy	
	Compounded Sterile Preparations (CSP's) contai ct.	ning Heparin related to
subpotency and/or lack of therapeutic effer In some instances, the complaint investiga laboratory responsible for relevant potency case, documented that the contract laborat each case, the certificate of analysis indicated However, your firm lacked data to demonst	ct. tion included a copy of a certificate of analysis is y testing associated with each CSP. The certificat ory had conducted a potency test for Heparin usin ted that the lot passed testing for potency. strate that the (b) (4) used by your co	esued by the contract e of analysis, in each ng an (b) (4)
subpotency and/or lack of therapeutic effe In some instances, the complaint investiga laboratory responsible for relevant potency case, documented that the contract laborat	ct. tion included a copy of a certificate of analysis is y testing associated with each CSP. The certificat ory had conducted a potency test for Heparin usin ited that the lot passed testing for potency. strate that the (b) (4) used by your co compendium (e.g. Factor IIa testing).	esued by the contract e of analysis, in each ng an (b) (4)
subpotency and/or lack of therapeutic effer In some instances, the complaint investiga laboratory responsible for relevant potency case, documented that the contract laborate each case, the certificate of analysis indicate However, your firm lacked data to demonst or exceeds the requirement in the official of Some examples of the complaints in quest A. A complaint dated 11/8/2010 which do	ct. tion included a copy of a certificate of analysis is y testing associated with each CSP. The certificat ory had conducted a potency test for Heparin usin ited that the lot passed testing for potency. strate that the (b) (4) used by your co compendium (e.g. Factor IIa testing).	esued by the contract e of analysis, in each ng an (b) (4) . In ntract laboratory meets
subpotency and/or lack of therapeutic effer In some instances, the complaint investiga laboratory responsible for relevant potency case, documented that the contract laborate each case, the certificate of analysis indicate However, your firm lacked data to demonstor or exceeds the requirement in the official of Some examples of the complaints in quest A. A complaint dated 11/8/2010 which do Units added to 0.45% Sodium Chloride In	ct. tion included a copy of a certificate of analysis is y testing associated with each CSP. The certificate ory had conducted a potency test for Heparin usin ted that the lot passed testing for potency. strate that the (b) (4) used by your co compendium (e.g. Factor IIa testing). ion consist of the following: cumented a lack of therapeutic effect for the CSF jection (100 units/ml), lot #101029800022 umented that the CSP, "Heparin 25,000 Units add	esued by the contract e of analysis, in each ng an (b) (4) . In ntract laboratory meets 9, "Heparin 25,000
subpotency and/or lack of therapeutic effer In some instances, the complaint investiga laboratory responsible for relevant potency case, documented that the contract laborate each case, the certificate of analysis indicate However, your firm lacked data to demonstor or exceeds the requirement in the official of Some examples of the complaints in quest A. A complaint dated 11/8/2010 which do Units added to 0.45% Sodium Chloride In B. A complaint dated 7/7/2010 which doce Injection USP (50 units/ml) 500ml Bag", 1	ct. tion included a copy of a certificate of analysis is y testing associated with each CSP. The certificate ory had conducted a potency test for Heparin usin ted that the lot passed testing for potency. strate that the (b) (4) used by your co- compendium (e.g. Factor IIa testing). ion consist of the following: cumented a lack of therapeutic effect for the CSF jection (100 units/ml), lot #101029800022 umented that the CSP, "Heparin 25,000 Units add lot #101018200053 was subpotent. cumented a lack of therapeutic effect associated the following:	esued by the contract e of analysis, in each ng an (b) (4) . In ntract laboratory meets P, "Heparin 25,000 ded to 5% Dextrose
subpotency and/or lack of therapeutic efferences In some instances, the complaint investigat laboratory responsible for relevant potency case, documented that the contract laborate each case, the certificate of analysis indicate However, your firm lacked data to demonstor exceeds the requirement in the official of Some examples of the complaints in quest A. A complaint dated 11/8/2010 which do Units added to 0.45% Sodium Chloride In B. A complaint dated 7/7/2010 which doce Injection USP (50 units/ml) 500ml Bag", 1 C. A complaint dated 5/17/2010 which do 25,000 Units added to 5% Dextrose Inject 2. Your firm does not maintain an approve	ct. tion included a copy of a certificate of analysis is y testing associated with each CSP. The certificate ory had conducted a potency test for Heparin using the that the lot passed testing for potency. strate that the (b) (4) used by your co- compendium (e.g. Factor IIa testing). ion consist of the following: cumented a lack of therapeutic effect for the CSF jection (100 units/ml), lot #101029800022 umented that the CSP, "Heparin 25,000 Units add lot #101018200053 was subpotent. cumented a lack of therapeutic effect associated to ion (50 units/ml), lot #101007800068. ed master compounding record which documents	essued by the contract e of analysis, in each ng an (b) (4) . In intract laboratory meets P, "Heparin 25,000 ded to 5% Dextrose with the CSP, "Heparin
subpotency and/or lack of therapeutic efferences In some instances, the complaint investigat laboratory responsible for relevant potency case, documented that the contract laborate each case, the certificate of analysis indicate However, your firm lacked data to demone or exceeds the requirement in the official of Some examples of the complaints in quest A. A complaint dated 11/8/2010 which do Units added to 0.45% Sodium Chloride In B. A complaint dated 7/7/2010 which doe Injection USP (50 units/ml) 500ml Bag", 1 C. A complaint dated 5/17/2010 which do 25,000 Units added to 5% Dextrose Inject 2. Your firm does not maintain an approve determination for compounded heparin set	ct. tion included a copy of a certificate of analysis is y testing associated with each CSP. The certificate ory had conducted a potency test for Heparin using the that the lot passed testing for potency. strate that the (b) (4) used by your co- compendium (e.g. Factor IIa testing). ion consist of the following: cumented a lack of therapeutic effect for the CSF jection (100 units/ml), lot #101029800022 unnented that the CSP, "Heparin 25,000 Units add lot #101018200053 was subpotent. cumented a lack of therapeutic effect associated for ion (50 units/ml), lot #101007800068. ed master compounding record which documents rvice admixtures.	essued by the contract e of analysis, in each ng an (b) (4) . In intract laboratory meets 9, "Heparin 25,000 ded to 5% Dextrose with the CSP, "Heparin the concentration rang
subpotency and/or lack of therapeutic efferences In some instances, the complaint investigat laboratory responsible for relevant potency case, documented that the contract laborate each case, the certificate of analysis indicate However, your firm lacked data to demonstor exceeds the requirement in the official of Some examples of the complaints in quest A. A complaint dated 11/8/2010 which do Units added to 0.45% Sodium Chloride In B. A complaint dated 7/7/2010 which doce Injection USP (50 units/ml) 500ml Bag", 1 C. A complaint dated 5/17/2010 which do 25,000 Units added to 5% Dextrose Inject	ct. tion included a copy of a certificate of analysis is y testing associated with each CSP. The certificate ory had conducted a potency test for Heparin using the that the lot passed testing for potency. strate that the (b) (4) used by your co- compendium (e.g. Factor IIa testing). ion consist of the following: cumented a lack of therapeutic effect for the CSF jection (100 units/ml), lot #101029800022 umented that the CSP, "Heparin 25,000 Units add lot #101018200053 was subpotent. cumented a lack of therapeutic effect associated to ion (50 units/ml), lot #101007800068. ed master compounding record which documents	esued by the contract e of analysis, in each ng an (b) (4) . In intract laboratory meets P, "Heparin 25,000 ded to 5% Dextrose with the CSP, "Heparir

-

•

ī

.

.

DEPAR	TMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION	
STRICT OFFICE ADDRESS AND PHONE NUMBER	DATE(S) OF INSPECTION	
S Food and Drug Administration M0 North Central Expressway	11/10/10; 11/29-30;12/2-3, 6-9/10	
allas, TX 75204	FEI NUMBER	
14-253-5200	3000717703	
dustry Information: www.fda.gov/oc/industry ME AND TITLE OF INDIVIDUAL TO WHOM REPORT IS ISSU		
: Bruce W. Bagley, Center Manager	STREET ADDRESS	
narmedium Services LLC	12620 West Airport Blvd. #130	
Y, STATE AND ZIP CODE	TYPE OF ESTABLISHMENT INSPECTED	
ugar Land, TX 77478-6200	Outsourcing Pharmacy	
-		
or example, the document entitled, '(b) (4 dmixture" dated 11/26/10 documents, in		
	1) There is no documentation to indicate that this calculation is part	
and site for 2010 revealed contamination as no documentation that a Microbiologi	will be issued for any microbial excursion in the Class 100 hood w Review of your "ID Tracking Log" for the Sugar in Hood # ^{[0](4)} (Date: 7/7/10, (b) (4)) which was 3 CFU. The ical Action report had been issued or that an appropriate investigation	
Acceeds the action limit of (b) (4) and site for 2010 revealed contamination ras no documentation that a Microbiologi	. Review of your "ID Tracking Log" for the Sugar in Hood # ⁽⁰⁾⁽⁴⁾ (Date: 7/7/10, (b) (4)) which was 3 CFU. The	
and site for 2010 revealed contamination vas no documentation that a Microbiologi	. Review of your "ID Tracking Log" for the Sugar in Hood # ⁽⁰⁾⁽⁴⁾ (Date: 7/7/10, (b) (4)) which was 3 CFU. The	
xceeds the action limit of (b) (4) and site for 2010 revealed contamination	. Review of your "ID Tracking Log" for the Sugar in Hood # ⁽⁰⁾⁽⁴⁾ (Date: 7/7/10, (b) (4)) which was 3 CFU. The	
and site for 2010 revealed contamination and solve for 2010 revealed contamination	. Review of your "ID Tracking Log" for the Sugar in Hood # ⁽⁰⁾⁽⁴⁾ (Date: 7/7/10, (b) (4)) which was 3 CFU. The	
and site for 2010 revealed contamination and solve for 2010 revealed contamination	. Review of your "ID Tracking Log" for the Sugar in Hood # ⁽⁰⁾⁽⁴⁾ (Date: 7/7/10, (b) (4)) which was 3 CFU. The	
and site for 2010 revealed contamination and solve for 2010 revealed contamination	. Review of your "ID Tracking Log" for the Sugar in Hood # ⁽⁰⁾⁽⁴⁾ (Date: 7/7/10, (b) (4)) which was 3 CFU. The	
Acceeds the action limit of (b) (4) and site for 2010 revealed contamination vas no documentation that a Microbiologi	. Review of your "ID Tracking Log" for the Sugar in Hood # ⁽⁰⁾⁽⁴⁾ (Date: 7/7/10, (b) (4)) which was 3 CFU. The	
and site for 2010 revealed contamination vas no documentation that a Microbiologi	. Review of your "ID Tracking Log" for the Sugar in Hood # ⁽⁰⁾⁽⁴⁾ (Date: 7/7/10, (b) (4)) which was 3 CFU. The	
and site for 2010 revealed contamination vas no documentation that a Microbiologi	. Review of your "ID Tracking Log" for the Sugar in Hood # ⁽⁰⁾⁽⁴⁾ (Date: 7/7/10, (b) (4)) which was 3 CFU. The	
and site for 2010 revealed contamination as no documentation that a Microbiologi	. Review of your "ID Tracking Log" for the Sugar in Hood # ⁽⁰⁾⁽⁴⁾ (Date: 7/7/10, (b) (4)) which was 3 CFU. The	
and site for 2010 revealed contamination as no documentation that a Microbiologi	. Review of your "ID Tracking Log" for the Sugar in Hood # ⁽⁰⁾⁽⁴⁾ (Date: 7/7/10, (b) (4)) which was 3 CFU. The	
ceeds the action limit of (b) (4) and site for 2010 revealed contamination ras no documentation that a Microbiologi	. Review of your "ID Tracking Log" for the Sugar in Hood # ⁽⁰⁾⁽⁴⁾ (Date: 7/7/10, (b) (4)) which was 3 CFU. The	
and site for 2010 revealed contamination as no documentation that a Microbiologi	. Review of your "ID Tracking Log" for the Sugar in Hood # ⁽⁰⁾⁽⁴⁾ (Date: 7/7/10, (b) (4)) which was 3 CFU. The	
and site for 2010 revealed contamination as no documentation that a Microbiologi	. Review of your "ID Tracking Log" for the Sugar in Hood # ⁽⁰⁾⁽⁴⁾ (Date: 7/7/10, (b) (4)) which was 3 CFU. The	
Acceeds the action limit of (b) (4) and site for 2010 revealed contamination as no documentation that a Microbiologi ad been conducted.	Review of your "ID Tracking Log" for the Sugar in Hood # (Date: 7/7/10, (b) (4)) which was 3 CFU. The ical Action report had been issued or that an appropriate investigation	
EMPLOYEE(S) SIGNATURE	. Review of your "ID Tracking Log" for the Sugar in Hood # ⁽⁰⁾⁽⁴⁾ (Date: 7/7/10, (b) (4)) which was 3 CFU. The	
EMPLOYEE(S) SIGNATURE	Review of your "ID Tracking Log" for the Sugar in Hood # (Date: 7/7/10, (b) (4)) which was 3 CFU. The ical Action report had been issued or that an appropriate investigation	