



## **Technical Report No. 91**

# **Post-Approval Change Management and Implementation for Biologics and Pharmaceutical Drug Products — A User's Guide**

Currently in preview, click [here](#) to buy full version



## Post-Approval Change Management and Implementation for Biologics and Pharmaceutical Drug Products Team

---

### Authors and Contributors

---

**Kara Follmann**, PhD, Pfizer (Co-Lead)

**Karolyn Gale**, Emergent BioSolutions (Co-Lead)

**Sally Anliker**, PhD, Eli Lilly and Company

**Walter Chambliss**, PhD, University of Mississippi

**Marcello Colao**, GSK Vaccines

**Sven Deutschmann**, PhD, Roche Diagnostics GmbH

**Exsandra Elcewicz**, Takeda

**Shishir Gadam**, PhD, Genentech

**Chandra Kasireddy**, Belcher Pharmaceuticals, LLC

**Laura Kelley**, Tiefenbacher Pharmaceuticals

**Suzanne Kiani**, Mylan

**Lorenz Liesum**, PhD, Roche

**José C. Menezes**, PhD, Valgenesis

**Brian Mullan**, PhD, Yposkesi

**Morten Munk**, Fujifilm Diosynth Biotechnologies

**Kassidy Polk Good**, Mylan

**Jyoti Sachdeva**, PhD, Mylan

**Sandra Maria Santos de Magalhaes Casaca**, MPMarm, Alvotech

**Marazban Sarkari**, PhD, Teva Pharmaceuticals

**Naheed Sayeed**, Apotex

**Mihaela Simianu**, PhD, CONCORDIA, MCS, LLC

**Raman Srinivasan**, Biogen Biologics Ltd.

**Gopi Vudathala**, PhD, Mucyte Corporation

**Gresham Wehler**, PhD, Abbvie

**Kim Wolfgram**, Biogen

**Mikael Yeung**, Center for Pharmaceutical Integration, LLC

**Leslie Zaczek**, Azzur Group, LLC (retired)

**Post-Approval Change  
Management and  
Implementation for Biologics and  
Pharmaceutical Drug Products —  
A User's Guide**

**Technical Report No. 21**

ISBN 978-1-945584-41-1

© 2021 Parenteral Drug Association, Inc.

All rights reserved.



# Table of Contents

<b>1.0 INTRODUCTION .....</b>	<b>1</b>	8.1 Harmonized Definitions and Consistent Requirements for Approval of Changes .....	17
1.1 Purpose.....	1	8.2 Mutual Recognition and Consistent Review Times of PACs in ICH Regions .....	17
1.2 Scope .....	1	<b>9.0 CONCLUSION .....</b>	<b>18</b>
<b>2.0 GLOSSARY OF TERMS.....</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>10.0 REFERENCES.....</b>	<b>18</b>
2.1 Glossary .....	2	<b>11.0 APPENDIX 1: REPLACEMENT OF TRADITIONAL ADVENTITIOUS AGENTS DETECTION METHODS WITH RAPID, PCR-BASED DETECTION METHODS. ....</b>	<b>20</b>
2.2 Abbreviations.....	3	11.1 Background.....	20
<b>3.0 BACKGROUND AND LANDSCAPE FOR PACS .....</b>	<b>4</b>	11.1.1 Description and Rationale of Proposed Changes.....	21
<b>4.0 KEY ELEMENTS OF A PHARMACEUTICAL QUALITY SYSTEM FOR PAC MANAGEMENT .....</b>	<b>5</b>	11.1.2 Present State of Testing.....	21
4.1 Management Review .....	5	11.2 Current Filing Considerations .....	24
4.2 Corrective Action and Preventive Action Program .....	6	11.2.1 Risk Management .....	25
4.3 Change Management System .....	6	11.3 Comparability Protocol Strategy Overview for the Replacement of the Traditional Mycoplasma Detection Methods with a PCR-based Method.....	25
4.4 Process Performance and Product Quality Monitoring .....	7	11.3.1 Conditions that Need to be Met Prior to Implementation of the Change: Acceptance Criteria for the PCR-Based Mycoplasma Detection Method.....	25
4.5 Quality Risk Management and Knowledge Management .....	7	11.4 References.....	31
<b>5.0 PAC PROCESS TOOLS TO ENHANCE REGULATORY FLEXIBILITY .....</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>12.0 APPENDIX 2: INTRODUCTION OF A NEW ISOLATOR SYSTEM FOR ASEPTIC FILL .....</b>	<b>32</b>
5.1 Established Conditions .....	10	12.1 Background .....	32
5.1.1 Background.....	10	12.2 Current Regulatory Filing Considerations—Improvements to Drug Product Aseptic Filling....	32
5.1.2 Benefits of Defining Established Conditions.....	10	12.2.1 U.S. Filing Considerations.....	32
5.1.3 ECs versus Non-ECs and Change Management .....	11	12.2.2 Canadian Filing Considerations .....	33
5.2 Post-Approval Change Management Protocols .....	12	12.2.3 EU Filing Considerations.....	34
5.3 Product Lifecycle Management.....	13	12.2.4 WHO Considerations .....	34
<b>6.0 GLOBAL LIFECYCLE AND POC MANAGEMENT.....</b>	<b>14</b>	12.3 Strategy .....	34
6.1 ICH Regions.....	14	12.4 References.....	61
6.2 Non-ICH Regions.....	14		
<b>7.0 LEGACY MARKETED PRODUCTS AND ICH Q12 ...</b>	<b>15</b>		
<b>8.0 RECOMMENDATIONS FOR HARMONIZATION (CATEGORIZATION OF CHANGES) .....</b>	<b>16</b>		

## FIGURES AND TABLES INDEX

<b>Figure 3.0-1</b>	Scientific and Risk-Based Approach to Categorization of Changes .....	5	<b>Table 12-8</b>	Risk Level Calculation Table .....	48
<b>Table 5.0-1</b>	Tools and Considerations for Decision-Making for PAC.....	9	<b>Table 12-9</b>	Evaluation of Risk to Product and/or Project to Inform Comparability Study Design .....	48
<b>Table 8.2-1</b>	Proposed Harmonized Standard Review Time .....	18	<b>Table 12-10</b>	Testing Results for OFB Drug Product after Three Pump Cycles.....	50
<b>Table 11.1.1-1</b>	List of Proposed Changes.....	21	<b>Table 12-11</b>	Filling Conditions for Engineering Runs .....	53
<b>Table 11.1.2-1</b>	Summary of Validation Results.....	22	<b>Figure 12-2</b>	Individual Vial Fill Volumes for Engineering Run 2.....	52
<b>Table 11.1.2-2</b>	Detection Limit/Sensitivity of Mycoplasma Detection Assays.....	23	<b>Figure 12-3</b>	Distribution of Fill Volumes for Engineering Run 2.....	52
<b>Table 11.2-1</b>	Summary of Current and Future Regulatory Requirements.....	24	<b>Table 12-12</b>	Filling Conditions for Engineering Runs .....	53
<b>Table 12.3-1</b>	Change in Filling Technology .....	35	<b>Table 12-13</b>	Testing Results for OFB Drug Product Engineering Runs .....	53
<b>Figure 12-1</b>	Considerations and Critical Quality .....	37	<b>Table 12-14</b>	Critical Process Parameters for OFB Drug Product Filling.....	54
<b>Table 12-1</b>	Current Process.....	39	<b>Table 12-15</b>	Critical Quality Attributes and Lifecycle Knowledge Management .....	56
<b>Table 12-2</b>	Current Critical Quality Attributes .....	40	<b>Table 12-16</b>	Release Testing .....	58
<b>Table 12-3</b>	Current Critical Process Parameters .....	40	<b>Table 12-17</b>	Summary of Changes from Currently Approved Process to Proposed Process.....	59
<b>Table 12-4</b>	Primary Container Closure System Used on Filling Line .....	41			
<b>Table 12-5</b>	Proposed Process.....	44			
<b>Table 12-6</b>	Process Change Impact Assessment .....	45			
<b>Table 12-7</b>	Impacted CTD Sections and/or Established Conditions.....	46			

# 1.0 Introduction

The complexity of global post-approval change/variation (PAC) processes and the time required to receive their approval presents a challenge for industry when it is working to implement needed changes and operating with a focus on continual improvement. Industry benchmarking shows that receiving approval for a PAC requiring global approval can take between two and five years, and the time it takes from original submission can vary from six months to several years depending on the jurisdiction and review pathway (1). For new products, where the amount of commercial process or product data at the time of the initial submission is limited, this timing can significantly impact the ability to implement necessary process improvements identified as more data becomes available. In specific cases, when a change is needed to ensure the product remains safe, efficacious, and of high quality or provides additional capacity based on high product demand, the global approval timing can result in drug product shortages.

The current regulatory pathway to implement change is highly complex. For each jurisdiction in which a product is licensed, the respective regulatory agency typically requires a notification based on its risk reporting category, or it must preapprove certain PACs for certain products. Differences in country- and region-specific requirements for PAC filings, filing procedures, and associated timelines can often make simultaneous implementation of changes problematic, necessitating a product be tested or produced using different processes based on where it will be distributed. Companies must consider this factor when deciding to implement a change.

These challenges were highlighted during the COVID-19 pandemic, as companies continued to manufacture lifesaving products despite the extreme strain on supply chains for raw materials, components, and manufacturing supplies. As alternative sources of supply or alternative materials were identified, the complexity of the global regulatory PAC process presented a significant challenge to product supply, highlighting the need for a harmonized approach to PAC implementation.

## 1.1 Purpose

This technical report expands on the latest concepts and tools for improving PAC management, as published in ICH Q12. It provides a practical guide for the pharmaceutical industry on how to implement PACs within the framework of an effective pharmaceutical quality system (PQS) and in alignment with ICH quality guidelines. It recognizes the challenges that the limited amount of global harmonization among regulators presents with respect to PACs and attempts to provide some insight on how industry can work with regulators to improve in this area. Though TR-91 aligns with ICH Q12, it also provides guidance for non-ICH regions. It suggests how to implement the tools described in ICH Q12 and provides examples of the concepts that can facilitate aligned industry understanding for PACs.

TR-91 highlights the benefits of some of the tools described in ICH Q12 that are already available in certain jurisdictions, specifically, PAC management protocols (PACMPs, or comparability protocols) and established conditions (ECs). These concepts were acceptable for use by several regulatory agencies prior to ICH Q12, that is, ECs and comparability protocols by the U.S. Food and Drug Administration (FDA) (11,12) and comparability protocols by the European Medicines Agency (EMA) (13) and WHO (4,5).

Section 10.0 (Appendix 1) and Section 11.0 (Appendix 2) provide examples of PACs common in industry; these are presented as representative frameworks for consideration, presented as hypothetical PACMPs (or comparability protocols) that can be leveraged for similar changes. These examples, although not all-inclusive, do offer insights into the types of documentation and the scientific justification that may be required for implementation. They are intended to be illustrative, but they do portray how negotiation with regulators, where existing requirements may be disproportionate to risk given either knowledge gained through development or process experience, could be demonstrated using a PACMP approach.

## 1.2 Scope

The information in this technical report focuses on chemistry, manufacturing, and controls (CMC) changes that can be applied to PACs for both small-molecule and large-molecule pharmaceutical products.