

**INTERNATIONAL COUNCIL FOR HARMONISATION OF
TECHNICAL REQUIREMENTS FOR PHARMACEUTICALS FOR
HUMAN USE**

ICH HARMONISED GUIDELINE

**TECHNICAL AND REGULATORY CONSIDERATIONS FOR
PHARMACEUTICAL PRODUCT LIFECYCLE MANAGEMENT**

Q12 Annexes

Final version

Adopted on 20 November 2019

This document has been developed by the appropriate ICH Expert Working Group and has been subject to consultation by the regulatory parties, in accordance with the ICH Process. At Step 4 of the Process the final draft is recommended for adoption to the regulatory bodies of ICH regions.

Q12 Annexes Document History

| Code | History | Date |
|-------------|--|------------------|
| Q12 | Adopted by the Regulatory Members of the ICH Assembly under <i>Step 4</i> (document dated 19 November 2019). | 20 November 2019 |
| Q12 | Endorsement by the ICH Assembly under <i>Step 2</i> and release for public consultation. | 16 November 2017 |

Legal notice: *This document is protected by copyright and may, with the exception of the ICH logo, be used, reproduced, incorporated into other works, adapted, modified, translated or distributed under a public license provided that ICH's copyright in the document is acknowledged at all times. In case of any adaption, modification or translation of the document, reasonable steps must be taken to clearly label, demarcate or otherwise identify that changes were made to or based on the original document. Any impression that the adaption, modification or translation of the original document is endorsed or sponsored by the ICH must be avoided.*

The document is provided "as is" without warranty of any kind. In no event shall the ICH or the authors of the original document be liable for any claim, damages or other liability arising from the use of the document.

The above-mentioned permissions do not apply to content supplied by third parties. Therefore, for documents where the copyright vests in a third party, permission for reproduction must be obtained from this copyright holder.

ICH HARMONISED GUIDELINE

TECHNICAL AND REGULATORY CONSIDERATIONS FOR PHARMACEUTICAL PRODUCT LIFECYCLE MANAGEMENT

Q12 Annexes

ICH Consensus Guideline

TABLE OF CONTENTS

| | |
|--|----|
| ANNEX I: ILLUSTRATIVE EXAMPLES | 5 |
| Annex IA: Identification of Established Conditions for the Manufacturing Process - Chemical Medicinal Product | 6 |
| Annex IB: Identification of Established Conditions for the Manufacturing Process Biological Medicinal Product | 11 |
| Annex IC: Identification of Established Conditions for Analytical Procedures | 18 |
| Annex ID: PACMP Example 1 | 21 |
| Annex IE: PACMP Example 2 | 23 |
| Annex IF: Product Lifecycle Management Document - Illustrative Example | 24 |
| ANNEX II: STRUCTURED APPROACH TO ANALYTICAL PROCEDURE CHANGES | 28 |

ANNEX I: ILLUSTRATIVE EXAMPLES

The examples provided in Annex IA through IF are mock examples provided for illustrative purposes. They only suggest how the tools described in chapters 3, 4, and 5 could be applied, and should not be used as a template or the sole basis for a regulatory submission. In addition, the reporting categories, as described in Chapter 2, may differ across regions depending on regional legislation, the nature of the product, and the MAH's demonstrated understanding of the product, process, and analytical procedure.

Terminology used in examples:

| ICH Terminology | Regional Terminology |
|----------------------------|-------------------------------|
| Prior Approval (PA) | PAS, Type II, PCA, etc. |
| Notification Moderate (NM) | CBE 30, Type IB, MCN, etc. |
| Notification Low (NL) | CBE 0, AR, Type IA, MCN, etc. |
| Not Reported (NR) | |

Annex IA and IB: Identification of Established Conditions for the Manufacturing Process

The examples in 1A and 1B illustrate how the development approaches described in Chapter 3, section 3.2.3.1 of the ICH Q12 Guideline could be applied. The examples describe different development approaches and resulting control strategies to illustrate how they influence the identification of ECs and reporting categories. MAAs could consist of a combination of these approaches.

These examples demonstrate that increased knowledge and understanding gained from progressively more extensive development approaches lead to reduction of uncertainty and improved management of risk. As a result, ECs could become less extensive and reporting categories more flexible.

For example:

- Enhanced knowledge may lead to a reduction in uncertainty, demonstrating that a material attribute or process parameter initially considered potentially critical in a minimal approach is not actually critical, i.e., does not have an impact on product quality and, therefore, is not an EC.
- Risk management activities could lead to different reporting categories e.g., a change from prior approval to a notification for a change to a CPP. Where the performance-based approach is used, some process parameters may not be classified as ECs due to assurance of quality being provided by online monitoring. In this circumstance, the typical operating conditions for process parameters are provided as supportive information. During manufacture, the process parameters may be adjusted to deliver the expected outcome. The risks related to the in-line PAT (Process Analytical Technology) tests, e.g., NIR, should be appropriately managed throughout the lifecycle. In-line PAT tests used for quality control are considered ECs.

A holistic view of the manufacturing process and overall control strategy is necessary when considering ECs since the output of one unit operation is the input for a subsequent operation.

Annex IA: Identification of Established Conditions for the Manufacturing Process - Chemical Medicinal Product

Powder Blending Unit Operation

| | Parameter | Acceptable ranges and reporting categories (White boxes are ECs and grey boxes are not ECs.) | | |
|--------------------------|-------------------------------|---|--|--|
| | | Minimal Parameter-Based Approach | Enhanced Parameter-Based Approach | Performance-Based Approach |
| Input Materials | API PSD | 20-50 um Tighten (NL) Widen (PA) | 5-200 um Tighten (NL) Widen (NM) | 5-200 um Tighten (NL) Widen (NM) |
| | API Moisture | <1.0% (NM) | (NR) | (NR) |
| | Excipients #1-3 Specification | Pharmacopoeial | Pharmacopoeial | Pharmacopoeial |
| Equipment and Parameters | Operating Principle | Diffusion Mixing (PA) | Diffusion Mixing (PA) | Diffusion Mixing (PA) |
| | Equipment type | V-blender (NM) | V-blender (NL) | (NR) |
| | Scale | 200 kg Increase >10x (NM) | 200 kg Increase >10x (NL) | 200-600 kg Increase >10x (NL) |
| | Blend Speed | 20 rpm CPP (NM) | Design Space consisting of Blend speed: 10-20 rpm Blend time 15-25 minutes CPP (NM) | 15 rpm CPP (NR) |
| | Blend Time | 20 minutes CPP (NM) | | 20 minutes CPP (NR) |

| | | | | |
|-----------------------------------|---------------------------------|---------------------|-------------------|--------------------------|
| Output Performance Measure | Homogeneity method principle | HPLC (NM) | Not Tested | NIR online analyser (PA) |
| | Homogeneity acceptance criteria | <5% RSD IPC (NM) | Not Tested | <5% RSD IPC (NM) |

Comments / Justification

For this example, discussion and justification for selected parameters are provided to illustrate concepts in chapter 3.2.3.1. “EC” refers to the identification of ECs; “reporting” refers to the assessment of appropriate reporting category.

Excipient specifications are ECs and managed in line with the Pharmacopoeia. Equipment operating principle is an EC in all cases.

Minimal Parameter-Based Approach

- API PSD
 - EC: The impact of particle size distribution (PSD) of API on blend homogeneity and dissolution could not be excluded during development. PSD was not studied outside the range of 20-50 um; this range is an EC.
 - Reporting: The impact of a change outside this range on blend homogeneity and dissolution is unknown, and the risk to product quality is potentially high. As a result, any future change outside the range would be reported as PA, supported by appropriate studies and data. Changes to tighten the EC range based on knowledge gained during the commercial phase (e.g., better process control observed at tighter ranges) are considered low risk and reported as NL.
- API Moisture
 - EC: The impact of API moisture content on blend flowability, which impacts content uniformity, could not be reasonably excluded during development and has not been further studied in detail. The set point value is based on a limited amount of development and manufacturing data. API moisture content is therefore considered an EC.
 - Reporting: A change in this EC is considered moderate risk since downstream processing involves a power-assisted feeder in the tablet press which mitigates the risk of content uniformity failure. The change is reported as NM.
- Blend Equipment:
 - EC: Only one type of blending equipment (V-blender) was considered in development. Due to the limited knowledge, blender type is considered an EC.
 - Reporting: A change in this EC is considered moderate risk and therefore is reported as NM.
- Blend speed and time:
 - EC: Blend speeds and times utilised have not been studied in detail beyond the set points described. The set point values are based on a limited amount of development and manufacturing data. Therefore, the set points and the homogeneity specification are considered ECs.
 - Reporting: When assessing the risk of changing set points for these parameters, it was demonstrated that detection mechanisms are sufficient to capture disturbances in homogeneity. Therefore, changes in these process parameters and specification are reported as NM.

Enhanced Parameter-Based Approach

- API PSD:
 - EC: The impact of PSD of API on blend homogeneity and dissolution was well understood. DoE studied PSD within 5-200 um. API PSD was confirmed as having no impact on dissolution. The proposed control range for PSD of 5-200 um maintained adequate homogeneity. Compared to the minimal approach, a wider PSD range is the EC.
 - Reporting: Enhanced knowledge gained from studying a wider range led to a reduction in uncertainty regarding the impact of changing the EC and a better understanding of the risk related to homogeneity. A change to increase the range beyond that studied is considered a moderate risk and reported as NM. Changes to tighten the EC range based on knowledge gained during the commercial phase (e.g., better process control observed at tighter ranges) are considered low risk and reported as NL.
- API Moisture:
 - EC: API Moisture has been studied in detail and demonstrated to have no impact on flowability and content uniformity within the ranges explored. API moisture content is not an EC.
- Blending equipment:
 - EC: The impact of different equipment types within the same operating principle on blend quality was studied and no significant impact was observed. Due to this enhanced knowledge, the EC is focused on blending principle, rather than specific type of equipment.
 - Reporting: Enhanced understanding regarding the impact of different blending equipment reduced uncertainty regarding the impact of changing blender type on blend homogeneity. A change is considered low risk and is reported as NL.
- Blend speed and time:
 - EC: Enhanced understanding of blending parameter variability on homogeneity allows ranges for blend speed and blend time (i.e., design space established across these two parameters) that maintain adequate product quality and offer more operational flexibility than setpoints. The ranges studied for both parameters are considered to be ECs. The EC for blend homogeneity testing seen in the minimal approach is not an EC in this approach as a result of enhanced knowledge about the risk of blend segregation gained through homogeneity assessment and stratified sampling during development.
 - Reporting: Changes outside of the design space established for blend speed and time are considered moderate risk and reported as NM.

Performance Based Approach


It is assumed that a performance-based approach is developed on the basis of an enhanced approach. The same relationships between material attributes, equipment, process parameters, and product

quality as outlined above for the enhanced parameter-based approach apply. However, some of the ECs are different as a result of a performance-based control strategy.

Using a performance-based approach (online NIR analyser) in the control strategy allows homogeneity confirmation in real-time. Use of the NIR analyser with feedback to blending operating parameters minimizes the need to rely on blend speed and time to ensure blend homogeneity. Therefore, these CPPs are not ECs. The NIR method and blend homogeneity specification are ECs. Enhanced understanding of blending and output measurement allows for a wider range of manufacturing scale. Typical operating conditions for blend speed and time described in Module 3.2 is supportive information and monitored to assure performance.

**Annex IB: Identification of Established Conditions for the Manufacturing Process
Biological Medicinal Product**

FLOW DIAGRAM



The following monoclonal antibody example illustrates how ECs and reporting categories could be defined differently depending on the related risk and development approaches used.

This example will focus on 2 steps: production culture and anion-exchange chromatography.

Production Culture (XXX L)

| Unit Operation | Input/Output | Acceptable ranges and reporting categories (White boxes are ECs and grey boxes are not ECs.) | | |
|----------------|----------------------------|---|---|--|
| | | Minimal Parameter-Based Approach | Enhanced Parameter-Based Approach | Performance-Based Approach |
| Input | Inoculum Cell Density | 4.0-6.0 x10 ⁵ cells/mL PP (NM) | 2.0-8.0 x10 ⁵ cells/mL PP (NR) | Controlled by MSPC PP (NR) |
| | Temperature | 37.0 – 38.0°C CPP (PA) | 36.0 – 39.0°C CPP (NM) | Controlled by MSPC CPP (NR) |
| | Input Y | ### CPP (PA) | ### CPP (PA) | Controlled by MSPC CPP (NR) |
| Output | Viability at harvest | ≥ 70% IPC (NM) | ≥ 50% (Monitored) (NR) | ≥ 50% IPC in-line automatic counting (NM) |
| | Titre | ≥ 4.0 g/L IPC (NM) | ≥ 4.0 g/L <i>Predicted through process model</i> (NR) | ≥ 4.0 g/L IPC in-line HPLC (NM) |
| | G0-F oligosaccharide (CQA) | <i>Included in release specification</i> | <i>Included in release specification</i> | 2.0-5.0% IPC in-line UPLC UV/MS (CQA not included in specification) (PA) |
| | Bioburden | ## CFU/mL IPC (PA) | ## CFU/mL IPC (PA) | ## CFU/mL IPC (PA) |

Minimal Parameter-Based Approach:

- **EC:**
 - Process development is minimal. Due to the lack of supporting justification, most parameters are considered ECs and ranges are narrow.
 - The bioburden test is considered an EC as the production culture step presents a known risk of microbial growth if contaminated.
- **Reporting:**
 - A change of inoculum cell density is medium risk taking into account that control of viability and titre takes place for this step. The change is reported as NM.
 - Considering that the impact of temperature and Input Y was not studied, and that literature suggests potential impact of these parameters on CQA, changes to these parameters are considered high risk. These changes are reported as PA.
 - A change in the bioburden test or results is considered high risk considering the severity of microbial contamination at that stage. The change is reported as PA.

Enhanced Parameter-Based Approach:

- **EC:**

CQAs have been identified and DoE studies for selected CQAs show that:

 - Temperature and Input Y can impact the CQA G0-F at different magnitude (high impact for Input Y and low to moderate impact for temperature); these are considered ECs.
 - Inoculum cell density does not impact CQAs and is not considered an EC.
 - Linkage studies demonstrate the lack of impact of viability at harvest on CQAs when reduced to 50%. Process characterisation studies demonstrate that viability at harvest is maintained above 70% when the CPPs (temperature and Input Y) are maintained within the proposed ranges. Viability at harvest is not considered an EC.
 - Titre is predicted through a process model. With this knowledge, cell viability at harvest and titre are not considered ECs.
 - Bioburden test is considered an EC as the production culture step presents a known risk of microbial growth if contaminated.
- **Reporting:**

Risk management activities have been performed and concluded that:

 - A change to Input Y is considered high risk because Input Y has been shown to have a high impact on G0-F. The change is reported as PA.
 - A change in temperature is considered moderate risk given the low to moderate impact on G0-F. The change is reported as NM.
 - A change in bioburden test or limit is considered high risk given the severity of microbial contamination at that stage. The change is reported as PA.

Performance-Based Approach:

- **EC:**

- In-line tests are used to control outputs in real time. In-line tests are considered to be ECs.
- Relevant inputs are monitored through Multivariate Statistical Process Control (MSPC) defining a process signature that is not considered an EC.
- Inputs are adjusted in real time based on a model accounting for the in-line measurements of outputs. Inputs are not considered ECs as the outputs of the step (titre and G0-F level) are assured by in-line testing.
- The bioburden test is considered an EC as the production culture step presents a known risk of microbial growth if contaminated.

- **Reporting:**

- Changes of viability and titre tests are assessed as moderate risk since CQAs are not directly impacted. These changes are reported as NM.
- A change to G0-F test or ranges is assessed as high risk because this attribute is not tested in the drug substance specification. The change is reported as PA.
- A change in the bioburden test or results is considered high risk given the severity of microbial contamination at that stage. The change is reported as PA.

Anion Exchange Chromatography

| Unit Operation | Input/Output | Acceptable ranges and reporting categories (White boxes are ECs and grey boxes are not ECs.) | | |
|----------------|------------------------|---|--|---|
| | | Minimal Parameter-Based Approach | Enhanced Parameter-Based Approach | Performance-Based Approach |
| Input | Feedstock Conductivity | 6.0 – 8.0 mS/cm CPP (PA) | 6.0 – 8.0 mS/cm CPP (PA) | 6.0 – 8.0 mS/cm CPP (NR) |
| | Feedstock pH | 4.8 – 5.2 CPP (PA) | 4.5-5.5 CPP (PA >5.5) | 4.0-6.0 CPP (NR) |
| | | | (NM <4.5) | |
| | Resin age | ≤ 20 cycles, ≤ 3 yrs CPP (PA) | ≤ 100 cycles, ≤ 3 yrs PP (NL) | ≤ 100 cycles, ≤ 3 yrs PP (NR) |
| Input Z | CPP (PA) | CPP (NM) | CPP (NR) | |
| Output | Bioburden | ≤ 10 CFU/10 mL IPC (NL) | ≤ 10 CFU/10 mL (Monitored) (NR) | ≤ 10 CFU/10 mL (Monitored) (NR) |
| | Endotoxin | ≤ 5 EU/mL IPC (NL) | ≤ 5 EU/mL (Monitored) (NR) | ≤ 5 EU/mL (Monitored) (NR) |
| | HCP (CQA) | <i>Tested in DS specification</i> | <i>Predicted through process model</i> | ≤ 100 ppm IPC in-line UPLC UV/MS (PA) |
| | CQA X | <i>Tested in DS specification</i> | <i>Predicted through process model</i> | In-line IPC (PA) |

Minimal Parameter-Based Approach:

- **EC:**
 - Process development is minimal. The impact of inputs on CQAs has not been studied. Due to the lack of knowledge, all inputs are considered to be ECs as they can potentially have impact on CQAs.
 - Output (i.e., bioburden and endotoxin) are considered ECs as they have potential impact on product quality.
 - HCP and CQA X are part of DS specifications, and are not tested at this stage. HCP and CQA X are not considered ECs for this step.
- **Reporting:**
 - Considering the lack of understanding of the impact of inputs (feedstock conductivity and pH, resin age, and Input Z) on CQAs, changes to these inputs are considered high risk. These changes are reported as PA.
 - Changes to bioburden and endotoxin limits are considered low risk as these are further tested in subsequent steps. These changes are reported as NL.

Enhanced Parameter-Based Approach:

- **EC:**
 - Studies on scale-down models demonstrate that feedstock conductivity and pH, and Input Z can impact CQAs (HCP and CQA X) and are considered CPPs.
 - Resin age has been studied up to 100 cycles and up to 3 years, and did not show any impact on CQAs. Impact on CQAs cannot be excluded when the range is further extended. Resin age is considered an EC.
 - HCP and CQA X are not considered ECs as multivariate studies demonstrated that they remain within their acceptance criteria when feedstock conductivity and pH, and Input Z are maintained within the studied ranges.
 - Bioburden and endotoxin are not considered ECs for this step, taking into consideration testing of the attributes in several of the following process steps, but are monitored.
- **Reporting:**

Risk management activities have been performed and concluded that:

 - Extension of resin age is considered low risk taking into account the ongoing validation protocol which includes time points beyond the claim of 100 cycles/3 years. This change is reported as NL.
 - Change to feedstock conductivity is considered high risk because it can impact HCP and CQA X. This change is reported as PA.
 - Change to feedstock pH is considered high risk when increased beyond 5.5, and is reported as PA. This change is considered moderate risk below 4.5, and is reported as NM.
 - A change in Input Z has a moderate impact on HCP and CQA X. This change is reported as NM.

Performance-Based Approach:

- **EC:**

In-line tests are used to control outputs (i.e., HCP and CQA X) in real time. Inputs are adjusted in real time based on a model accounting for the in-line measurements of outputs. In-line tests are considered ECs.

- **Reporting:**

The control strategy relies on the in-line tests to ensure that HCP and CQA X remain within acceptable ranges. Changes to these in-line tests or ranges are assessed as high risk and are reported as PA.

Annex IC: Identification of Established Conditions for Analytical Procedures

The following is an example to illustrate how ECs could be presented for an analytical procedure, acceptance criteria, and testing facility, along with their suggested reporting categories. This example considers an analytical procedure (capillary electrophoresis) for a biological drug substance (non-glycosylated recombinant protein) referred to as *Illustropin*, using a minimal development approach validated in accordance to ICH Q2. To better illustrate the example, the change categories, conditions, and data requirements are according to the WHO Guidelines on procedures for changes to approved biotherapeutic products. The actual reporting categories and data requirements may differ for a particular product and by region.

The information summarized in the table below provides guidance on:

- The conditions to be fulfilled for a given change to be classified as moderate or minor (if any of the conditions outlined for a given change are not fulfilled, the change is assessed and if appropriate the next higher reporting category may be used– for example, if any conditions recommended for a low quality change are not fulfilled, the change is may be considered to be a moderate quality change);
- Adequate scientific data and justification should be provided to support a given change.

| | All information listed are ECs | Reporting (as example referring to WHO) |
|-----------------------|---|--|
| Method | Measurement of Purity: Determination of charged variants of active substance by capillary electrophoresis (Non-reduced) and corrected relative area %. | NM <i>Conditions: None</i> <i>Supporting Data: 1-5</i> |
| Test solutions | Illustropin Reference Standard: Concentration of test solutions and reference standards: 1 mg/ml Illustropin in water | NL <i>Conditions 1-4</i> <i>Supporting Data: 1, 4, 5</i> |
| Equipment | Suitable Capillary Electrophoresis system Suitable spectrophotometric detector. Capillary: Material: uncoated fused silica capillary diameter Ø = 50 µm. Size: effective length = at least 70 cm | |
| Condition | Chemicals (Pharmacopoeial quality) Separation buffer (CZE): 13.2 g/l solution of ammonium phosphate adjusted to pH 6.0 with phosphoric acid filtered Rinsing Agents: 1M sodium Hydroxide, water, 0.1M sodium Hydroxide Instrument parameters Detection: 200 nm (UV) Electric Field Strength: 217 V/cm Temperature: 30 °C Sample Analysis Injection test solution (a) and the reference solution; injection for at least 3 s then CZE buffer injection for 1 s. Separation: Separation buffer at both ends of the capillary | NL <i>Conditions 1-4</i> <i>Supporting Data: 1, 4, 5</i> |

| | | |
|----------------------------|---|--|
| | <p>Sample storage at 4 °C during analysis.</p> <p>System conditioning</p> <p><u>Preconditioning:</u></p> <p>At least 20 min 1M Sodium Hydroxide</p> <p>At least 10 min water</p> <p>At least 20 min separation buffer</p> <p><u>Between-run rinsing:</u></p> <p>0.1M Sodium hydroxide at least 2 min</p> <p>Separation buffer at least 6 min</p> | |
| System suitability | <p>System Suitability</p> <p>Specificity: the electropherogram obtained is similar to the electropherogram of Illustropin supplied with Illustropin reference; 2 peaks (I1, I2) eluting prior to the principal peak and at least 2 peaks (I3, I4) eluting after the principal peak are clearly visible.</p> | <p>NL</p> <p><i>Conditions 1-4</i></p> <p><i>Supporting Data: 1, 4, 5</i></p> |
| Acceptance Criteria | <p>Deamidated forms: maximum 5.0 per cent;</p> <p>Any other impurity: for each impurity, maximum 2.0 per cent;</p> <p>Total: maximum 10.0 per cent.</p> | <p>Widening: NM</p> <p><i>Conditions: None</i></p> <p><i>Supporting Data: 1, 5, 6</i></p> <p>Narrowing: NL</p> <p><i>Conditions: 2, 7</i></p> <p><i>Supporting Data: 1</i></p> |
| Site transfer | | <p>NM</p> <p><i>Conditions None</i></p> <p><i>Supporting Data: 7 & 8</i></p> <p>NL</p> <p><i>Conditions 4-6</i></p> <p><i>Supporting Data: 7 & 8</i></p> |

| Conditions that must be met: in order to implement the change at the corresponding reporting category |
|---|
| <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. There is no change in the limits/acceptance criteria outside the approved limits for the approved assays used at release/ stability. 2. The method of analysis is the same and is based on the same analytical technique or principle (for example, change in column length or temperature, but not a different type of column or method) and no new impurities are detected 3. The modified analytical procedure maintains or improves performance parameters of the method 4. The change does not concern potency-testing 5. No changes made to the test method 6. The transfer is within a facility approved in the current marketing authorization for performance of other tests 7. The change does not result from unexpected events arising during manufacture (for example, new unqualified impurity, change in total impurity limits) |
| Supporting Data (Documentation to be submitted) |
| <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Updated drug substance specifications. |

2. Copies or summaries of analytical procedures if new analytical procedures are used.
3. Validation/qualification results if new analytical procedures are used.
4. Comparative results demonstrating that the approved and proposed analytical procedures are equivalent.
5. Justification for the proposed drug substance specification (for example, tests, acceptance criteria or analytical procedures).
6. Documented evidence that consistency of quality is maintained.
7. Information demonstrating technology transfer qualification for the non-pharmacopoeial assay or verification for the pharmacopoeial assay.
8. Evidence that the new company/facility is GMP-compliant.

Annex 1D and 1E: PACMP Examples

The examples provided below are intended to illustrate the range of PACMPs that are possible for a given type of change. They are not intended to serve as a binding template and other approaches may also be acceptable. The first example below outlines a protocol for a single change (a manufacturing site change) to a single product. The second example outlines a protocol for multiple changes (multiple manufacturing site changes) that could be implemented for multiple products. These examples are not intended to suggest that the only type of change appropriate for inclusion in a PACMP is a manufacturing site change. As described in ICH Q12 Guideline Chapter 4, in order to meet expectations regarding continual improvement of the product and process, many other quality-related changes may be suitable for inclusion in a PACMP.

Annex 1D: PACMP Example 1

Alternative manufacturing site for a small molecule drug substance

Outline for Step 1 Submission

1. Introduction and Scope

This PACMP is intended to allow for the addition of an alternative manufacturing site for the manufacture, testing, and release of the drug substance for a small molecule solid oral drug product.

Based on the risk management activities described below, the implementation of this change in Step 2 is proposed to be reported in a submission type that is a lower category than currently provided for in existing regulations or guidance, or a submission type eligible for accelerated review timelines, depending on regional requirements.

2. Quality Risk Management (QRM) Activities

QRM is conducted for the proposed alternative site and includes:

- Identification and assessment of the potential risks associated with the proposed change, as well as the activities proposed to mitigate each risk;
- Accounting for known elements of the process, such as robustness, existing controls, and potential impact on product quality; and
- Incorporating prior knowledge gained from development and commercial manufacturing experience.

3. Acceptance criteria

Based on the risk assessment, the following acceptance criteria should be met:

- In a comparative batch analysis, three consecutive batches of drug substance manufactured at the alternative manufacturing site should meet approved specification to demonstrate equivalence to batches manufactured at the currently approved site.

Other conditions to be met prior to implementation:

- Stability studies will be initiated immediately on a suitable number of commercial scale batches of drug substance manufactured at the alternate manufacturing site and drug product manufactured with drug substance produced at the alternate manufacturing site.

Stability data are to be reported to the regulatory authority subsequent to implementation of the new site according to regional requirements.

- Alternative manufacturing site to have acceptable compliance status for small molecule drug substance manufacturing; depending on the region, this may be indicated by the last GMP inspection with acceptable outcome, through a valid GMP certificate, or other appropriate documentation (e.g., Qualified Person declaration)
- Alternative manufacturing site to use similar manufacturing equipment or equipment with the same type of material of construction
- Technology transfer and process qualification to be completed
- No change to synthetic route, control strategy, impurity profile, or physicochemical properties
- No change to any specification or analytical method for starting material or intermediates
- No change in analytical methods or specification for release and stability testing for drug substance manufactured at the alternative site
- Any additional regional requirements.

Summary of Step 1 and Step 2 Submissions

| PACMP Component | PACMP Step 1 Contents (registration/approval of protocol) | PACMP Step 2 Contents (change implementation) |
|--|---|--|
| Overall Strategy (Scope and Limitations of proposed change) | Defined scope and limitations | Demonstrate requirements of scope are met |
| QRM | Description of QRM activities and summary of risk assessment | Confirmation that previously conducted risk assessment has not changed; or, if new information is available that impacts the risk assessment, an updated risk assessment is provided |
| Acceptance criteria | Tests and studies to be performed; description of any other criteria to be met, including plans to report outcomes from ongoing stability testing | Data demonstrating that acceptance criteria are met. Confirmation that other criteria are met. Updated CTD sections for S.2.1 Manufacturer(s) of Drug Substance and S.4.4 Batch Analyses for Drug Substance. |

Annex IE: PACMP Example 2

Manufacturing Site Transfers of Biotechnological Drug Substances

Proposed Outline for Step 1 Submission

1. Introduction and Scope

The primary objective of this expanded PACMP is to support the mobility across drug substance manufacturing sites, i.e., the transfer of one or multiple products from one donor site to one or more recipient site(s) including CMOs (sites already licensed with appropriate inspection record) thereby reducing the number of regulatory submissions of similar content and driving consistency. The expanded PACMP effectively leverages concepts of Quality Risk Management and ICH Q9. Typical process adaptations linked to scale and equipment differences at the donor and recipient site(s) are in scope of the protocol (e.g., change in raw material sourcing) whereas the scope excludes opportunistic significant process changes (e.g., changes to increase productivity/yield).

2. Quality Risk Management (QRM)

QRM is performed for each individual site transfer, and includes:

- Identification, scoring, and documentation of the potential hazard and harm associated with each manufacturing unit operation and process change, as well as the prevention and detection controls
- Accounting for known elements of the process, such as robustness, existing controls, and potential impact on product quality

3. Comparability/ Acceptance Criteria

The overall comparability plan in line with ICH Q5E comprises the following elements:

- The drug substance meets all release and in-process specifications, as well as comparability acceptance criteria (e.g., tolerance intervals [TI, 95/99]) derived from the entire manufacturing history
- Analytical profiles from selected characterisation tests of post-change material are consistent with pre-change material in side-by-side comparison
- Process performance attributes, e.g., cell culture performance, purification process yields, and impurities levels are comparable between donor and recipient site
- Planned process validation at the recipient site
- Drug Substance degradation studies consistent with pre-change material

4. Site specific Considerations

a) Site Risk

A risk assessment for the receiving site will be conducted by the MAH at the time of implementation. The risk assessment includes the GMP compliance status and should also include factors such as facility experience, process knowledge, and any additional regional assessments (e.g., QP declaration). The outcome of the risk assessment will indicate to the MAH whether a site inspection by the competent regulatory authority may be needed and whether additional data to support the change should be generated (e.g., site-specific stability data).

b) Process Validation

An overview of the process validation project plan and validation master plan for the site transfer in accordance to the current PQS system should be provided (at step 1). A summary of validation studies performed to support the site transfers, e.g., studies adopted from the donor site and new studies at the recipient site are part of the step 2 implementation submission.

The number of proposed validation batches should be based on the variability of the process, the complexity of the process/product, process knowledge gained during development, supportive data at commercial scale during the technology transfer and the overall experience of the MAH.

c) Stability

Stability studies are traditionally rate-limiting to site transfer timelines; following successful demonstration of comparability by analytical characterisation methods, including accelerated and/or stress stability studies (see ICH Q12 Guideline Chapter 9) can leverage tiered regulatory submission reporting categories and commitments.

Summary Expanded PACMP Step 1 submission and proposed outline for Step 2 submission

| Component | Step 1 contents (registration of protocol) | Step 2 contents (change implementation) |
|--|--|---|
| Overall Strategy (Scope and Limitations) | Defined scope and limitations | Demonstrate requirements of scope met, including process changes associated with transfer |
| QRM | Description of QRM program and approach to site transfer risk assessment | Documented risk control strategy and executed risk management report summary |
| Comparability & Stability | Comparability plan, real-time stability commitments and acceptance criteria (product-specific) | Data demonstrating that acceptance criteria are met |
| Process Validation | Overview of validation program | Summary of facility/equipment differences and applicable validation; validation summary data support the process, facility/equipment, and method transfer |
| Site risk | Description of site inspection risk assessment | Outcome of site inspection risk assessment defines actual change submission requirements |

Annex IF: Product Lifecycle Management Document - Illustrative Example

The following example for drug product illustrates how MAH can present the elements of ICH Q12 Chapter 5 in an initial PLCM document. Other approaches and formats can be used as appropriate.

This example follows the ‘enhanced parameter-based approach’ from Annex IA; example for identifying Established Conditions for a Solid Dosage Form Tablet X (small molecule).

ECs defined in the Annex IA example are presented in the table below with additional illustrative ECs, a PACMP and a post-approval CMC Commitment. This table should not be seen as an exhaustive list of ECs. It is recognised that other CTD sections containing ECs, or ECs within a CTD section, as outlined in Appendix 1, may be included in a PLCM document. Additional unit operations (roller compaction, tableting, and film-coating) are listed for illustrative purposes but their ECs and reporting categories are not described. Similarly, while only the PSD attribute is included in this table, the entire drug substance specification would be provided in an application.

In this example, where the MAH proposes to follow regional regulations and guidance for a change to a particular EC, the reporting category has been left blank.

| CTD Section | Established Conditions <i><u>(Note that identification and justification of EC is presented in the relevant section of CTD)</u></i> | Reporting Category when making a change to the Established Condition |
|--------------------|--|---|
| 3.2.S.4.1 | Input Material - API PSD (5-200 um) | Tighten (NL) Widen (NM) |
| 3.2.P.3.1 | <i>Drug Product Manufacturing sites (including those for testing, primary and secondary packaging, device assembly for drug product-device combination products)</i> | |
| 3.2.P.3.2 | <i>Drug Product Batch Formula (Qualitative and Quantitative)</i> | |
| 3.2.P.3.3 | The manufacturing process consists of the following sequence of unit operations; 1. Powder blending 2. Roller compaction 3. Tablet compression 4. Film-coating | |
| | 1. Powder Blending The active substance and three excipients are mixed together. The following process parameter are defined as established conditions. | |
| | Operating principle: Diffusion mixing | PA |
| | Equipment Type: V-blender | NL |

| | | |
|------------------|---|----|
| | Scale: 200kg | NL |
| | Design Space for blending process parameters Blend speed: 10-20 rpm Blend time: 15-25 minutes | NM |
| | 2. Roller Compaction | |
| | 3. Tablet Compression | |
| | 4. Film-coating | |
| 3.2.P.3.4 | Design Space for blending process parameters Blend speed: 10-20 rpm Blend time: 15-25 minutes | NM |
| 3.2.P.4 | Input Material - Excipients #1 Specification (Pharmacopeial) | |
| 3.2.P.4 | Input Material - Excipients #2 Specification (Pharmacopeial) | |
| 3.2.P.4 | Input Material - Excipients #3 Specification (Pharmacopeial) | |

| CTD Section Referenced | PACMP or Post-approval CMC Commitment (if applicable) |
|-------------------------------|--|
| 3.2.P.3.3 | PACMP included in the MAA for expanded range for scale. |
| 3.2.P.3.3 | CMC commitment to monitor dissolution performance for 10 batches manufactured at upper end of blend time range due to potential over lubrication at the proposed commercial scale (200kg). |

ANNEX II: STRUCTURED APPROACH TO ANALYTICAL PROCEDURE CHANGES

Principles for Analytical Procedure Changes

MAHs are expected to maintain existing analytical procedures for authorised products and ensure that these are kept up to date. These analytical procedures can relate to the drug substance(s) and drug product. The intent of this approach is to incentivise structured implementation of at least equivalent analytical procedures that are fit for purpose. An approach wherein specific criteria are defined for changes to analytical procedures used to test marketed products is described below. If this approach is followed and all criteria are met, the analytical procedure change can be made with immediate or other post-implementation notification, as appropriate, to the relevant regulatory authorities.

This approach does not apply in the following situations:

- Procedures where the acceptance criteria do not adequately reflect the complex information provided by the method. In particular, procedures for which only a subset of the characteristics are identified and specified (e.g., test for identity by peptide map, assay for complex drug substances), or where the specified acceptance criteria include a general comparison to a reference standard beyond specified characteristics (e.g., “comparable to reference standard” such as for naturally derived products, biotechnology products).
- Change(s) to a test method based on a biological/immunological/immunochemical principle or a method using a biological reagent (e.g., bioassay, binding assay, ELISA, testing for viral adventitious agents).
- Changes to models and multivariate methods; model maintenance for multivariate models is not considered to be a change.
- Changes to analytical procedures (methods) described in pharmacopoeial monographs.

It is important to note that with the exception of the above exclusion criteria, all other methods are in scope including those used for biotechnological/biological products.

In order for this approach to be used, the following should be met:

- The physicochemical basis and the high-level description of the current method and the intended method should be the same (e.g., reversed-phase chromatography with UV spectroscopic detection)
- The acceptance criteria of the validation protocol of the current method can be applied to the proposed method as well.
- Validation results should demonstrate that the intended method is equivalent to or better than the current method
- Test results obtained using the current method and intended method should be equivalent to each other. This should be assessed in two ways: First, the intended method should give an equivalent outcome, i.e., the same conclusion will be made regardless of whether the data was obtained by the current or the intended method. Second, the validation protocol should contain explicit criteria that compare results obtained using the current and proposed method. See step 2 below for further details.

- System suitability requirements should be established for the revised method to ensure the same effectiveness and day-to-day performance of the revised method compared to the current method.
- Acceptance criteria changes (e.g., total impurities, potency) should not be introduced using this mechanism unless tighter/more restrictive acceptance criteria are introduced, or they are allowed by existing regional regulations.
- Toxicological or clinical data are not required as a result of the method change.

If these criteria are met, the methods are equivalent, and changes can be made with immediate or other post-implementation notification, as appropriate, to regulatory authorities.

Structured Approach for Analytical Procedure Changes

- Step 1: Evaluate the physicochemical basis of the method (the mode) and the method description. When two or more techniques are used together (e.g., HPLC with UV and MS detection), each technique should be included in the method description. The current and intended method (and its mode(s)) should have the same scientific basis and principles. Changes between different modes (e.g. reversed phase to normal phase liquid chromatography) are not in the scope of this guideline.

By way of examples, the following changes could be acceptable:

- A change to a liquid column chromatography method where the mode of separation remains the same e.g. reversed phase to reversed phase, size exclusion to size exclusion etc.
- A change to an electrophoretic method where the mode of separation and method description remains the same e.g. reduced to reduced, non-reduced to non-reduced, etc.
- A change to a pure spectroscopic or chemical/physical property method where principle remains the same e.g., UV to UV, Refractive Index to Refractive Index, DSC to DSC.

This approach can be applied to other methods, as appropriate.

- Step 2: A prospective analytical validation protocol should be prepared and approved internally by the company. It should be based on a comparison of the current and intended method, knowledge of the original validation protocol, and regulatory expectations. The validation should assure that the intended method will be fit for its intended purpose and should contain at least the following:
 - The principles of ICH Q2 should be followed to validate the intended method. All validation characteristics relevant to the type of method being validated should be executed as described in ICH Q2.
 - The validation protocol should include, at minimum, the tests used to validate the current method and all other relevant tests in ICH Q2, or as required for the analytical method type. For example, if specificity, linearity, precision and accuracy were assessed during validation of the current method, then specificity, linearity, precision and accuracy should also be included in the validation of the intended method. The protocol acceptance criteria should reflect current expectations for method performance, be justified scientifically, and not be less stringent than those used for the validation of the current method.

- The validation should demonstrate that the intended method is at least equivalent to the current method using parallel testing of an adequate number of samples of appropriate concentration based on the intended use of the method. The assessment of equivalency should include the requirement that the new method does not lose any meaningful information provided by the current method. In addition, the same conclusion should result when assessing data from the same samples tested using the current and intended methods.
- If there is a switch from manual to automated methods, the validation should also assess the impact of any related changes in critical reagents, reference standards or software.
- The protocol should also contain the detailed operating conditions of both the current method and the intended method to assure the changes being made are clear.
- Step 3: Consider the system suitability criteria that exist in the current method, if any, and determine, based on method development data and any additional knowledge gained from commercial production, the system suitability criteria aspects that should be part of the intended method. System suitability in this context includes all criteria used to evaluate the day-to-day performance of the method when used for routine testing.
- Step 4: Execute the validation protocol and compare the results to the predetermined acceptance criteria. If all criteria are met, the method is considered acceptable for its intended use. If any criterion is not met, the change in method is outside of the scope of this approach and should not be implemented.
- Step 5: Consider new product information, if any, identified as a result of a change in the context of the current regulatory filing. If new or revised acceptance criteria (e.g., total impurities, potency) are required based on results obtained during method validation, this structured approach may not be used unless allowed by existing regional regulations. In addition, this approach may not be used if toxicological or clinical data are required as a result of the method change. Thus, the method change should have no impact on safety, efficacy, purity, strength, identity, or potency of the product.
- Step 6: Prepare a written summary report documenting the outcome of the validation versus the protocol criteria.
- Step 7: Follow the internal change process as defined within the company's PQS to implement the change.
- Step 8: Unless new information is identified as a result of this process (see step 5), provide a post-implementation notification of the method change to the regulatory authority after the change is implemented as per regional reporting requirements. This may include the updated method description, the protocol, and the summary report of the validation.
- Step 9: Complete post-change monitoring. The company's change control system (refer to Appendix 2) should explicitly identify and document a mechanism to assure the change was effective with no unintended consequences. The outcome of the assessment should be documented with a conclusion indicating the acceptability of the change.
- Step 10: All information related to the method change should be available for verification during regulatory inspection.