


Residual Solvents: A PhRMA Perspective

PDA-USP Joint Conference: Residual Solvents
January 18-19, 2007
North Bethesda, MD

Neil Schwarzwaldner
Eli Lilly and Company
PhRMA Compendial Liaison Team



PhRMA Compendial Liaison Team

Gabriel Aguado, Sanofi-Aventis

Joe Albanese, Johnson & Johnson

Eric Butler-Roberts, Centocor

Sam Costanzo, Proctor & Gamble

Barbara Ferguson, Schering-Plough

Joe Garber, AstraZeneca

Sumitra Ghate, Eli Lilly

Ralph Gomez, Roche

Kevin Goode, GlaxoSmithKline

Matt Meekins, PSGA / Johnson &
Johnson

Scott Messner, Abbott

Psyche Peace, GlaxoSmithKline

Neil Schwarzwald, Eli Lilly

Judy Shimek, Eli Lilly

Janeen Skutnik, Pfizer

Andy Sopirak, Cephalon

Franklin Swanek, Boehringer-
Ingelheim

Amy Swartz, Pfizer

Debbie Teitz, Bristol-Myers Squibb

Gina Trimble, Wyeth

Andreas Trute, Novartis

Ronald Tscherne, Roche

Luciano Virgili, Bristol-Myers Squibb

Mark Wiggins, Merck

A PhRMA Perspective

- History
- USP adoption
- The way forward
- Discussion points

History

Timeline

History

Timeline

- 1997 ICH guideline Q3C adopted by FDA, EMEA, MHLW for new products
- 1998 EMEA announced adoption of Q3C for existing products, effective July 2000
- 2000 Ph.Eur. chapters 5.4 and 2.4.24 take effect
- 2002 ICH revised limits for 2 solvents based on tox data
- 2005 USP proposed replacing Organic Volatile Impurities with Residual Solvents
 - Industry raised issues over differences from Q3C
- 2006 Revised USP proposal resolving many issues
- 2007 USP requirement to be effective in July; revisions take effect this December

History

Adoption for new products

- ICH guideline Q3C provides a consistent means of evaluating drug products to ensure patient safety
- Initially applied only to new products
- Submission in registrations → approval by regulatory agencies

History

Adoption for existing products

- Implemented by EMEA / PhEur for products marketed in Europe in July 2000
- Implementation pending by USP July 2007
- Regulatory submission may not be required, depending on registration; much of the documentation is internal
- Application to all products requires significant effort to implement

Global implementation steps

- Form global core team of experts
- Assign site implementers
- Obtain and review supplier data
- Obtain and review manufacturing data
- Perform qualification testing to confirm data, as needed
- Add tests and acceptance criteria, as needed
- Change suppliers, as needed
- Compile document packet
- Update registrations, as needed
- Establish maintenance strategy

Lessons learned

From EMEA/Ph.Eur. implementation, we learned:

- Products met Q3C without manufacturing changes
- Some changes:
 - New suppliers
 - Additional tests and limits
 - Registration updates
- *Q3C is a workable way of demonstrating control and ensuring patient safety*

USP adoption

What about OVIs?

USP adoption

What about OVIs?

- 5 vs. 60 solvents
- Different philosophical approaches
 - OVI is a traditional compendial requirement – a prescribed method and limit for each ingredient
 - ICH Q3C considers patient exposure to solvent in the drug product, cumulative approach allowed
- OVI conflicts with Q3C
 - A material might be acceptable by Q3C, but fail by OVI
- *Pharmaceutical manufacturers supported using ICH guideline Q3C in place of OVIs*

USP adoption

Proposal in PF 31(5), Sep-Oct 2005

- Chapter <467> changed to Residual Solvents
- Industry noted significant differences from ICH guideline Q3C:
 - Alteration of text → subtle changes in meaning
 - References to <467> added to individual monographs
 - Methods and limits to be submitted to USP to be added to monographs
 - Instructions for reporting levels (COAs) omitted
 - USP solvent reference standards required for testing

Industry positions on 2005 proposal

- ICH text should be preserved
- Monographs are not the right place for most solvent information; depends on manufacturer
- Methodology should be left to manufacturer
- ICH flexibility should be maintained
- *Revised proposal in PF 32(5), Sep-Oct 2006*

USP adoption

Proposal in PF 32(5), Sep-Oct 2006

- Many industry concerns addressed
- In some cases, method and limit must still be submitted for possible inclusion in monograph
 - If solvent limit above Q3C
 - Class 3 solvent above 0.5%, with specific method
 - If solvent not listed in Q3C
- Class 3 solvents must be tested by a specific method if LOD is not in monograph
- *Philosophical difference remains: USP sees a significant role for monographs in controlling solvents, while ICH controls through process*

USP adoption

Industry observations on methodology

- 3 methods are suitable for screening only
- Methods not validated for particular materials
 - Known issues with some solvents / matrices
- <467> allows other validated methods, but:
 - “...only the results obtained by the procedures given in this general chapter are conclusive.”
 - Use of a different validated method would require method comparison
- *A manufacturer’s solvent method, validated for a material, should not require comparison data to the methods in <467>*

The way forward

What pharmaceutical manufacturers have done...

The way forward

What pharmaceutical manufacturers have done...

- Complied with ICH guideline Q3C for hundreds of products
 - New products approved since 1998
 - All products marketed in Europe since 2000
- Identified methodology and established routine testing as needed
- Established processes to meet Q3C for new products and maintenance of existing products

The way forward

... and what we want to do.

- Continue to use the documentation, testing, and processes already created to comply with ICH guideline Q3C, apply to meet USP
- Conversely, we do not want to revisit established documentation, testing, and processes to comply with USP standards different from Q3C
- Implement Q3C for additional existing products in the United States to ensure patient safety
- *Build upon what has already been done*
- *Focus on patient safety*

Discussion Points



Discussion Points

- How can we minimize work which does not improve patient safety?
 - Revisions to existing documentation
 - Comparison studies to <467> methods
- Does the typical USP model for methods and limits work for ICH guidelines?
 - Q3C written to guide registration
 - Q3C states the goal, but allows flexibility to achieve the goal
 - “Official” methods vs. other validated method



Thank you!