



First Committee Meeting Summary:

- **Meeting Date:** April 26, 2017
- **Meeting Time:** 2:00-2:40pm (EDT)
- **Meeting attendees:** Chancey, Caren; Ketha, Krishna; Volkova, Evgeniya ; Rios, Maria; Lathrop, Julia; Syed, Sajjad H; Jones, Cecily; Jones, Dana; Chun, Haecin; McClure, Michelle; Crise, Bruce; Verma, Swati; Francis, Kori; Anderson, Marie; Leiby, David; Asher, David; Hewlett, Indira; Eder, Anne; Trout, Deborah; Kelly, Sunday; Renshaw, Carolyn; Eltermann, John; Kumar, Vasantha

Submission Details:

- **Application Number:** **STN 125653/0**
- **Applicant:** **Roche Molecular Systems, Inc.**
- **License #:** **1636**
- **Application Type:** **Original BLA**
- **Device Name:** **cobas® Zika**
- **Submission Link:**

(b) (4)

- **Review Schedule:** **Priority Review- 6 Month Review**
- **Associated Reference submission:** **IND# 16926 ('Search' 16926 in the EDR)**
- **Summary:** cobas® Zika is a qualitative test that is run on the cobas® 6800 System and cobas® 8800 System. cobas® Zika enables the simultaneous detection of Zika RNA and the internal control in a single test of an infected, individual donation.

- **Intended Use:**

The cobas® Zika test for use with the cobas® 6800/8800 System, is a qualitative in vitro nucleic acid screening test for the direct detection of Zika virus RNA in plasma specimens from individual human donors, including donors of whole blood and blood components, and other living donors. It is also intended for use in testing plasma specimens to screen organ donors when specimens are obtained while the donor's heart is still beating. The test is not intended for use as an aid in diagnosis. The test is not intended for screening other body fluids. This test is not intended for use on samples of cord blood.

Review Team:

RPM- Vasantha Kumar

Lead Reviewer- Caren Chancey

Clinical- Julia Lathrop

Non-clinical- Krishna Ketha

CMC- Evgeniya Volkova; Maria Rios (CMC)

Statistics- Tie-Hua Ng

Software- Sajjad Syed

DMPQ- Cecily Jones (Debbie Trout- Consult)

BIMO- Haecin Chun

APLB- Dana Jones

OTAT/DHT- Michelle McClure; Bruce Crise (include Ping He)

DBSQC- Kori Francis; Marie Anderson

Lot Release (DETDD)- Swati Verma

Product Specific Issues- Sanjai Kumar; Pradip Akolkar; David Leiby; Indira Hewlett; David Asher; Ann Eder

DETTD Reg Policy/Managed Review- Sayah Nedjar

Senior Management- Peyton Hobson; Hira Nakhasi

Prior to the First Committee Meeting, the team was requested to review the submission to ensure the disciplines they are responsible for review are present in the submission and are in an accessible form.

First Committee Meeting Discussion:

1. To ensure the submission is complete and verify all sections are present consistent with the Table of Contents.

The team was asked to confirm at that all sections are present and are accessible.

There are some sections not provided with the BLA.

- a) *Lot Release protocols missing in the submission (Roche will be asked to submit a lot release protocol template by May 12, 2017)*
- b) *CMC- The BLA currently does not contain complete information on test validation and process validation. According to Roche (see Attachment 1 of Zika Chemistry, Manufacturing, and Controls Overview), it was agreed during a previous meeting between RMS and FDA that these data will be provided later as an amendment. Roche stated at the meeting that the target submission date for the BLA would be the 1st quarter of 2017, and estimated the validation work to be completed by August 2017. As it stands now, the CMC section without information on test/process validation does not include all data necessary to make a complete assessment for review, and this issue would be brought to the DETTD management.*
- c) *The financial information section seems to lack documents for (b) (4) [REDACTED], which participated in the clinical studies testing samples for both Zika nucleic acid and antibodies.*
- d) *Software related requirements to be requested from Roche-documents specific to ASAP: Software Design Specifications, Software Requirements, List of Anomalies, Software Release Management, cyber-security assessment*

2. To ensure a reviewer is assigned to review each section of the supplement.

Reviewers for each discipline were assigned to review their respective sections and all the reviewers had received the link to the submission.

3. To identify if consult reviewers are needed in the review process.

No consult reviewer are required

4. To identify follow up activities to be completed before the next meeting (Filing Meeting).

All reviewers are required to check his/her assigned sections to make sure all the attachments and links are present in the submission. Email the RPM/SL any missing parts identified.

5. Discuss expectations for the Filing Meeting.

The Filing Meeting is scheduled for May 22, 2017.

6. To share the review findings to date and advice if there are any actions required at this time.

The team was requested to let the RPM and the lead reviewer know if any actions are necessary now.

7. Document whether pre-license or pre-approval inspections are necessary. If not completed during the meeting, document that “the need for pre-license or pre-approval inspections will be determined by day 45 of the review.”

The DMPQ reviewer mentioned that the current CDRH led Establishment Inspection (EI) was conducted on (b) (4) as a CP 7382.845, QSIT Level I Postmarket inspection for (b) (4) Test. CAPA and P&PC subsystems were covered. Limited coverage was given to the Design Control subsystem. The inspection was classified NAI. The previous EI was conducted on (b) (4) by Core Team Biologics as a CP 7342.008 and resulted in a 10-item FDA-483 related to CAPA, cleaning validation deficiencies and no stability data for expired internal reference and was classified VAI.

In light of the aforementioned inspection history, the preapproval inspection for the subject submission does not appear necessary; therefore, a recommendation would be made to ‘waive’ the inspection based on the criteria outlined in the CBER SOPP 8410 “Determining When Pre-Licensing/Pre-Approval Inspections (PLI/PAI) are necessary.”

8. Discuss whether BIMO inspection(s) will be required and if, yes, identify the sites requiring inspection.

a) If the review committee agrees that BIMO inspection is needed for this BLA, BIMO suggests that the study protocol to issue BIMO inspections would be Protocol cX8-ZIKA-412. This protocol involved a total of five clinical test sites. Two study sites have a history of BIMO inspection with CBER (both sites received no action indicated from the latest inspection); therefore, BIMO recommends selecting the other three clinical test sites that were not inspected by CBER.

9. Confirm meeting date for Filing Meeting and discuss expectations for the Filing Meeting.

Filing meeting scheduled for May 22, 2017. Will be discussed at the meeting

10. Any follow-up activities?

Information requests to be sent to Roche

11. There were no issues identified by reviewers from other disciplines- Statistics, OTAT/DHT, APLB

-END-

Vasantha Kumar

Vasantha Kumar, Ph.D.
Regulatory Project Manager

Center for Biologics Evaluation and Research
Office of Blood Research and Review
U.S. Food and Drug Administration
WO 71/Room 4206
Tel: 240-402-8413
Vasantha.Kumar@fda.hhs.gov