

**FDA-Industry PDUFA VI Reauthorization Meeting**  
**January 19th, 2016, 3:00-4:30am**  
**FDA White Oak Campus, Silver Spring, MD**  
**Building 51, Room 1215**

**Purpose:** To discuss FDA and Industry pre-market review process enhancement proposals.

**Participants**

FDA

Steven Berman	CDER
Joseph Franklin	OCC
Patrick Frey	CDER
John Jenkins	CDER
Christopher Joneckis	CDER
Theresa Mullin	CDER
Michael Pacanowski	CDER
Mary Parks	CDER
Vada Perkins	CDER
James Smith	CDER
Sara Stradley	CDER
Kellie Taylor	CDER

Industry

Cartier Esham	BIO
Sascha Haverfield	PhRMA
Laurie Keating	BIO (Alnylam)
Robert Kowalski	PhRMA (Novartis)
Mark Taisey	PhRMA (Amgen)

**Breakthrough therapy program**

FDA and industry discussed commitment letter language related to how additional resources for the breakthrough therapy program will be utilized to continue the current program.

**Early consultation on the use of new surrogate endpoints**

FDA and industry discussed draft commitment letter language describing a process for early consultation on the use of new surrogate endpoints during drug development. FDA and industry agreed on the focus and intent of the consultations and agreed to continue discussions on the requirements for sponsors who wish to take advantage of early consultations for their drug development programs.

**Meeting management**

FDA and industry identified and agreed upon a small number of minor clarifying edits to the meeting management section of the commitment letter.

**Combination product review**

FDA discussed draft language to enhance the agency's capacity to conduct cross-center regulatory activities for the review of combination products. FDA described its intended approach of using enhanced procedures, documentation, and training, along with additional resources and communications, to enhance its review activities. Industry indicated that it was supportive overall of proposed efforts in this area and would consider FDA's proposed language.

The need to review and revise other sections of the PDUFA V commitment letter to determine whether they were still necessary was also discussed.

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