

**FDA-Industry PDUFA VI Reauthorization Steering Committee Meeting**  
**October 20, 2015, 2:00pm-3:30pm**  
**FDA White Oak Campus, Silver Spring, MD**  
**Building 71, Room 1208/1210**

---

**Purpose**

To provide progress updates for each working group and discuss next steps for the Steering Committee.

**Participants**

<u>FDA</u>		<u>Industry</u>	
Josh Barton	CDER	Beatrice Biebuyck	BIO (Alexion)
Steve Berman	CDER	Jennifer Boyer	BIO (Alkermes)
Amanda Edmonds	OC	Cartier Esham	BIO
Patrick Frey	CDER	Jeffrey Francer	PhRMA
John Jenkins	CDER	Sascha Haverfield	PhRMA
Chris Joneckis	CDER	Kay Holcombe	BIO
Andrew Kish	CDER	Robert Kowalski	PhRMA (Novartis)
Theresa Mullin	CDER	Robert Metcalf	PhRMA (Eli Lilly)
Mary Parks	CDER	Michelle Rohrer	BIO (Roche Genentech)
Grail Sipes	CDER	Mark Taisey	PhRMA (Amgen)
Graham Thompson	CDER		
Terry Toigo	CDER		
Brad Wintermute	OIMT		

The meeting provided a series of updates from various subgroup discussions focused on pre-market review, financial issues, regulatory decision tools, post-market review and information technology.

**Pre-Market Group Progress Report & Next Steps**

The Pre-Market working group noted that they had reviewed performance data related to FDA-sponsor formal meeting (Type A, B, & C) process timeframes and discussed the timing of background packages. FDA said that one of the biggest rate-limiting steps in achieving the target timeframes for the increasing numbers of meetings is the difficulty finding time in senior-level staff schedules to ensure their participation in the meetings. FDA noted that there are now about 10 meetings per day led by CDER's Office of New Drugs. The group also reviewed data on the review of labeling supplements, including both Changes Being Effected (CBE) and Prior Approval Supplements (PAS).

The group reported discussing the new drug review program's current resource needs and challenges. FDA noted that, as a public health agency, it is important to maintain some flexibility within its operating environment to ensure that the Agency can manage numerous priorities required in fulfilling its public mission. With this in mind, FDA was hesitant to formally commit to additional metric goals that could over burden the system. FDA noted that it was reviewing the status of current resources for the review program and would provide additional details at a later date.

### **Financial Group Progress Report & Next Steps**

The Financial working group reported that they had spent the majority of their last meeting discussing an FDA-provided overview of current staff time reporting practices in both CDER and CBER. This included an overview of the challenges experienced while implementing a recent change to CDER's time reporting system.

The group also reported that they had begun to discuss the mechanics of the current PDUFA workload adjuster. Industry expressed an interest in better understanding how the resources provided by the workload adjuster are allocated. Industry conveyed an interest in assuring the resources provided through the workload adjuster are utilized by the review offices experiencing increases in workload. The group noted they would continue their discussions of the workload adjuster in their next meeting.

### **Regulatory Decision Tools Group Progress Report & Next Steps**

The Regulatory Decision Tools working group stated that they had had initial discussions of Industry's proposal on innovative clinical trial design as well as proposals from the FDA on innovative clinical trials, improving subgroup analysis, and building statistical programmer capacity to enhance implementation of data standards.

The group noted they would be further discussing innovative clinical trials at a future meeting and would be discussing each side's proposals on Patient-Focused Drug Development at their next meeting.

### **Post-Market Group Progress Report & Next Steps**

The Post-Market working group noted that they had reviewed both Industry and FDA proposals relating to the use of real world evidence in regulatory decision making. The group noted that that FDA's proposal included additional resources for the Sentinel Initiative; the group would be discussing current resourcing for Sentinel.

### **Information Technology Group Report & Next Steps**

The Information Technology (IT) working group stated that they had spent most of their meeting discussing the performance of the Electronic Submission Gateway (ESG). Industry noted an interest in knowing which version of relevant software FDA is using in order to be able to test submissions internally before sending to the Agency. Industry also expressed an interest in additional information concerning maintenance schedules for the ESG, as well as a better understanding of current status of rejection rates of submissions by the system.

There were no other substantive proposals, significant controversies, or differences of opinion discussed at this meeting.