



EFDA
የኢትዮጵያ ምግብና መድኃኒት ባለሥልጣን
ETHIOPIAN FOOD & DRUG AUTHORITY

Medicine Evaluation and Market Authorization Lead Executive Office

Guidelines on procedures and data requirements for changes to approved biotherapeutic products

Document No. EFDA/GDL/068

Date of approval: 10/01/2025

Version No: 001

Date of First issue: 19/01/2025

Document History

Version Number	Reason for Amendment	Effective Date
001	New document	19/01/2025

Seble Shambel

Table of Contents

Abbreviations	iii
1. Introduction	1
2. Purpose and scope	2
3. Terminology	3
4. General considerations	8
5. Special considerations	11
5.1. Comparability exercise	11
5.2. Bridging studies	12
5.3. Similar biotherapeutic products	12
6. Reporting categories for quality changes	13
6.1. Major quality changes.....	14
6.2. Moderate quality changes	15
6.3. Minor quality changes.....	15
6.4. Quality changes with no impact.....	15
7. Reporting categories for safety, efficacy and/ or product labelling information changes.....	17
7.1. Safety and efficacy changes.....	17
7.2. Product labelling information changes	19
7.3. Urgent product labelling information changes.....	20
7.4. Administrative product labelling information changes.....	20
8. Procedures	21
8.1. Procedures for prior approval supplements	23
8.2. Procedures for minor quality changes and quality changes with no impact	27
8.3. Procedures for urgent product labelling information changes	28
8.4. Procedures for administrative product labelling information changes	28
Annex 1: Reporting categories and suggested review timelines.....	30
Annex 2: Changes to the drug substance	33
Annex 3: Changes to the drug product.....	55
Annex 4: Safety, efficacy and product labelling information changes	80

Abbreviations

BSE	Bovine Spongiform Encephalopathy
CQA	Critical Quality Attribute
EFDA	Ethiopia Food and Drug Authority
GCP	Good Clinical Practice
GLP	Good Laboratory Practice
GMP	Good Manufacturing Practice
HPLC	High Performance Liquid Chromatography.
ICH	International Council on Harmonisation of Technical Requirements for Registration of Pharmaceuticals for Human Use
MAH	Marketing Authorization Holder
MCB	Master Cell Bank
NRA	National Regulatory Authority
PAS	prior approval supplement
PD	Pharmacodynamic
PEG	Polyethylene glycol
PK	Pharmacokinetic
SBP	Similar Biotherapeutic Product
TSE	Transmissible Spongiform Encephalopathy
WCB	Working Cell Bank

1. Introduction

Biotherapeutic products are an increasingly important component of global health care. Once, the biotherapeutic products registered and made available for use changes are inevitable considering the dynamic nature of science. This in turn insist the need for regulatory guidance for on making post-approval changes to biotherapeutic products in order to help address the complexity and other challenges associated with the life-cycle management of such products.

This document is intended to provide guidance to experts of the Food and Drug Authority of Ethiopia and manufacturers on regulating changes to registered biotherapeutic products in order to assure their continued quality, safety and efficacy, as well as continuity in supply and access. The term “biotherapeutic products” as used in this document collectively includes the originator products and SBPs (also called “biosimilars”).

Changes are essential for the continual improvement of the manufacturing process and for maintaining state-of-the-art control of biotherapeutic products, and often need to be implemented after the product has been approved (that is, when marketing authorization has been received). Changes may be made for a variety of reasons, including: (a) to maintain routine production (for example, replenishment of reference standards, or change of raw materials); (b) to improve product quality, or the efficiency and consistency of manufacture (for example, changes in the manufacturing process, equipment or facility, or adding a new manufacturing site); (c) to make safety or efficacy changes (for example, adding a new indication, changing the dosage regimen, or adding information on co-administration with other medicines); (d) to update product labelling information (for example, improvement of the management of risk by addition of a warning statement for a particular target population, or limiting the target population); or (e) to address administrative changes (for example, change in the proper/nonproprietary or trade name of a biotherapeutic product).

The authority and marketing authorization holders should recognize that:

- any change to a biotherapeutic product has a potential impact on the quality, safety and/or efficacy of that product;
- any change to the information associated with the product (that is, product labelling information) may have an impact on its safe and effective use.

The regulation of changes to approved biotherapeutic products is key to ensuring that products of consistent quality, safety and efficacy are marketed after they receive authorization.

This document is intended to serve as a guide for requirements for the regulation of post-approval changes to biotherapeutic products. The categories of changes and reporting procedures are provided in the main body of the document and the data requirements to support the proposed changes are provided in the appendices.

2. Purpose and scope

This guidance for marketing authorization holders on the regulation of changes to the original marketing authorization dossier or product license for an approved biotherapeutic product in terms of: (a) the procedures and criteria for the appropriate categorization and reporting of changes; and (b) the data required to enable authority to evaluate the potential impact of the change on the quality, safety and efficacy of the product.

The guidance applies in principle to all biologically active protein products used in the treatment of human diseases (for example, fusion plasma fractionated products) and those intentionally modified by, proteins, PEGylation, conjugation with a cytotoxic drug or modification of rDNA sequences. The guidance also applies to protein products used for in vivo diagnosis (for example, monoclonal antibody products used for imaging).

While this Guideline apply to products that have received a license or a marketing authorization, the principles described herein may also apply to quality changes that occur during development of a product and where comparability needs to be demonstrated. However, the amount and type of data submitted for such products will be limited and will vary according to the nature of each product and its stage of development.

Prophylactic vaccines against infectious diseases, and gene and cell therapy products, are not covered by this Guideline. Detailed and specific guidance for vaccines are available in a separate Guideline are available at EFDA website. However, the principles set out in this document may apply to low molecular weight heparins.

3. Terminology

The definitions given below apply to the terms used in this Guideline. They may have different meanings in other contexts.

Acceptance criteria: criteria, expressed by numerical limits, ranges or other suitable measures, which should be met to release the drug substance or drug product or materials at different stages of their manufacture.

Biotherapeutic product: a biological medicinal product with the indication of treating human disease. For the purpose of these WHO Guidelines, biotherapeutic products include all biologically active protein products (including plasma-fractionated products) which are used in the treatment of human diseases, and those intentionally modified by, for example, fusion proteins, PEGylation, conjugation with a cytotoxic drug or modification of rDNA sequences. They also include protein products used for in vivo diagnosis (for example, monoclonal antibody products used for imaging).

Change: refers to a change that includes, but is not limited to, the product composition, manufacturing process, quality controls, analytical methods, equipment, facilities or product labelling information made to an approved marketing authorization or license by the marketing authorization holder. Also referred to as “variations” or “post-notice of compliance changes” in other documents.

Comparability exercise: the activities – including study design, conducting of studies and evaluation of data – that are designed to investigate whether a pre-change product and a post-change product are highly similar.

Comparability protocol: a well-defined plan for future implementation of quality change(s) (for example, manufacturing-related changes, change of analytical method or site transfer). Also referred to as “post-approval change management protocol” in other documents. A comparability protocol establishes the tests to be performed and acceptable limits to be achieved to demonstrate the comparability of pre-change and post-change products following specific quality change(s).

Container closure system: refers to the following components:

- A primary container closure system is a packaging component that is in, or may come into, direct contact with the drug product dosage form (for example, vial or pre-filled syringe) or components that contribute to the container/closure integrity of the primary packaging material for a sterile product.
- A secondary container closure system is a packaging component that is not, and will not be, in direct contact with the dosage form (for example, carton or tray).
- A functional secondary container closure system is a packaging material that is not in direct contact with the product and that provides additional protection or serves to deliver the product.

Control strategy: a planned set of controls derived from current product and process understanding that ensures process performance and product quality. The controls can include parameters and attributes related to drug substance and drug product materials and components, facility and equipment operating conditions, in-process controls, finished product specifications, and the associated methods and frequency of monitoring and control.

Critical quality attribute: a physical, chemical, biological or microbiological property or characteristic that is selected for its ability to indicate the consistent quality of the product within an appropriate limit, range or distribution to ensure the desired product quality.

Design space: the multidimensional combination and interaction of input variables (for example, material attributes) and process parameters that have been demonstrated to provide assurance of quality.

Dosage form: the physical form in which a pharmaceutical product is presented by the manufacturer (form of presentation) and the form in which it is administered (form of administration). Also referred to as “pharmaceutical form” in other documents.

Drug product: a pharmaceutical product type in a defined container closure system that contains a drug substance, generally in association with excipients.

Drug substance: the active pharmaceutical ingredient and associated molecules that may be subsequently formulated to produce the drug product.

Excipient: any component of the drug product, other than the active component/drug substance and the packaging material, generally added during formulation. Also referred to as “inactive ingredient” in other documents.

Final batch: a collection of sealed final containers that is homogeneous with respect to the composition of the product. A final batch must have been filled in one continuous working session.

Formulated bulk: an intermediate in the drug product manufacturing process, consisting of the final formulation of drug substance and excipients at the concentration to be filled into primary containers.

In-process control: checks performed during manufacture to monitor or to adjust the process in order to ensure that the intermediate or final product conforms to its specifications. The control of the production environment or equipment may also be regarded as part of in-process control.

Intermediate: a material produced during steps in the manufacture of a biotherapeutic product that undergoes further processing before it becomes the drug product. See also the definition for Drug substance.

Manufacturer: any person or legal entity engaged in the manufacture of a product subject to marketing authorization or licensure. In other documents, “manufacturer” may also refer to any person or legal entity that is an applicant or holder of a marketing authorization or product license where the applicant assumes responsibility for compliance with the applicable product and establishment standards. See also the definition for Marketing authorization holder.

Marketing authorization: a formal authorization for a medicine to be marketed. Once an NRA approves a marketing authorization application for a new medicine, the medicine may be marketed and may be available to be prescribed by physicians. Also referred to as “product license” or “license” in this and other documents.

Marketing authorization application: a formal application to the authority for approval to market a new medicine. The purpose of the marketing authorization application is to

determine whether the medicine meets the statutory standards for safety, efficacy, product labelling information and manufacturing. Also referred to as “product license application” or “license application” in this and other documents.

Marketing authorization holder: any person or legal entity that has received a marketing authorization or license to manufacture and/or distribute to the marketing authorization or license.

Master cell bank (MCB): an aliquot of a single pool of cells which generally has been prepared from the selected cell clone under defined conditions, dispensed into multiple containers and stored under defined conditions.

Primary packaging site: site involved in the activity of putting a drug in its primary container which is, or may be, in direct contact with the dosage form.

Process validation: documented evidence which provides a high degree of assurance that a specific process will consistently result in a product that meets its predetermined specifications and quality characteristics.

Product labelling information: refers to printed materials that accompany a prescription medicine and all labelling items, namely:

- prescribing information (an instruction circular that provides product information on indication, dosage and administration, safety and efficacy, contraindications, warnings and a description of the product for health-care providers (also referred to as “summary of product characteristics” or “package insert” in various countries);
- patient labelling or consumer information;
- inner label or container label;
- outer label or carton.

Quality attribute: a physical, chemical, biological or microbiological property or characteristic.

Quality change: a change in the manufacturing process, product composition, quality control testing, equipment or facility. Also referred to as “chemistry manufacturing and control (CMC) change” in other documents.

Raw materials: a general term used to denote the culture media components, reagents or solvents intended for use in the production of starting material, drug substance, intermediates or drug products.

Real-time release testing: testing that provides the ability to evaluate and ensure the quality of in-process and/or final product based on process data, which typically include a valid combination of measured material attributes and process controls.

Reference standards/materials: well-characterized materials used as references against which batches of biological products are assessed. These materials remain fundamental to ensuring the quality of biological products as well as the consistency of production, and are essential for the establishment of appropriate clinical dosing.

Safety and efficacy change: a change that has an impact on the clinical use of the biotherapeutic product in relation to safety, efficacy, dosage and administration, and that requires data from clinical or post-marketing studies, and in some instances clinically relevant nonclinical studies, to support the change.

Secondary packaging facility: site involved in packaging activities using a packaging component that is not, and will not be, in direct contact with the dosage form (for example, putting the primary container in the outer container or affixing labels).

Shelf-life: the period of time during which a drug substance or drug product, if stored under the conditions defined on the container label, is expected to comply with the specification, as determined by stability studies on a number of batches of the product. The expiry date is assigned to each batch by adding the shelf-life period to the date of manufacture.

Similar biotherapeutic product (SBP): a biotherapeutic product that is similar in terms of quality, safety and efficacy to an already licensed reference biotherapeutic product, and which was developed and approved on the basis of the principles outlined in relevant WHO guidelines.

Source material/starting material: material from a biological source that marks the beginning of the manufacturing process of a drug as described in a marketing authorization or license application and from which the active ingredient is derived either directly (for

example, plasma derivatives, ascitic fluid or bovine lung) or indirectly (for example, cell substrates, host/vector production cells, eggs or viral strains).

Specification: a list of tests, references to analytical procedures and appropriate acceptance criteria which are numerical limits, ranges or other criteria for the tests described. Specifications are critical quality standards that are proposed and justified by the manufacturer and approved by the regulatory authorities.

Supplement: a written request submitted to the NRA to approve a change in the original application for the marketing authorization (or product licence) or any other notification to add to (that is, to supplement) the information in the original marketing authorization or product license file. A prior approval supplement (PAS) is a supplement requiring approval from the NRA prior to implementation of the change. Also referred to as “change application dossier” in other documents.

Validation: the demonstration, with documentary evidence, that any procedure, process, equipment, material, activity or system will consistently produce a result meeting predetermined acceptance criteria.

Working cell bank (WCB): the working cell bank is prepared from aliquots of a homogeneous suspension of cells obtained from culturing the master cell bank under defined culture conditions.

4. General considerations

Changes to approved biotherapeutic products or SBPs are categorized on the basis of a risk analysis which takes into consideration the complexity of the production process and product, the patient population and the proposed changes. When a change affects the manufacturing or the control strategy, the assessment should include evaluation of the impact of the change on quality (i.e., identity, strength, purity and potency) as it may relate to the safety and/or efficacy of the product. When a change affects the clinical use of a product or of product labelling information, this assessment should include evaluation of the effect of the change on the safety and efficacy of the product.

Prior to implementing a change with a potential impact on quality, the marketing authorization holder (MAH) should demonstrate through appropriate studies (analytical testing, functional assays and, if needed, clinical and/or nonclinical studies) that the pre-change and post-change products are comparable in terms of quality, safety and efficacy.

For each change, the MAH should decide if the information in the original marketing authorization or product license needs to be supplemented (that is, requires an official submission of a supplement to the authority) based on the recommendations provided in this Guideline. Supplements requiring approval by the authority prior to the implementation of a change – that is, for changes that potentially have **a major or moderate impact** – are referred to as prior approval supplements (PASs) and must be submitted in advance to the authority. For supplements that do not require approval prior to implementation – that is, for changes that potentially have **a minor impact** on product quality – the authority should be notified following implementation of the change.

For each change, the supplement should contain information developed by the MAH to allow the authority to assess the effects of the change. All changes, regardless of their impact on quality, safety and efficacy, should be recorded and retained by the manufacturer or MAH in accordance with document retention procedure and GMP requirements.

For manufacturing changes not specifically described in this Guideline, the MAH is encouraged to use scientific judgement, leverage competent regulatory authority guidance or to contact the authority to determine the potential impact of the change on quality, safety and efficacy in order to discuss the appropriate reporting category.

Assessment of the extent to which a quality change (also referred to as a manufacturing change) affects the quality attributes of the product is generally accomplished by comparing manufacturing steps and test results from in-process, release, and characterization testing of the pre-change product (for example, using historical data) with those of the post-change product. It can then be determined if the test results are comparable – that is, if the drug substance, intermediate or drug product made after the change is comparable to, and/or meets the predefined acceptance criteria of, the drug substance or drug product made before the change. Where minor differences in quality are identified, these may be considered

acceptable provided that they are shown not to have an adverse impact on the quality, safety or efficacy of the product. In some cases, additional supporting data may be required.

A marketing authorization holder or manufacturer making a change to an approved biotherapeutic product should also conform to other applicable laws and regulations, including good manufacturing practices (GMP), good laboratory practices (GLP) and good clinical practices (GCPs). MAHs and drug substance/product manufacturers should also comply with relevant GMP validation and record-keeping requirements and should ensure that relevant records are readily available for examination by authorized authority personnel during inspections. For example, changes in equipment used in the manufacturing process generally require installation qualifications (IQs), operational qualifications (OQs) and performance qualifications (PQs). This information does not need to be included in a PAS for equipment changes but is part of GMP requirements and should be available during inspections. Inspections (on-site or paper-based) may occur routinely or may be required during submission review of a PAS for a major manufacturing change such as a move to a new facility.

Certain major changes, such as changes to the molecule (for example, changing amino acid sequence or conjugating to PEG moieties) will lead to a new molecular entity and are not considered as post-approval changes. For these changes, submission of a product license application for a new marketing authorization may be required. The Authority will also consider a change in the quantity of drug substance per dose of biotherapeutic product as a new and requires new product market authorization application for marketing authorization.

To ensure product supply and encourage adequate reporting of changes by manufacturers, the authority will establish procedures for the concurrent (that is, parallel) review of changes to the product. The manufacturing of biotherapeutic products requires, for example, the replenishment of biological starting materials such as WCBs and secondary/working reference standards which are considered as routine changes. Consequently, these changes often need to be reviewed concurrently with other manufacturing or safety and efficacy changes. Conversely, clinical safety and efficacy changes, such as the addition of a new indication or new age group for the use of a biotherapeutic product, require considerable

supporting data including clinical studies; thus, review time should not impact the review of unrelated manufacturing changes or the immediate implementation of urgent changes to product labelling information. However, multiple related changes, or those supported by the same information, may be submitted in the same supplement.

In this Guideline, descriptions of the reporting categories for quality changes are provided in section 6, and the reporting categories for information changes on safety, efficacy and product labelling are provided in section 7. Proposed regulatory procedures for the reporting of changes to the authority are described in section 8. Examples of suggested review timelines for changes in the various categories are given in Annex 1. A comprehensive list of quality changes and the type of information that should be included in a supplement application are provided in Annex 2 (for the drug substance and intermediates) and in Annex 3 (for the drug product). Examples of changes that affect clinical use of a product and product labelling information (on safety, efficacy, dosage, administration and product components) are provided in Annex 4.

5. Special considerations

5.1. Comparability exercise

The need for – and extent of – a comparability exercise depends upon the potential impact of the change(s) on the quality, safety and efficacy of the product. Comparability exercises can range from analytical testing alone (for example, where process changes have no impact on any quality attribute) to a comprehensive exercise requiring nonclinical and clinical bridging studies. For example, a change in the culture conditions or in the purification process may cause the alteration of the glycosylation profile of the product, including site directed glycosylation. Alteration of glycosylation profiles may cause a change in the pharmacokinetic/pharmacodynamic (PK/PD) profile of the product. If comparability can be demonstrated through analytical studies alone, nonclinical or clinical studies with the post change product are not necessary. However, where the relationship between specific quality attributes and safety and efficacy has not been established, and/ or differences are observed between some critical quality attributes of the pre-change and post-change product, it may be

necessary to include a combination of quality, nonclinical and/or clinical studies in the comparability exercise.

5.2. Bridging studies

Nonclinical and clinical bridging studies are studies in which a parameter of interest (such as a manufacturing process or formulation) is directly compared with a changed version of that parameter with respect to the effect of the change on the product's clinical performance. If the physicochemical properties, biological activity, purity and/or level of impurities of the pre-change and post-change product are comparable, the safety and efficacy of the biotherapeutic product can be inferred. However, nonclinical and/or clinical bridging studies may be required when analytical data alone either do not establish comparability or are insufficient to do so. The comparison of efficacy responses and safety outcomes (for example, PK/PD profile, or rates of common adverse events and serious adverse events) is often the primary objective. For ethical reasons, it is desirable to apply the 3R principles (Replacement, Reduction, Refinement) to the use of animals where scientifically appropriate. The following are examples of changes that are likely to require nonclinical and/or clinical bridging studies: (a) generation of a new MCB derived from a different host cell line; (b) a new dosage form; (c) a new formulation (for example, a new excipient); (d) a new presentation (for example, addition of pre-filled pens to vials); (e) a new route of administration; and (f) a new dosing schedule. For these and comparable changes, any proposed use of alternative approaches to a bridging study must be justified.

5.3. Similar biotherapeutic products

Following approval, an SBP is considered to be independent from the reference product and has its own life-cycle. The manufacturer is not required to re-establish similarity to the reference product when comparability exercises are conducted.

A major change in clinical use for an SBP that relies on the previously demonstrated similarity provided in the original approval of the SBP may be considered by the authority on a case-by-case basis. For example, a new indication given to the reference product after approval of an SBP should not automatically be given to the SBP. However, when new safety information on the reference product is added after the original approval of the SBP,

the labelling information changes of the SBP should follow the changes made for the reference product unless it can be demonstrated that the new information on the reference product is not relevant to the SBP.

6. Reporting categories for quality changes

On the basis of the potential effect of the quality change (for example, manufacturing change) on the quality attributes (that is, identity, strength, purity and potency) of the biotherapeutic product, and on the potential impacts of this on the safety or efficacy of the product, a change should be categorized as:

- a major quality change
- a moderate quality change
- a minor quality change, or
- a quality change with no impact.

The implementation of changes in the major or moderate categories must be reported to the authority in order to supplement the information in the original marketing authorization or product license. Major and moderate quality changes should be reviewed and approved by the authority prior to implementation of the change (that is, prior to distribution of the post-change product).

Quality changes that are expected to have minimal potential impact, or to have no impact on the quality, safety or efficacy of the biotherapeutic product, do not require submission of a PAS. The changes included in these categories may be implemented by the marketing authorization holder without prior review and approval by the authority. However, quality changes with minimal potential to have an impact should be notified to the authority within the timeline indicated in Annex 1 following implementation.

For each approved product, the marketing authorization holder or manufacturer should maintain a comprehensive chronological list of all quality changes, including minor quality changes. Additionally, this list should include a description of the quality changes, including the manufacturing site(s) or area(s) involved, the date each change was made, and references to relevant validations and standard operating procedures. All data supporting minor quality

changes, as listed in Annexes 2 and 3 below, should be available on request to the authority or during inspections.

Further information on each category of change is given below in sections 6.1–6.4, with Annexes 2 and 3 providing a comprehensive list of major, moderate and minor quality changes, and the information required to support each change. The quality changes listed in Annexes 2 and 3 should be reported or recorded in the appropriate categories, as recommended in this section and in the appendices. If a quality change may potentially have an impact on the quality, safety and efficacy of the biotherapeutic product, but is not included in Annexes 2 or 3, the authority may be consulted for the correct classification. When procedures and timelines for such consultations are not in place, manufacturers should determine the classification of the change on the basis of a change-specific risk assessment using the principles and examples provided in this Guideline.

6.1. Major quality changes

Major quality changes are changes to the product composition, manufacturing process, quality controls, facilities or equipment that have significant potential to have an impact on the quality, safety or efficacy of the biotherapeutic product or SBP. The MAH should submit a PAS and receive a notification of approval from the authority before implementing the change (as noted in Annex 1).

For a change in this category, the PAS should specify the products concerned and should include a detailed description of the proposed change. Additional supporting information is needed for the drug substance (as noted in Annex 2) and for the drug product (as noted in Annex 3) and could include: (a) information on the methods used and studies performed to evaluate the effect of the change on the product's quality attributes; (b) the data derived from those studies; (c) relevant validation protocols and results; and (d) updated product labelling information. In some cases, major quality changes may also require nonclinical and/or clinical data. Relevant considerations on the data required can be found in the authority Guidelines on the quality, safety and efficacy of biotherapeutic protein products prepared by recombinant DNA technology.

6.2.Moderate quality changes

Moderate quality changes are changes to the product composition, manufacturing process, quality controls, facilities or equipment that have a moderate potential to have an impact on the quality, safety or efficacy of the biotherapeutic product or SBP. The MAH should submit a PAS and receive a notification of approval from the authority before implementing the change. The requirements for the PAS for moderate quality changes are the same as those for major quality changes; however, the amount of supporting data required will generally be less than that required for major changes and the review timeline should be shorter.

6.3.Minor quality changes

Minor quality changes are changes to the product composition, manufacturing process, quality controls, facilities or equipment that have a minimal potential to have an impact on the quality, safety or efficacy of the biotherapeutic product or SBP. Changes in this category may be implemented by the marketing authorization holder without prior review by the authority. However, the authority should be notified of the changes within a specified timeline (see Annex 1). The justification and supporting documentation for minor quality changes are not needed for such notification but should be made available by the marketing authorization holder upon request from the authority.

When a minor quality change affects the lot release specifications (for example, narrowing of a specification, or compliance with pharmacopoeial changes) and affects the quality control testing as summarized in the lot release protocol, the marketing authorization holder should inform the institution responsible for reviewing the release of lots (see introductory sections in Annexes 2 and 3).

Minor quality changes that are related to a major or moderate change should be described in the supplement for the major or moderate quality change (see section 8.2 for additional details).

6.4.Quality changes with no impact

Quality changes that have no impact on product quality, safety or efficacy may be implemented by the marketing authorization holder without prior review by the authority.

Information on such changes must be retained as part of the manufacturer's GMP records or marketing authorization holder's product records, as applicable. These changes must comply with the applicable GMP requirements and must be available for review during GMP inspections. Examples of such changes include, but are not limited to:

- non-critical changes to the licensed application, including spelling corrections and editorial clarifications made to documents (such as validation summaries and/or reports, analytical procedures, standard operating procedures or production documentation summaries) that have no impact on the quality, safety and efficacy of the product;
- replacement of equipment with identical equipment;
- change in specifications for a compendial raw material, a compendial excipient or a compendial container closure component to comply with an updated pharmacopoeial standard/monograph;
- transfer of quality control testing activities to a different facility within a GMP-compliant site;
- with the exception of a potency assay or a bioassay, transfer of the quality control testing activities for a pharmacopoeial assay to a different facility within the same company;
- change in the in-process controls performed at non-critical manufacturing steps;
- addition of a new GMP-compliant storage warehouse for raw materials, master and working cell banks, and drug substance;
- installation of non-process-related equipment or rooms to improve the facility, such as warehousing refrigerators or freezers;
- addition of time point(s) into the post-approval stability protocol;
- deletion of time point(s) from the post-approval stability protocol beyond the approved shelf-life.

7. Reporting categories for safety, efficacy and/ or product labelling information changes

After assessing the effect of a change related to the clinical use of a product or to product labelling information on the safe and effective use of a biotherapeutic product, marketing authorization holders should classify this change as one of the following reporting categories:

- safety and efficacy change;
- product labelling information change;
- urgent product labelling information change; or
- administrative product labelling information change (in cases where prior approval before implementation is needed).

The product labelling information includes prescribing information (or package insert) for health-care providers or patients, outer label (that is, carton) and inner label (that is, container label). After approval, the marketing authorization holder should promptly revise all promotional and advertising items relating to the biotherapeutic product to make them consistent with implementation of the product labelling information change.

Further information on each category is provided below in sections 7.1–7.4. In addition, examples of efficacy, safety and product labelling information changes considered to be appropriate for each category are provided in Annex 4.

7.1.Safety and efficacy changes

Safety and efficacy changes are changes that have an impact on the clinical use of the biotherapeutic product in relation to safety, efficacy, dosage and administration. To support such changes, data are required from clinical studies and, in some cases, from clinically relevant nonclinical studies. Safety and efficacy changes also require supplement submission and approval prior to implementation of the change.

In general, safety and efficacy changes affect the product labelling information and have the potential to increase or decrease the exposure levels of the biotherapeutic product either by expanding the population that is exposed or by changing dosage or dosing. These changes may be related to clinical use of the biotherapeutic product, and can include:

- addition or expansion of a safety claim or efficacy claim, including expansion of the population that is exposed;
- change in the strength or route of administration;
- change in the recommended dose and/or dosing schedule;
- co-administration with other biotherapeutic products or medicines;
- deletion or reduction of existing risk-management measures (for example, contraindications, adverse events, warnings or cautionary text/statements in the product labelling information).

The type and scope of the required nonclinical and/or clinical safety and efficacy data are determined case by case on the basis of risk–benefit considerations related to the impact of the changes, the biotherapeutic product attributes and the disease that the biotherapeutic product is designed to prevent. Other considerations include:

- the nature of the disease treated (that is, morbidity and mortality, acute or chronic disease, current availability of disease therapy, and size and nature of patient population);
- safety considerations (for example, adverse drug reactions observed, adverse events in specific patient populations, management of adverse reactions and change in rates of adverse reactions);
- the availability of animal models.

Marketing authorization holders are encouraged to consult with the authority on the adequacy of the clinical and/or nonclinical data needed to support a safety and efficacy change, if deemed necessary. Additionally, some changes such as dosage form, content of excipients or residual components, or delivery device may require clinical data as well as revision of the product labelling information. The authority should be consulted on the data required to support such changes.

For nonclinical and clinical studies, the recommendations given in the Guideline on the quality, safety and efficacy of biotherapeutic protein products prepared by recombinant DNA technology should apply. Guidance on approaches to the nonclinical and clinical comparability exercise can also be found in guidelines on the evaluation of SBPs.

For a change under this category, the marketing authorization holder should submit a supplement to the authority that includes the following where applicable:

- a detailed description of – and rationale for – the proposed change;
- a summary of the methods used and studies performed to evaluate the effect of the change on the safety or efficacy of the biotherapeutic product;
- amended product labelling information;
- information on clinical studies (protocol, statistical analysis plan and clinical study report);
- information on clinical assay methods (standard operating procedures) and validations; and
- the pharmacovigilance plan.

7.2. Product labelling information changes

Product labelling information changes are changes to the labelling items that have the potential to improve the management of risk to the population for which use of the biotherapeutic product is currently approved through:

- the identification or characterization of any adverse event resulting in the addition or strengthening of risk-management measures for an adverse event considered to be consistent with a causal association with the biotherapeutic product concerned;
- the identification of subgroups for which the benefit-to-risk profile of the biotherapeutic product has the potential to be less favourable; and
- the addition or strengthening of risk-management measures, including instructions on dosing or any other conditions of use.

Product labelling information changes require the filing of a PAS and a notification of approval from the authority prior to distribution of the product. Supplements for product labelling information changes related to the clinical use of a product often require data from pharmacovigilance reports (that is, periodic safety update reports). Changes supported by large clinical or nonclinical studies are usually not considered as product labelling information changes but as safety and efficacy changes.

For a change under this category, the marketing authorization holder should submit to the authority a PAS that includes the following where applicable:

- a detailed description of – and rationale for – the proposed change;
- pharmacovigilance reports and statistical analysis of results; and
- amended product labelling information.

7.3.Urgent product labelling information changes

Urgent product labelling information changes are changes to the labelling items that need to be implemented in an expedited manner in order to mitigate a potential risk to the population in which the biotherapeutic product is currently approved for use. Marketing authorization holders should consult with the authority and agree on the required supporting documentation and time frames for the labelling changes or the need for a Dear Health-Care Professional Letter (that is, a formal letter from a manufacturer to health-care professionals) to convey the information prior to the submission of the supplement(s).

7.4.Administrative product labelling information changes

Administrative product labelling information changes are changes that are not expected to affect the safe and efficacious use of the biotherapeutic product. In some cases, these changes may require reporting to the authority and receipt of approval prior to implementation, while in other cases reporting may not be required.

- Examples of product labelling information changes that require approval by the authority prior to implementation are changes in the proper/nonproprietary name or trade name of the biotherapeutic product. Changes in this category are considered important for reasons of liability and monitoring.
- Examples of product labelling information changes that do not require approval by the authority prior to implementation are administrative changes such as those related to labelling (for example, minor changes in format without any negative effect on readability). These changes should be reported to the authority as part of a subsequent PAS for safety and efficacy changes or product labelling information changes when updated product labelling information is included.

Manufacturers are encouraged to consult with the authority regarding the appropriate reporting category for labelling changes to approved products.

8. Procedures

The authority should establish written instructions regarding submission procedures and timelines (with action dates) for consultation by marketing authorization holders as they prepare to submit a supplement for a change. These instructions should cover: (a) the identification of emergency use; (b) expanded access; and (c) expedited and/or priority review, timelines and procedures for life-saving medications to address an unmet need. As supplements for a major quality change or an efficacy and safety change require extensive documentation and data, the review times should be longer than those for supplements for moderate quality changes or product labelling information changes. Furthermore, the authority may establish different timelines for the review of major quality changes that do not require clinical data as compared with safety and efficacy changes that do require clinical data. Annex 1 provides different regulatory categories and their review timelines.

If a change is not included in Annexes 2, 3 or 4, marketing authorization holders are encouraged to use scientific judgement, leverage competent regulatory authority guidance or to contact the authority to determine the appropriate category of a supplement prior to submission of the information in support of a change. Similarly, MAHs should consult the authority for major changes that require the inclusion of a GMP certificate and which may trigger a pre-submission inspection, or that may require clinical and/or nonclinical data to support a change in safety and efficacy or in product labelling information.

To assist in the acceptance of submissions for review, the covering letter or the Module 1 documentation of the Common Technical Document accompanying a supplement for a quality change should clearly specify the selected category by labelling the submission as either a major quality change or a moderate quality change.

The covering letter accompanying a supplement for a safety, efficacy or product labelling information change should specify that the change is being reported in the selected category by labelling the submission as:

- a safety and efficacy change;
- a product labelling information change;
- an urgent product labelling information change; or
- an administrative product labelling information change (in cases where prior approval is needed before implementation).

Major quality change supplements that contain both quality data and revised product labelling information but no clinical and/or nonclinical data should be labelled “**Major quality change and Product labelling information change**” and the covering letter should specify that the submission includes both quality changes and revised product labelling information items.

Major quality change supplements that contain quality, safety and efficacy data (from clinical studies and/or clinically relevant nonclinical studies) and revised product labelling information, should be labelled “**Major quality change and Safety and efficacy change**” and the covering letter should specify that the submission includes quality changes, results from clinical and/or nonclinical studies, and revised product labelling information items.

Each supplement should include a list of all the changes contained in the submission. The list should describe each change in sufficient detail to allow the authority to determine quickly whether the appropriate reporting category has been used. If the submission has been inappropriately classified, the MAH should be notified. Minor quality changes that are related/consequential to moderate or major quality changes should be described in the PAS. In addition, any minor changes that have been implemented should be annotated in the affected documents (for example, Common Technical Document sections) and reported in any future filing to the NRA. For example, a minor change such as narrowing of a specification should be included in a supplement for a moderate or major change which includes updated quality control release information.

Multiple changes

Multiple related changes, involving various combinations of individual changes, may be submitted in the same supplement. For example, a manufacturing site change may also involve changes to the equipment and manufacturing process. For submissions that include multiple

changes, the marketing authorization holder should clearly specify which data support each change.

Multiple major or moderate quality changes for the same product may be filed in a single submission provided that the changes are related and/or supported by the same information. Minor quality changes that were implemented previously and that are related and/or consequential to a moderate or major quality change should be described in the PAS for the moderate or major quality change. If the proposed changes are related, the marketing authorization holder should indicate the association between them. The marketing authorization holder should also clearly specify which supporting data support which change. Such changes could affect both the drug substance and the drug product. If too many changes are filed within the same submission, or if major issues are identified with a change and extensive time would be required to review them, the authority may ask the marketing authorization holder to divide the changes into separate submissions and to resubmit the file. If the recommended reporting categories for the individual changes differ, the submission should be in accordance with the most restrictive of the categories recommended for the individual changes. In the case of numerous changes of the same category, the authority may reclassify the submission to the next higher level on the basis of the potential impact of the totality of the changes on the quality, safety and efficacy of the biotherapeutic product or SBP. This reclassification should be communicated to the marketing authorization holder at the start of the assessment.

8.1.Procedures for prior approval supplements

The procedures in this section apply to all changes requiring approval prior to implementation: namely, major and moderate quality changes, safety and efficacy changes, product labelling information changes, urgent product labelling information changes and selected administrative product labelling information changes. The following items should be included, where applicable, in the supplement submission for post-approval changes:

- a covering letter that includes:
 - ✓ the type of submission (for example, major quality change, moderate quality change or safety and efficacy change),

- ✓ a list of the change(s) and a rationale for the change(s) with sufficient detail (including a justification for the selected reporting category) to allow for processing and reviewer assignments by the authority,
 - ✓ an indication of the general type of supporting data, and
 - ✓ cross-referenced information (including product name, marketing authorization holder's name, submission type and date of submission/approval);
- completed documents or forms based on the authority requirements, such as a medicine submission application form, signed and dated;
 - the anticipated date for implementation of the change (recognizing that in some cases the implementation of the change may be delayed after approval to allow for depletion of the previously approved biotherapeutic or to allow for global staggered approval depending on supply/demand);
 - GMP information (for example, inspection history and/or evidence of GMP compliance rating by experienced NRAs), as applicable;
 - when relevant, a side-by-side comparison showing the differences between the approved manufacturing process (including quality control tests) and the proposed one(s);
 - when relevant, clinical and/or nonclinical study reports, pharmacovigilance reports, and annotated and clean drafts of product labelling information.

In addition to the above general information, the specific information required to support the various quality changes is outlined in Annexes 2 and 3. It should be noted that the general information is not repeated under each of the various changes outlined in the annexes. All data recommended to support a change should be provided with the submission, in addition to the general information as appropriate. If recommended supporting data are not submitted, a detailed rationale should be provided to explain why.

If the same change is applicable to multiple products, a separate submission is generally required for each product – though the data may be cross-referenced. The authority may in some cases allow a common change to be bundled into one submission for multiple products. When cross-references are made to information that has been submitted previously, details of the cross-referenced information should be provided in the covering letter.

An applicant should submit application file in electronically through eRIS system based on the requirements of the authority. The data submitted should be well organized and should be provided in the format defined by the authority. After the authority completes the review of the supporting data in a supplement, the following outcomes are possible:

- If the authority determines that the information submitted in a supplement supports the quality, safety and efficacy of the product manufactured with the change, EFDA will issue a written notification of approval stating that the change can be implemented, and the product manufactured with the change can be distributed.
- If the authority determines that the information submitted in a supplement fails to support the quality, safety or efficacy of the product manufactured with the change, the EFDA will issue a written request notification for additional documentation, information and clarification to be submitted by the MAH. If the identified deficiencies are minor, they may be addressed without stopping the review process. If the deficiencies are major or are not resolved during the allotted review period following rounds of questions and requests for more information, the authority may decide to issue a written notification of noncompliance, as a result of which the review process is stopped, the change may not be implemented and the product manufactured with the change may not be distributed. In the case of a notification of noncompliance being issued, the following outcomes are possible:
 - ✓ If the marketing authorization holder's response document to the notification of noncompliance is adequate and all identified deficiencies are resolved in a satisfactory manner, the authority will issue a written notification of approval stating that the change can be implemented and the product manufactured with the change can be distributed.
 - ✓ If the information in the marketing authorization holder's response document to the notification of noncompliance is not adequate and not all identified deficiencies are resolved in a satisfactory manner, the authority will issue a written notification of rejection stating that the change cannot be implemented and the product manufactured with the change cannot be distributed.

When the marketing authorization holder don't agree with the decision of the authority in handling of such noncompliance, the MAH may follow the compliant and appeal procedures established for resolving such disagreement. Such procedures should allow the marketing authorization holder to request re-evaluation of the submitted application in case the application is initially rejected by the authority.

The authority may consider the use of a "comparability protocol" when a marketing authorization holder submits changes:

Comparability protocol

A comparability protocol (also referred to as "post-approval change management protocol" in other documents) establishes a framework for a well-defined plan for future implementation of a quality change. This will include the tests to be done and acceptable limits to be achieved when assessing the effect of specific changes on the quality, safety or efficacy of a biotechnological product or SBP. For some changes, the routine quality tests performed to release the drug substance or drug product are not considered sufficient for assessing the impact of the change, and additional in-process tests and characterization tests may be needed. Comparability protocols are often used for the routine replenishment of WCBs and reference standards used in quality control tests when the remaining aliquots of reference standards expire or diminish.

The purpose of a comparability protocol is to provide transparency in the data requirements for changes and increase the predictability of the effects of changes. This allows for the more expedient distribution of a product by permitting the marketing authorization holder to submit a protocol for a change which, if approved, may justify a reduced reporting category for the change when the comparability data are obtained and the change is implemented. Comparability protocol can be provided in the original submission. Otherwise, a new comparability protocol, or a change to an existing one, requires submission of a supplement and approval prior to implementation because it may result in a lower reporting category for the changes covered in the comparability protocol once the actual comparability data are submitted. The change in reporting category for a change covered by a comparability protocol and the supporting data to be generated should be established by the authority at the time the comparability protocol is approved. For a minor quality change that results from the execution of a comparability protocol,

the change should be notified to the authority immediately after implementation. For some marketing authorization holders with multiple related products and facilities, an expanded change protocol can be proposed. The scope of an expanded change protocol may cover multiple related products or manufacturing changes (for example, facility changes).

Production documents

Production documents (that is, executed batch records) are not generally required to support changes to the marketing authorization dossier or product license. However, such documents may be requested during review and should be made available to the authority on request. These documents should be retained in accordance with GMP and should be available during inspections.

8.2.Procedures for minor quality changes and quality changes with no impact

Implementation of minor quality changes does not require prior approval from the authority but should be notified to the EFDA.

Supporting data should not be provided with the notification unless it may help in justifying the reporting category. However, as recommended in Annexes 2 and 3 below, the minor quality changes should be recorded or compiled with related supporting data generated by the manufacturer in a document or file dedicated to minor changes. The documents or files for all minor quality changes should be available to the authority on request or during inspection.

EFDA may audit minor quality changes by requesting and reviewing the supporting data, as deemed appropriate during an inspection or review of related changes. If the classification of a change or the supporting data are not considered to be acceptable then the marketing authorization holder may be requested to file a supplement for a major or moderate quality change.

Minor quality changes that have previously been implemented and are related and/or consequential to a major or moderate quality change should be described in the relevant parts of the documentation when submitting a PAS for the major or moderate change. As for all minor

quality changes, the supporting data for these changes do not need to be included in the supplement but should be retained by the manufacturer.

Changes that have no impact on the quality, safety and efficacy of the product are not reported, but if the authority determines (during an inspection or a review of related changes) that the information for the change fails to demonstrate the continued safety or efficacy of the product manufactured using the changes, the authority may work to resolve the problem with the marketing authorization holder. If the authority finds that the product in distribution poses a danger to public health, or if it determines that there are unresolved issues, it may require the marketing authorization holder to cease distribution of the product manufactured using the changes or to remove the product from distribution pending resolution of the issues related to the changes.

8.3.Procedures for urgent product labelling information changes

For urgent changes to product labelling information which address safety updates and have the potential to have an impact on public health (for example, addition of a contraindication or a warning), the authority will follow expedited review and approval procedure. The implementation of such changes on a case-by-case basis. Such expedited procedures would contribute to the dissemination of the most current information to health-care providers and would help to mitigate discrepancies between the labels used in the various countries and posted on websites.

8.4.Procedures for administrative product labelling information changes

Depending on the scope of the change, administrative product labelling information changes may require approval prior to implementation. For example, changes in the proper/nonproprietary name or trade name of the biotherapeutic product require approval before implementation, while minor formatting changes do not.

For an administrative product labelling information change that requires approval prior to implementation, the marketing authorization holder should submit a supplement containing background information on the change and annotated and clean drafts of the product labelling information.

Administrative product labelling information changes that do not need prior approval and that have been implemented since the last approved product labelling information should be included when submitting a subsequent PAS for safety and efficacy changes or for product labelling information changes. In these cases, the product labelling information should be annotated when filing the next PAS to indicate the new changes and those administrative changes that have been implemented since the last approval.

Annex 1: Reporting categories and suggested review timelines

The review timelines are established taking into consideration the capability of the authority, the impact of the change and the amount of data required to support the change. The review time frames for major changes should be longer than those for moderate changes. The review times in the table below are based on the experience of several NRAs and apply to situations where the authority performs a full review or assessment of the supplement. The review time would start when the supplement has been accepted for review and found to be complete, and would end at the time when the initial assessment is shared with the marketing authorization holder by the issuance of either a notification of approval or a notification of noncompliance with a list of comments and deficiencies. In case of the latter, the marketing authorization holder may seek approval for the change by submitting an amendment to the supplement with responses to all the comments in the notification of noncompliance.

The authority will indicate the timelines for the secondary review cycle following the receipt of responses from the marketing authorization holder. If minor deficiencies are identified during the initial review cycle, the authority may communicate these to the marketing authorization holder without stopping the review clock in order to try to finalize the assessment within the established timeline.

Expedited implementation procedures will be in place for dealing with product labelling information changes which address urgent safety issues.

Reporting categories for post-approval changes and suggested review timelines

Quality Change		
Reporting category	Procedure	Review timeline
Major quality changes	PAS	3–6 months
Moderate quality changes	PAS	1–3 months
Minor quality changes	Require notification to the authority ^{a, b}	N/A
Quality changes with no impact	Do not require notification	N/A

to the NRA

Safety, efficacy and product labelling information changes		
Reporting category	Procedure	Suggested review timeline
Safety and efficacy changes	PAS	3-6 months
Product labelling information changes	PAS	1-3 months
Urgent product labelling information changes ^c	PAS for urgent safety restrictions	Immediate implementation on receipt of supplement by the authority
Administrative product labelling information changes	PAS	30 days
	Do not require approval prior to implementation ^d	N/A

^a The authority is responsible for determining the timeline for reporting the notification (for example, annually). However, the authority should establish a mechanism to ensure that notifications are received no later than one-year post-implementation. In a case where a minor quality change results from the use of a comparability protocol, the change should be notified to the authority immediately after implementation.

^b Minor quality changes impacting the registered details may be bundled with moderate or major quality changes, if needed.

^c Urgent product labelling information changes are applicable only to label changes which address urgent safety updates or have the potential to have an impact on public health, with immediate implementation allowed after prior agreement between authority and marketing authorization holders.

^d Administrative product labelling information changes that do not require approval prior to implementation and that have been implemented since the last approved product labelling information change should be reported by including all changes in subsequent PAS for safety and efficacy changes or product labelling information changes when updated product labelling information is included.

The authority that procure biotherapeutic products from countries other than their own are encouraged to establish alternative accelerated timelines for changes that have previously been approved by the other recognize National Regulatory Authorities. On the basis of the regulatory pathway options provided in section 8, the following examples of accelerated timelines could be established:

- *The authority recognizes the decision of other regulatory authorities and does not perform a review of supporting data but is informed of the change. Using this approach, EFDA could allow changes to be implemented immediately after receipt of the change notification.*
- *The authority performs an assessment of the decision of the NRA of the licensing country to determine if recognition of the latter NRA's decision is appropriate. Using this approach, the authority could establish abbreviated review timelines – such as 2 months for major quality changes, 4 months for safety and efficacy changes, and immediate implementation on receipt of the change notification for moderate quality changes and product labelling information changes.*
- *The authority performs a partial review and evaluation of a complete supporting data package, as originally submitted to the licensing country. Using this approach, timelines would be expected to be shorter than the timelines described in the above table.*

Annex 2: Changes to the drug substance

The examples presented in this annex are intended to assist with the classification of changes made to the quality information for the drug substance. The information summarized in the table below provides guidance on:

- the conditions to be fulfilled for a given change to be classified as major, moderate or minor (if any of the conditions outlined for a given change are not fulfilled, the change is automatically considered to be at the next higher reporting category – for example, if any conditions recommended for a moderate quality change are not fulfilled, the change is considered to be a major quality change);
- the supporting data for a given change, either to be submitted to the authority or maintained by the marketing authorization holder (if any of the supporting data outlined for a given change are not provided, are different or are not considered applicable, adequate scientific justification should be provided); and
- the reporting category (major, moderate or minor quality change).

Marketing authorization holders should use scientific judgement, leverage competent regulatory authority guidance or contact the authority if a change is not included in the table and has the potential to impact on product quality. Marketing authorization holders should also contact the authority when a change is considered at the next higher reporting category because any of the conditions outlined are not fulfilled and where the supporting data are not described. Supporting data should be provided according to the submission format accepted by the authority.

Quality changes to comply with updated compendia and/or pharmacopoeias

The Authority is making a list of the recognized compendia and/or pharmacopoeias. Manufacturers are expected to comply with the current versions of compendia/ pharmacopoeias, as referenced in the approved marketing authorization. Changes linked to a change in the compendial/pharmacopoeial methods or specifications for a drug substance do not need to be submitted for review if reference is made to the current edition of the compendium or pharmacopoeia, but the changes should be notified to the authority with information on them available for inspection.

In some cases, changes introduced to comply with recognized compendia/ pharmacopoeias may require approval by the authority prior to implementation regardless of the timing of the change in relation to the date when the compendium/pharmacopoeia was updated. For example, supplement submission and approval by the authority may be required for some changes to quality control tests performed for product release (for example, to potency tests), for changes that have an impact on any product labelling information items, and for changes that may affect the quality, safety or efficacy of the product.

Quality changes affecting lot release

Where post-approval changes to the drug substance affect the lot release protocol (for example, changes to test procedures, reference standards or laboratory sites) or sample testing requirements for lot release, the marketing authorization holder should inform the institution responsible for reviewing the release of product lots. These procedures apply to changes that have been authorized by the authority in the case of major and moderate quality changes and to changes that have been implemented in the case of minor quality changes. For example, the qualification of a new lot of reference standard against the approved reference standard may be considered a minor quality change if the qualification of a new standard is performed in accordance with an approved protocol and specification. Nevertheless, these changes must be reported to the authority.

Manufacturer			
Description of change	Conditions to be fulfilled	Supporting data	Reporting category
1. Change to a drug substance manufacturing facility:			
Note: For the purpose of this change, manufacturing refers to unit operations in the manufacturing process of the drug substance and is not intended to refer to quality control testing, storage or transportation.			
a. Replacement or addition of a manufacturing facility for the bulk drug substance or any intermediate	None	1–4, 6–8	Major
	1–3	1–8	Moderate

b. Conversion of a drug substance manufacturing facility from single-product to multi-product	4, 9,	10	Moderate
c. Deletion of a manufacturing facility or manufacturer of an intermediate drug substance, or bulk	5, 6	None	Minor

Conditions

1. The proposed facility is an approved drug substance facility for bioterapeutics (for the same company/marketing authorization holder).
2. Any changes to the manufacturing process and/or controls are considered either moderate or minor (for example, duplication of product line).
3. The new facility/suite is under the same quality assurance/quality control oversight.
4. The proposed change does not involve additional containment requirements.
5. There should remain at least one site/manufacturer, as previously authorized, performing the same function as the one(s) to be deleted.
6. The deletion should not be due to critical deficiencies in manufacturing (for example, recurrent out-of-specification events, environmental monitoring failures, etc.).

Supporting data

1. Evidence of GMP compliance of the facility.
2. Name, address and responsibilities (for example, fermentation, purification) of the proposed facility.
3. Summary of the process validation studies and results.
4. Comparability of the pre-change and post-change drug substance with respect to physicochemical properties, biological activity, purity, impurities and contaminants, as appropriate. Nonclinical and/or clinical bridging studies may be required if quality data alone are insufficient to establish comparability. The extent and nature of nonclinical and/or clinical studies should be determined on a case-by-case basis, taking into consideration the quality comparability findings, the nature and level of the knowledge of the product, existing relevant nonclinical and clinical data, and aspects of their use.
5. Justification for the classification of any manufacturing process and/or control changes as moderate or minor.
6. Description of the batches and summary of in-process control and release testing results as quantitative data, in a comparative tabular format, for at least three consecutive commercial-scale batches of the pre-change and post-change drug substance. Comparative pre-change test results do not need to be generated concurrently; relevant historical testing results are acceptable. Matrixing, bracketing, use of smaller-scale batches, use of fewer than three batches and/or leveraging data from scientifically justified representative batches, or batches not necessarily manufactured consecutively, may be acceptable where justified and agreed by the NRA.
7. Comparative pre-change and post-change test results for the manufacturer's characterized key stability-indicating attributes for at least three commercial-scale drug substance batches produced with the proposed changes and stored under accelerated and/or stress conditions for a minimum of 3 months. Test results that cover a minimum of 6 months in real-time/real-temperature conditions should also be provided. A possibility of 3 months of real-time data

could be acceptable if properly justified (for example, it can be proven that the relevant effect, if present, can already be observed within 3 months). Comparative pre-change test results do not need to be generated concurrently; relevant historical results for batches on the stability programme are acceptable. Additionally, the manufacturer should commit to undertake real-time stability studies to confirm the full shelf-life/holdtime of the drug substance under its normal storage conditions and to report to the NRA any failures in these ongoing long-term stability studies. Matrixing, bracketing, use of smaller-scale batches and/or use of fewer than three batches of drug substance for stability testing may be acceptable where justified (6).

8. Updated post-approval stability protocol.
9. Information describing the change-over procedures for shared product-contact equipment and the segregation procedures, as applicable. If no revisions, the manufacturer should state that no changes were made to the change-over procedures.
10. Cleaning procedures (including data in a summary validation report and the cleaning protocol for the introduction of new products, as applicable) demonstrating lack of carry-over or cross-contamination.

Description of change	Conditions to be fulfilled	Supporting data	Reporting category
-----------------------	----------------------------	-----------------	--------------------

2. Change to the cell banks:

Note: New cell substrates that are unrelated to the licensed master cell bank (MCB) or pre-MCB material may require a new application for marketing authorization or license application.

a. Adaptation of an MCB into a new culture medium	None	1, 2, 5–8, 10	Major
b. Generation of a new MCB	1	1, 2, 5–8	Moderate
c. Generation of a new working cell bank (WCB)	2–4	1, 2	Minor
3. Change in the cell bank manufacturing site	None	1, 2, 9	Moderate
4. Change in the cell bank testing/storage site	5, 7	9	Minor
5. Change in the cell bank qualification protocol	None	3, 4	Moderate
	6	4	Minor

Conditions

1. The new MCB is generated from the original clone or from a pre-approved MCB and is grown in the same culture medium.

2. The new cell bank is generated from a pre-approved MCB.
3. The new cell bank is at the pre-approved passage level.
4. The new cell bank is released according to a pre-approved protocol/process or as described in the original license.
5. No changes have been made to the tests/acceptance criteria used for the release of the cell bank.
6. The protocol is considered more stringent (that is, addition of new tests or narrowing of acceptance criteria).
7. No changes have been made to the storage conditions used for the cell bank, and the transport conditions of the cell bank have been validated.

Supporting data

1. Qualification of the cell bank according to guidelines considered acceptable by the NRA.
2. Information on the characterization and testing of the MCB/WCB, and cells from the end-of-production passage or post-production passage.
3. Justification of the change to the cell bank qualification protocol.
4. Updated cell bank qualification protocol.
5. Comparability of the pre-change and post-change drug substance with respect to physicochemical properties, biological activity, purity, impurities and contaminants, as appropriate. Nonclinical and/or clinical bridging studies may occasionally be required when quality data are insufficient to establish comparability. The extent and nature of nonclinical and/or clinical studies should be determined on a case by- case basis, taking into consideration the quality-comparability findings, the nature and level of knowledge of the product, existing relevant nonclinical and clinical data, and aspects of its use.
6. Description of the batches and summary of in-process and release testing results as quantitative data, in a comparative tabular format, for at least three consecutive commercial-scale batches of the drug substance derived from the new cell bank. Matrixing, bracketing, use of smaller-scale batches, use of fewer than three batches and/or leveraging data from scientifically justified representative batches, or batches not necessarily manufactured consecutively, may be acceptable where justified.
7. Comparative pre-change and post-change test results for the manufacturer's characterized key stability-indicating attributes for at least three commercial-scale drug substance batches produced with the proposed changes and stored under accelerated and/or stress conditions for a minimum of 3 months. Test results that cover a minimum of 6 months in real-time/real-temperature conditions should also be provided. A possibility of 3 months of real-time data could be acceptable if properly justified (for example, it can be proven that the relevant effect, if present, can already be observed within 3 months). Comparative pre-change test results do not need to be generated concurrently; relevant historical results for batches on the stability programme are acceptable. Additionally, the manufacturer should commit to undertake real-time stability studies to confirm the full shelf-life/holdtime of the drug substance under its normal storage conditions and to report to the NRA any failures in these ongoing long-term stability studies. Matrixing, bracketing, the use of smaller-scale batches and/or the use of fewer than three batches of drug substance for stability testing may be acceptable where justified (6).
8. Updated post-approval stability protocol.
9. Evidence that the new company/facility is GMP-compliant.
10. Supporting nonclinical and clinical data or a request for a waiver of in vivo studies with justification.

Description of change	Conditions to be fulfilled	Supporting data	Reporting category
6. Change to the fermentation or cell culture process:			
a. A critical change (a change with high potential to have an impact on the quality of the drug substance or drug product; for example, incorporation of disposable bioreactor technology)	None	1–7, 9, 11	Major
b. A change with moderate potential to have an impact on the quality of the drug substance or drug product (for example, extension of the in vitro cell age beyond validated parameters)	1, 3	1–6, 8, 10	Moderate
c. A noncritical change with minimal potential to have an impact on the quality of the drug substance or drug product, such as: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • a change in harvesting and/ or pooling procedures which does not affect the method of manufacture, recovery, intermediate storage conditions, sensitivity of detection of adventitious agents or production scale; • duplication of a fermentation train; or • addition of similar/ comparable bioreactors 	1–5, 7–10	1, 2, 4, 8	Minor
Description of change	Conditions to be fulfilled	Supporting data	Reporting category
7. Change to the purification process, involving the following:			
a. A critical change (a change with high potential to have an impact on the quality of the drug substance or drug product, for example, a change that could potentially have an impact on the viral clearance capacity of the process or the impurity profile of the drug substance)	None	1, 2, 5–7, 9, 11, 12	Major
b. A change with moderate potential to have an impact on the quality of the drug substance or drug product (for example, a change in the chemical separation method, such as ion-exchange HPLC to reversed-phase HPLC)	1, 3	1, 2, 5–7, 10–12	Moderate
c. A noncritical change with minimal potential to have an impact on the quality of the drug substance	1–4	1, 2	Minor

or drug product (for example, addition of an in-line filtration step equivalent to the approved filtration step)			
8. Change in scale of the manufacturing process:			
a. At the cell culture stage	3, 9–11	2, 3, 5–7, 9, 11	Moderate
b. At the purification stage	1, 2, 4, 6	2, 5–7, 9, 11	Moderate
9. Introduction of reprocessing steps	12, 13	8, 10, 11, 13	Minor
10. Addition of a new holding step or change in the parameters of an approved holding step	None	5, 14	Moderate
<p>Conditions</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The change does not have an impact on the viral clearance data or the chemical nature of an inactivating agent. 2. There is no change in the drug substance specification outside the approved limits. 3. There is no change in the drug substance impurity profile outside the approved limits. 4. The change is not necessitated by recurring events arising during manufacture or because of stability concerns. 5. The change does not affect the purification process. 6. The change in scale is linear with respect to the proportionality of production parameters and materials. 7. The new fermentation train is identical to the approved fermentation train(s). 8. There is no change in the approved in vitro cell age. 9. The change is not expected to have an impact on the quality, safety or efficacy of the final product. 10. There is no change in the proportionality of the raw materials (that is, the change in scale is linear). 11. The change in scale involves the use of the same bioreactor (that is, it does not involve the use of a larger bioreactor). 12. The need for reprocessing is not due to recurrent deviations from the validated process, and the root cause triggering reprocessing is identified. 13. The proposed reprocessing steps have been shown to have no impact on product quality. 			
<p>Supporting data</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Justification for the classification of the change(s) as critical, moderate or noncritical in terms of its impact on the quality of the drug substance. 2. Flow diagram (including process and in-process controls) of the proposed manufacturing 			

process(es) and a brief narrative description of the proposed manufacturing process(es).

3. If the change results in an increase in the number of population doublings or sub cultivations, information on the characterization and testing of the postproduction cell bank for recombinant product or of the drug substance for nonrecombinant product.
4. For drug substance obtained from, or manufactured with, reagents obtained from sources that are at risk of transmitting bovine spongiform encephalopathy/ transmissible spongiform encephalopathy (BSE/TSE) agents (for example, ruminant origin), information and evidence that the material does not pose a potential BSE/TSE risk (for example, name of manufacturer, species and tissues from which the material is a derivative, country of origin of the source animals, use and previous acceptance of the material).
5. Process validation results.
6. Comparability of the pre-change and post-change drug substance with respect to physicochemical properties, biological activity, purity, impurities and contaminants, as appropriate. Nonclinical and/or clinical bridging studies may occasionally be required when quality data are insufficient to establish comparability. The extent and nature of nonclinical and/or clinical studies should be determined on a case-by-case basis, taking into consideration the quality– comparability findings, the nature and level of knowledge of the product, existing relevant nonclinical and clinical data, and aspects of its use.
7. Description of the batches and summary of in-process and release testing results as quantitative data, in a comparative tabular format, for at least three consecutive commercial-scale batches of the pre-change and post-change drug substance. Comparative pre-change test results do not need to be generated concurrently; relevant historical testing results are acceptable. Matrixing, bracketing, the use of smaller-scale batches, the use of fewer than three batches and/or leveraging data from scientifically justified representative batches, or batches not necessarily manufactured consecutively, may be acceptable where justified.
8. Description of the batches and summary of in-process and release testing results as quantitative data, in a comparative tabular format, for one commercial-scale batch of the pre-change and post-change drug substance. Comparative pre-change test results do not need to be generated concurrently; relevant historical testing results are acceptable. Batch data on the next two full-production batches should be made available on request and should be reported by the marketing authorization holder if outside the specification (with proposed action). The use of a smaller-scale batch may be acceptable where justified and.
9. Comparative pre-change and post-change test results for the manufacturer’s characterized key stability-indicating attributes for at least three commercial-scale drug substance batches produced with the proposed changes and stored under accelerated and/or stress conditions for a minimum of 3 months. Test results that cover a minimum of 6 months in real-time/real-temperature conditions should also be provided. A possibility of 3 months and one batch of real-time data could be acceptable if properly justified (for example, it can be proven that the relevant effect, if present, can already be observed within 3 months). Comparative pre-change test results do not need to be generated concurrently; relevant historical results for batches on the stability programme are acceptable. Additionally, the manufacturer should commit to undertake real-time stability studies to confirm the full shelf-life/hold-time of the drug substance under its normal storage conditions and to report to the authority any failures in these ongoing long-term stability studies. Matrixing, bracketing, the use of smaller-scale batches and/or the use of fewer than three batches of drug substance for stability testing may be acceptable where justified.
10. Comparative pre-change and post-change test results for the manufacturer’s characterized key stability-indicating attributes with at least one commercial-scale drug substance batch produced with the proposed changes under real-time/ real-temperature testing conditions. Comparative

pre-change test results do not need to be generated concurrently; relevant historical results for batches on the stability programme are acceptable. Test results that cover a minimum of 6 months in real-time/real-temperature conditions should also be provided. A possibility of 3 months of real-time data could be acceptable if properly justified (for example, it can be proven that the relevant effect, if present, can already be observed within 3 months). Additionally, the manufacturer should commit to undertake real-time stability studies to confirm the full shelf-life/hold-time of the drug substance under its normal storage conditions and to report to the NRA any failures in these ongoing long-term stability studies. Matrixing, bracketing, the use of smaller-scale batches and/or use of forced degradation or accelerated temperature conditions for stability testing may be acceptable where justified.

11. Updated post-approval stability protocol and stability commitment to place the first commercial-scale batch of the drug product manufactured using the post-change drug substance into the stability programme.
12. Information assessing the risk with respect to potential contamination with adventitious agents (for example, impact on viral clearance studies and BSE/TSE risk).
13. Data describing the root cause triggering the reprocessing, as well as validation data (for example, extended hold-times, resistance to additional mechanical stress) to help prevent the reprocessing from having an impact on the drug substance.
14. Demonstration that the new or revised holding step has no negative impact on the quality of the drug substance (data from one commercial-scale or scientifically justified representative drug substance batch should be provided).

Description of change	Conditions to be fulfilled	Supporting data	Reporting category
11. Change in equipment used in the drug substance manufacturing process, involving the following:			
Note: New bioreactor technology (for example, a change from stainless steel bioreactor to disposable bioreactor) is excluded from this table and should be filed according to change 6a .			
a. Introduction of new equipment with different operating principles and different product contact material	None	1–5	Moderate
	3, 4	1, 2, 5	Minor
b. Introduction of new equipment with the same operating principles but different product contact material	None	1, 3–5	Moderate
	3, 4	1, 4, 5	Minor
c. Introduction of new equipment with different operating principles but the same product contact material	None	1–3, 5	Moderate
	4	1, 2, 5	Minor
d. Replacement of product contact equipment with equivalent equipment	None	3	Minor
e. Change of product-contact equipment from dedicated to shared	1, 2	1, 6	Minor

f. Relocation of major equipment to another room in the same facility/suite/ premises	2, 4, 5	None	Minor
Conditions <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The site is approved as a multi-product facility. 2. The change has no impact on the risk of cross-contamination and is supported by validated cleaning procedures. 3. The manufacturing process is not impacted by the change in product-contact equipment. 4. The change has no impact on product quality. 5. Re-qualification of the equipment follows the original qualification protocol. 			
Supporting data <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Information on the in-process control testing. 2. Process validation study reports. 3. Description of the batches and summary of results as quantitative data, in a comparative tabular format, for one commercial-scale batch of the drug substance produced with the approved and proposed product contact equipment/material. Batch data on the next two full-production batches should be made available on request and reported by the marketing authorization holder if outside specification (with proposed action). 4. Information on leachables and extractables. 5. Information on the new equipment and comparison of similarities and differences regarding operating principles and specifications between the new and the replaced equipment. 6. Information describing the change-over procedures for the shared product contact equipment. 			
Description of change	Conditions to be fulfilled	Supporting data	Reporting category
12. Change in specification for the materials, involving the following:			
a. Narrowing of the approved specification limits for starting materials/ intermediates	1–4	1–3, 5	Minor
b. Widening of the approved specification limits for starting materials/ intermediates	None	1–3, 5, 7	Moderate
	3–7	3–6	Minor
13. Change in supplier of raw materials of biological origin (for example, fetal calf serum, insulin, trypsin)	None	4, 6, 9, 10	Moderate
	8	4, 6	Minor
14. Change in source of raw materials of biological origin (for example, bovine trypsin to porcine trypsin)	None	4, 7, 9, 10	Moderate
	8	4, 7	Minor
Conditions <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The change in specification for the materials is within the approved limits. 			

2. The grade of the materials is the same or is of higher quality, where appropriate.
3. There is no change in the drug substance specification outside the approved limits.
4. There is no change in the impurity profile of the drug substance outside the approved limits.
5. The change has no significant effect on the overall quality of the drug substance and/or drug product and there are no changes to the cell banks.
6. The change is not necessitated by recurring events arising during manufacture or because of stability concerns.
7. The test does not concern a critical attribute (for example, content, impurity, any critical physical characteristics or microbial purity).
8. The change is for compendial raw materials of biological origin (excluding human plasma-derived materials).

Supporting data

1. Revised information on the quality and controls of the materials (for example, raw materials, starting materials, solvents, reagents and catalysts) used in the manufacture of the post-change drug substance.
2. Updated drug substance specification, if changed.
3. Copies or summaries of analytical procedures if new analytical procedures are used.
4. For drug substance obtained from, or manufactured with, reagents obtained from sources that are at risk of transmitting bovine spongiform encephalopathy/ transmissible spongiform encephalopathy (BSE/TSE) agents (for example, ruminant origin), information and evidence that the material does not pose a potential BSE/TSE risk (for example, name of manufacturer, species and tissues from which the material is a derivative, country of origin of the source animals, use and previous acceptance of the material).
5. Comparative table or description, where applicable, of pre-change and post-change in-process tests/limits.
6. Description of the batches and summary of in-process and release testing results as quantitative data, in a comparative tabular format, for one commercial-scale batch of the pre-change and post-change drug substance. Comparative pre-change test results do not need to be generated concurrently; relevant historical testing results are acceptable. Batch data on the next two full-production batches should be made available on request and reported by the marketing authorization holder if outside specification (with proposed action). The use of a smaller-scale batch may be acceptable where justified.
7. Description of the batches and summary of in-process and release testing results as quantitative data, in a comparative tabular format, for three consecutive commercial-scale batches of the pre-change and post-change drug substance. Comparative pre-change test results do not need to be generated concurrently; relevant historical testing results are acceptable. Matrixing, bracketing, the use of smaller-scale batches, the use of fewer than three batches and/or leveraging data from scientifically justified representative batches, or batches not necessarily manufactured consecutively, may be acceptable where justified.
8. Justification/risk assessment showing that the attribute is non-significant.
9. Information assessing the risk with respect to potential contamination with adventitious agents (for example, impact on viral clearance studies and BSE/TSE risk).
10. Information demonstrating suitability of the auxiliary materials/reagents of both sources through the comparability of the drug substance.

Description of change	Conditions to be fulfilled	Supporting data	Reporting category
-----------------------	----------------------------	-----------------	--------------------

15. Change to in-process tests and/or acceptance criteria applied during manufacture of the drug substance, involving the following:			
a. Narrowing of approved in-process limits	1, 3, 6, 7	1, 4	Minor
b. Addition of new in-process test and limits	2, 3, 6	1–5, 8	Minor
c. Deletion of a non-significant in-process test	1–4, 6	1, 4, 7	Minor
d. Widening of the approved in-process limits	None	1–4, 6, 8	Moderate
	1–4	1, 4, 5, 8	Minor
e. Deletion of an in-process test which may have a significant effect on the overall quality of the drug substance	None	1, 4, 6, 8	Moderate
f. Addition or replacement of an in-process test as a result of a safety or quality issue	None	1–4, 6, 8	Moderate
16. Change in the in-process controls testing site Note: Transfer of in-process control testing to a different facility within a GMP-compliant site is not considered to be a reportable change but is treated as a minor GMP change and is reviewed during inspections.	1–3, 5, 6	9	Minor
Conditions			
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. No change in the drug substance specification outside the approved limits. 2. No change in the impurity profile of the drug substance outside the approved limits. 3. The change is not necessitated by recurring events arising during manufacture or because of stability concerns. 4. The test does not concern a critical attribute (for example, content, impurity, any critical physical characteristics or microbial purity). 5. The replaced analytical procedure maintains or tightens precision, accuracy, specificity and sensitivity, if applicable. 6. No change in the approved in-process controls outside the approved limits. 7. The test procedure remains the same, or changes in the test procedure are minor. 			
Supporting data			
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Revised information on the controls performed at critical steps of the manufacturing process and on intermediates of the proposed drug substance. 2. Updated drug substance specification, if changed. 3. Copies or summaries of analytical procedures if new analytical procedures are used. 4. Comparative table or description, where applicable, of pre-change and post-change in-process tests/limits. 5. Description of the batches and summary of in-process and release testing results as quantitative 			

<p>data, in a comparative tabular format, for one commercial-scale batch of the pre-change and post-change drug substance. Comparative pre-change test results do not need to be generated concurrently; relevant historical testing results are acceptable. Batch data on the next two full-production batches should be made available on request and reported by the marketing authorization holder if outside specification (with proposed action). The use of a smaller-scale batch may be acceptable where justified.</p> <p>6. Description of the batches and summary of in-process and release testing results as quantitative data, in a comparative tabular format, for three consecutive commercial-scale batches of the pre-change and post-change drug substance. Comparative pre-change test results do not need to be generated concurrently; relevant historical testing results are acceptable. Matrixing, bracketing, the use of smaller-scale batches, the use of fewer than three batches and/or leveraging data from scientifically justified representative batches, or batches not necessarily manufactured consecutively, may be acceptable where justified.</p> <p>7. Justification/risk assessment showing that the attribute is non-significant.</p> <p>8. Justification for the new in-process test and limits.</p> <p>9. Evidence that the new company/facility is GMP-compliant.</p>			
Description of change	Conditions to be fulfilled	Supporting data	Reporting category
17. Change in the approved design space, involving the following:			
a. Establishment of a new design space	None	1	Major
b. Expansion of the approved design space	None	1	Major
c. Reduction in the approved design space (any change that reduces or limits the range of parameters used to define the design space)	1	1	Minor
Conditions			
1. The reduction in design space is not necessitated by recurring problems arising during manufacture.			
Supporting data			
1. Manufacturing development data to support the establishment of, or changes to, the design space.			
Control of the drug substance			
Description of change	Conditions to be fulfilled	Supporting data	Reporting category
18. Change affecting the quality control (release and stability) testing of the drug substance, involving the following:			
Note: Transfer of testing to a different facility within a GMP-compliant site is not considered to be a reportable change but is treated as a minor GMP change and is reviewed during inspections.			

a. Transfer of the quality control testing activities for a non pharmacopoeial assay to a new company not approved in the current marketing authorization or license, or to a different site within the same company	None	1, 2	Moderate
	1–3	1, 2	Minor
b. Transfer of the quality control testing activities for a pharmacopoeial assay to a new company not approved in the current marketing authorization or license	None	1, 2	Moderate
	1	1, 2	Minor
Conditions <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The transferred quality control test is not a potency assay or bioassay. 2. No changes are made to the test method. 3. The transfer is within a facility approved in the current marketing authorization for the performance of other tests. 			
Supporting data <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Information demonstrating technology transfer qualification for the non pharmacopoeial assay or verification for the pharmacopoeial assay. 2. Evidence that the new company/facility is GMP-compliant. 			
Description of change	Conditions to be fulfilled	Supporting data	Reporting category
19. Change in the standard/monograph (that is, specifications) claimed for the drug substance, involving the following:			
a. A change from a pharmacopoeial standard/monograph to an in-house standard	None	1–5	Moderate
b. A change from an in-house standard to a pharmacopoeial standard/monograph or from one pharmacopoeial standard/monograph to a different pharmacopoeial standard/monograph	1–4	1–3	Minor
20. Change in the specifications for the drug substance in order to comply with an updated pharmacopoeial standard/monograph	1, 2	1, 2	Minor
Conditions <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The change is made exclusively in order to comply with a pharmacopoeial monograph. 2. There is no change in drug substance specifications outside the approved ranges. 3. There is no deletion of tests or relaxation of acceptance criteria of the approved specifications, except to comply with a pharmacopoeial standard/monograph. 4. There are no deletions or changes to any analytical procedures, except to comply with a 			

pharmacopoeial standard/monograph.			
Supporting data			
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Revised drug product labelling information, as applicable. 2. Updated copy of the proposed drug substance specifications. 3. Where an in-house analytical procedure is used and a pharmacopoeial standard/monograph is claimed, results of an equivalency study between the in-house and pharmacopoeial methods. 4. Copies or summaries of validation reports if new analytical procedures are used. 5. Justification of specifications with data. 			
Description of change	Conditions to be fulfilled	Supporting data	Reporting category
21. Changes in the control strategy of the drug substance, involving the following:			
a. Change from end-product testing to upstream controls for some test(s) (for example, real-time release testing, process analytical technology)	None	1–3, 5	Major
b. Addition of a new critical quality attribute in the control strategy	None	1–5	Moderate
c. Deletion of a critical quality attribute from the control strategy	None	1, 5	Moderate
Conditions			
None			
Supporting data			
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Information on the controls performed at critical steps of the manufacturing process and on intermediates of the proposed drug substance. 2. Updated copy of the proposed drug substance specifications. 3. Copies or summaries of analytical procedures if new analytical procedures are used. 4. Copies or summaries of validation reports if new analytical procedures are used to monitor the new CQA at release. 5. Justification and supporting data for each proposed change to the control strategy. 			
Description of change	Conditions to be fulfilled	Supporting data	Reporting category
22. Change in the specification/analytical procedure used to release the drug substance, involving the following:			
a. Deletion of a test	None	1, 5, 6	Moderate
b. Addition of a test	1–3	1–3, 5	Minor

c. Replacement of an analytical procedure	None	1–5	Moderate
	5, 6, 8	1, 4, 5	Minor
d. Changes to an approved analytical procedure	None	1–5	Moderate
	2, 4–6	1, 4, 5	Minor
e. Change from an in-house analytical procedure to a recognized compendial/ pharmacopoeial analytical procedure	None	1–5	Moderate
	2, 6	1–3	Minor
f. Widening of an approved acceptance criterion	None	1, 5, 6	Moderate
g. Narrowing of an approved acceptance criterion	1, 4, 7	1	Minor
<p>Conditions</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The change does not result from unexpected events arising during manufacture (for example, new unqualified impurity, change in total impurity limits). 2. There is no change in the limits/acceptance criteria outside the approved limits for the approved assays used at release/ stability. 3. The addition of the test is not intended to monitor new impurity species. 4. 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. 5. The modified analytical procedure maintains or improves performance parameters of the method. 6. The change does not concern potency-testing. 7. Acceptance criteria for residual solvent are within recognized or approved acceptance limits (for example, within ICH limits for a Class 3 residual solvent, or pharmacopoeial requirements). 8. The change is from one pharmacopoeial assay to another pharmacopoeial assay or the marketing application holder has demonstrated an increased understanding of the relationship between method parameters and method performance defined by a systematic development approach including robustness studies. 			
<p>Supporting data</p> <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. 			

Description of change	Conditions to be fulfilled	Supporting data	Reporting category
23. Replacement of a primary reference standard	None	1, 2	Moderate
24. Change of the reference standard from pharmacopoeial or international standard to in-house (no relationship with international standard)	None	1, 2	Moderate
25. Change of the reference standard from in-house (no relationship with international standard) to pharmacopoeial or international standard	3	1, 2	Minor
26. Qualification of a new batch of reference standard against the approved reference standard (including qualification of a new batch of a secondary reference standard against the approved primary standard)	1	1, 2	Minor
27. Change to reference standard qualification protocol	None	3, 4	Moderate
28. Extension of the reference standard shelf-life or re-test period	2	5	Minor
Conditions <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Qualification of the new reference standard is in accordance with an approved protocol. 2. The extension of the shelf-life of the reference standard is in accordance with an approved protocol. 3. The reference standard is used for a physicochemical test. 			
Supporting data <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Justification for the change in reference standard. 2. Information demonstrating qualification of the proposed reference standards or materials (for example, source, characterization, certificate of analysis, comparability data). 3. Justification of the change to the reference standard qualification protocol. 4. Updated reference standard qualification protocol. 5. Summary of stability testing and results to support the extension of reference standard shelf-life. 			
Drug substance container closure system			
Description of change	Conditions to be fulfilled	Supporting data	Reporting category

29. Change in the primary container closure system(s) for the storage and shipment of the drug substance	None	1, 2, 4, 5	Moderate
	1	1, 3, 5	Minor
Conditions			
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> The proposed container closure system is at least equivalent to the approved container closure system with respect to its relevant properties (including results of transportation or compatibility studies, if appropriate). 			
Supporting data			
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Updated dossier sections describing information on the proposed container closure system (for example, description, composition, materials of construction of primary packaging components, specifications). Data demonstrating the suitability of the container closure system (for example, extractable/leachable testing) and compliance with pharmacopoeial standards, if applicable. Results demonstrating that the proposed container closure system is at least equivalent to the approved container closure system with respect to its relevant properties (for example, results of transportation or compatibility studies, and extractable/leachable studies). Comparative pre-change and post-change test results for the manufacturer's characterized key stability-indicating parameters with commercial-scale drug substance material using several container batches (for example, three different batches) produced with the proposed changes and stored under accelerated and/ or stress conditions for a minimum of 3 months. Test results that cover a minimum of 6 months in real-time/real-temperature conditions should also be provided. A possibility of 3 months of real-time data could be acceptable if properly justified (for example, it can be proven that the relevant effect, if present, can already be observed within 3 months). Comparative pre-change test results do not need to be generated concurrently; relevant historical results for batches on the stability programme are acceptable. Additionally, the manufacturer should commit to undertake real-time stability studies to confirm the full shelf-life/hold-time of the drug substance under its normal storage conditions and to report to the NRA any failures in these ongoing long-term stability studies. Matrixing, bracketing, the use of smaller-scale batches and/or the use of fewer than three container batches for stability testing may be acceptable where justified. Comparative table of pre-change and post-change specifications of the container closure system. 			
Description of change	Conditions to be fulfilled	Supporting data	Reporting category
30. Change in the supplier for a primary container closure, involving the following:			
a. Replacement or addition of a supplier	None	1–3	Moderate
	1, 2	None	Minor
b. Deletion of a supplier	None	None	Minor
Conditions			

1. There is no change in the type of container closure, the materials of construction or the sterilization process for a sterile container closure component.
2. There is no change in the specifications of the container closure component outside the approved ranges.

Supporting data

1. Data demonstrating the suitability of the container closure system (for example, extractable/leachable testing).
2. Information on the proposed container closure system (for example, description, materials of construction of primary packaging components, specifications).
3. Test results that cover a minimum of 6 months in real-time/real-temperature conditions should also be provided. A possibility of 3 months of real-time data could be acceptable if properly justified (for example, it can be proven that the relevant effect, if present, can already be observed within 3 months). Comparative prechange test results do not need to be generated concurrently; relevant historical results for batches on the stability programme are acceptable. Additionally, the manufacturer should commit to undertake real-time stability studies to confirm the full shelf-life/hold-time of the drug substance under its normal storage conditions and to report to the NRA any failures in these ongoing long-term stability studies. Matrixing, bracketing, the use of smaller-scale batches and/or the use of fewer than three batches of drug substance for stability testing may be acceptable where justified.

Description of change	Conditions to be fulfilled	Supporting data	Reporting category
31. Change in the specification/analytical procedure of the primary container closure system for the drug substance, involving the following:			
a. Deletion of a test	1, 2	1, 2	Minor
b. Addition of a test	3	1–3	Minor
c. Replacement of an analytical procedure	6, 7	1–3	Minor
d. Minor changes to an analytical procedure	4–7	1–3	Minor
e. Widening of an acceptance criterion	None	1, 2	Moderate
f. Narrowing of an acceptance criterion	8	1	Minor

Conditions

1. The deleted test has been demonstrated to be redundant compared to the remaining tests or is no longer a pharmacopoeial requirement.
2. The change to the specification does not affect the functional properties of the container closure component and does not result in a potential impact on the performance of the drug substance.
3. The change is not necessitated by unexpected recurring events arising during manufacture of the primary container closure system or because of stability concerns.
4. There is no change in the acceptance criteria outside the approved limits.

5. The new analytical procedure is of the same type.
6. Results of method validation demonstrate that the new or modified analytical procedure is at least equivalent to the approved analytical procedure.
7. The new or modified analytical procedure maintains or tightens precision, accuracy, specificity or sensitivity.
8. The change is within the range of approved acceptance criteria.

Supporting data

1. Updated copy of the proposed specification for the primary container closure system.
2. Rationale for the change.
3. Description of the analytical procedure and, if applicable, validation data.

Stability

Description of change	Conditions to be fulfilled	Supporting data	Reporting category
32. Change in the shelf-life of the drug substance or for a stored intermediate of the drug substance, involving the following:			
a. Extension	None	1–5	Moderate
	1–4	1, 2, 5	Minor
b. Reduction	None	1–5	Moderate
	5	2–4	Minor

Conditions

1. There are no changes to the container closure system in direct contact with the drug substance with the potential of impact on the drug substance, or to the recommended storage conditions of the drug substance.
2. Full long-term stability data are available covering the proposed shelf-life and are based on stability data generated on at least three commercial-scale batches.
3. Stability data were generated in accordance with the approved stability protocol.
4. Significant changes were not observed in the stability data.
5. The reduction in the shelf-life is not necessitated by recurring events arising during manufacture or because of stability concerns (Note: Problems arising during manufacturing or stability concerns should be reported for evaluation).

Supporting data

1. Summary of stability testing and results (for example, studies conducted, protocols used, results obtained).
2. Proposed storage conditions and shelf-life, as appropriate.
3. Updated post-approval stability protocol and stability commitment.
4. Justification for the change to the post-approval stability protocol or stability commitment.
5. Results of stability testing (that is, full real-time/real-temperature stability data covering the proposed shelf-life generated on stability testing of at least three commercial-scale batches)

<p>unless otherwise justified). For intermediates, data to show that the extension of shelf-life has no negative impact on the quality of the drug substance. Under special circumstances, interim stability-testing results and a commitment to notify the NRA of any failures in the ongoing long-term stability studies may be provided. In such cases, the extrapolation of shelf-life should be made in accordance with ICH Q1E guidelines.</p>			
Description of change	Conditions to be fulfilled	Supporting data	Reporting category
33. Change in the post-approval stability protocol of the drug substance, involving the following:			
a. Substantial change to the post-approval stability protocol or stability commitment, such as deletion of a test, replacement of an analytical procedure or change in storage temperature	None	1–5	Moderate
	1	1, 2, 4, 5	Minor
b. Addition of test(s) into the post-approval stability protocol	2	1, 2, 4, 5	Minor
c. Deletion of time point(s) from the post-approval stability protocol within the approved shelf-life	3	4, 5	Minor
<p>Conditions</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> In the case of replacement of an analytical procedure, the new analytical procedure maintains or tightens precision, accuracy, specificity and sensitivity. The addition of test(s) is not due to stability concerns or to the identification of new impurities. Deletion of time point(s) is made in accordance with relevant guidelines, for example. 			
<p>Supporting data</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Copies or summaries of analytical procedures if new analytical procedures are used. Validation results if new analytical procedures are used. Proposed storage conditions and/or shelf-life, as appropriate. Updated post-approval stability protocol including justification for the changes, and stability commitment. If applicable, stability-testing results to support the change to the post-approval stability protocol or stability commitment (for example, data to show greater reliability of the alternative test). 			
Description of change	Conditions to be fulfilled	Supporting data	Reporting category
34. Change in the storage conditions for the drug substance, involving the following:			
a. Addition or change to storage conditions for the drug substance (for example, widening or narrowing of a temperature criterion)	None	1–4	Moderate
	1, 2	1–3	Minor
b. Addition of a cautionary statement	None	1, 3, 4	Moderate

	1	1, 3, 4	Minor
c. Deletion of a cautionary statement	None	1, 3, 5	Minor
<p>Conditions</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The change is not necessitated by recurring events arising during manufacture or because of stability concerns. 2. The change consists in the narrowing of a temperature criterion within the approved ranges. 			
<p>Supporting data</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Proposed storage conditions and shelf-life. 2. Updated post-approval stability protocol and stability commitment. 3. Justification of the change in the storage conditions/cautionary statement. 4. Results of stability testing (that is, full real-time/real-temperature stability data covering the proposed shelf-life generated on one commercial-scale batch). 5. Results of stability testing (that is, full real time/real temperature stability data covering the proposed shelf-life generated on at least three commercial-scale batches). 			

Annex 3: Changes to the drug product

The examples presented in this annex are intended to assist with the classification of changes made to the quality information of the drug product. The information summarized in the drug product table provides guidance on:

- the conditions to be fulfilled in order for a given change to be classified as major, moderate or minor (if any of the conditions outlined for a given change are not fulfilled, the change is automatically considered to be at the next higher reporting category
 - for example, if any of the conditions recommended for a moderate quality change are not fulfilled, the change is considered to be a major quality change);
- the supporting data for a given change, either to be submitted to the authority and/or maintained by the marketing authorization holder (if any of the supporting data outlined for a given change are not provided, are different or are not considered applicable, adequate scientific justification should be provided); and
- the reporting category (major, moderate or minor quality change).

Marketing authorization holders should use scientific judgement, leverage competent regulatory authority guidance or contact the authority if a change is not included in the table and has the potential to impact on product quality. Marketing authorization holders should also contact the authority when a change is considered at the next higher reporting category because any of the conditions outlined are not fulfilled and where the supporting data are not described.

Supporting data should be provided according to the submission format accepted by the authority.

Quality changes to comply with updated compendia and/or pharmacopoeias

The authority has listed in main Guideline for Registration of Medicines the recognized compendia and/or pharmacopoeias. Manufacturers are expected to comply with the current version of compendia/ pharmacopoeias as referenced in the approved marketing authorization. Changes in the compendial/pharmacopoeial methods or specifications for a drug product do not need to be submitted for review if reference is made to the current edition of the compendium or

pharmacopoeia, but the changes should be notified to the authority, with information on them available for inspection.

In some cases, changes made to comply with recognized compendia/ pharmacopoeias may require approval by the authority prior to implementation regardless of the timing of the change in relation to the date when the compendium/pharmacopoeia was updated. For example, supplement submission and approval by the authority may be required for some changes to quality control tests performed for product release (for example, to potency tests), for changes that have an impact on any product labelling information item, and for changes that may affect the quality, safety or efficacy of the product.

Quality changes affecting lot release

Where post-approval changes to the final product affect the lot release protocol (for example, changes to test procedures, reference standards or laboratory sites) or sample testing requirements for lot release, the marketing authorization holder should inform the institution responsible for reviewing the release of product lots. These procedures apply to changes that have been authorized by the authority in the case of major and moderate quality changes and to changes that have been implemented in the case of minor quality changes. For example, the qualification of a new lot of reference standard against the approved reference standard may be considered a minor quality change if the qualification of a new standard is performed in accordance with an approved protocol and specification. Nevertheless, these changes must be reported to the authority.

Description and composition of the drug product			
Note: Changes in dosage form and/or presentation may, in some cases, necessitate the filing of a new application for marketing authorization or licensure. Marketing authorization holders are encouraged to contact the authority for further guidance.			
Description of change	Conditions to be fulfilled	Supporting data	Reporting category
35. Change in the description or composition of the drug product, involving the following:			
a. Addition of a dosage form or change in the formulation (for example, lyophilized powder to liquid, change in the	None	1–10	Major

amount of excipient, new diluent for lyophilized product)			
b. Change in fill volume (same concentration, different volume)	None	1, 5, 7, 9, 10	Major
	1, 2	1, 5, 7, 9	Moderate
	1–3	5, 7, 9	Minor
c. Change in the concentration of the active ingredient (for example, 20 units/ml versus 10 units/ml)	None	1, 5, 7, 9, 10	Major
	2, 4, 5	1, 5, 7	Moderate
d. Addition of a new presentation (for example, addition of a new pre-filled syringe where the approved presentation is a vial for a biotherapeutic in a liquid dosage form)	None	1, 5, 7–10	Major
<p>Conditions</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. No changes are classified as major in the manufacturing process to accommodate the new fill volume. 2. No change in the dose is recommended. 3. The change involves narrowing the fill volume while maintaining the lower limit of extractable volume. 4. The new concentration is bracketed by existing approved concentrations. 5. More than two concentrations are already approved (that is, linear PK/PD profile of the product from at least three different concentrations over the bracketed range has been demonstrated and the two extreme concentrations of the bracketed range have been shown to be bioequivalent or therapeutically equivalent). 			
<p>Supporting data</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Revised drug product labelling information, as applicable. 2. Characterization data demonstrating comparability of the new dosage form and/ or formulation. 3. Description and composition of the dosage form if there are changes to the composition or dose. 4. Discussion of the components of the drug product, as appropriate (for example, choice of excipients, compatibility of drug substance and excipients, leachates, compatibility with new container closure system). 5. Information on the batch formula, manufacturing process and process controls, controls of critical steps and intermediates, process validation results. 6. Control of excipients if new excipients are proposed (for example, specification). 7. Information on specification, analytical procedures (if new analytical methods are used), validation of analytical procedures (if new analytical methods are used), batch analyses (certificate of analysis 			

for three consecutive commercial-scale batches should be provided). Bracketing for multiple-strength products, container sizes and/or fills may be acceptable if scientifically justified.

8. Information on the container closure system and leachables and extractables, if any of the components have changed (for example, description, materials of construction and summary of specification).
9. Comparative pre-change and post-change test results for the manufacturer's characterized key stability-indicating attributes for at least three commercial-scale drug product batches produced with the proposed changes and stored under accelerated and/or stress conditions for a minimum of 3 months. Test results that cover a minimum of 6 months in real-time/real-temperature conditions should also be provided. A possibility of 3 months of real-time data could be acceptable if properly justified (for example, it can be proven that the relevant effect, if present, can already be observed within 3 months). Comparative pre-change test results do not need to be generated concurrently; relevant historical results for batches on the stability programme are acceptable. Additionally, the manufacturer should commit to undertake real-time stability studies to confirm the full shelf-life/hold-time of the drug product under its normal storage conditions and to report to the NRA any failures in these ongoing long-term stability studies. Matrixing, bracketing, the use of smaller-scale batches and/or the use of fewer than three batches of drug product for stability testing may be acceptable where justified.
10. Supporting clinical data or a justification for why such studies are not needed.

Description and composition of the drug product: change to a diluent

Description of change	Conditions to be fulfilled	Supporting data	Reporting category
36. Change to the diluent, involving the following:			
a. Change in manufacturing process	None	1-5	Moderate
	1, 3	1-4	Minor
b. Replacement of or addition to the source of a diluent	None	1-6	Moderate
	1-3	1-3	Minor
c. Change in facility used to manufacture a diluent (same company)	1, 2	1, 3, 5	Minor
d. Addition of a diluent filling line	1, 2, 4	1, 3, 5	Minor
e. Deletion of a diluent	None	None	Minor

Conditions

1. The diluent is water for injection or a salt solution (including buffered salt solutions) – that is, it does not include an ingredient with a functional activity such as a preservative, and there is no change to its composition.
2. After reconstitution, there is no change in the drug product specification outside the approved limits.
3. The proposed diluent is commercially available in the country/jurisdiction of the NRA.
4. The addition of the diluent filling line is in an approved filling facility.

Supporting data

1. Flow diagram (including process and in-process controls) of the proposed manufacturing process(es) and a brief narrative description of the proposed manufacturing process(es).
2. Updated copy of the proposed specification for the diluent.
3. Description of the batches and summary of results as quantitative data, in a comparative tabular format, for at least three consecutive commercial-scale batches of the approved and proposed diluent. Comparative test results for the approved diluent do not need to be generated concurrently; relevant historical testing results are acceptable.
4. Updated stability data on the product reconstituted with the new diluent.
5. Evidence that the facility is GMP-compliant.
6. Revised drug product labelling information, as applicable.

Manufacture

Description of change	Conditions to be fulfilled	Supporting data	Reporting category
37. Change in the approved design space, involving the following:			
a. Establishment of a new design space	None	1	Major
b. Expansion of the approved design space	None	1	Major
c. Reduction in the approved design space (any change that reduces or limits the range of parameters used to define the design space)	1	1	Minor

Conditions

1. The reduction in design space is not necessitated by recurring problems that have arisen during manufacture.

Supporting data

1. Pharmaceutical development data to support the establishment or changes to the design space.

Description of change	Conditions to be fulfilled	Supporting data	Reporting category
38. Change involving a drug product manufacturer/manufacturing facility, involving the following:			
a. Replacement or addition of a manufacturing facility for the drug product (including formulation/filling and primary packaging)	None	1–7	Major
	1–5	1–3, 5–8	Moderate
b. Conversion of a drug product manufacturing facility from single-product to multiproduct facility	None	9, 10	Moderate
c. Replacement or addition of a secondary packaging facility, including secondary functional packaging (that is, assembly) facility	2, 3	1–3	Minor
d. Deletion of a drug product manufacturing facility or packaging site	6, 7	None	Minor

Conditions

1. The proposed facility is an approved formulation/filling facility (for the same company/marketing authorization holder).
2. There is no change in the composition, manufacturing process and drug product specification.
3. There is no change in the container/closure system and storage conditions.
4. The same validated manufacturing process at critical steps (that is, compounding and filling) is used.
5. The newly introduced product is in the same family of product(s), or in the same therapeutic classification, as the products already approved at the site, and also uses the same filling process/equipment.
6. There should remain at least one site/manufacturer, as previously authorized, performing the same function as the one(s) to be deleted.
7. The deletion should not be due to critical deficiencies in manufacturing (for example, recurrent out-of-specification events, environmental monitoring failures, etc.).

Supporting data

1. Name, address and responsibilities (for example, formulation, filling, primary/ secondary packaging) of the proposed production facility involved in manufacturing and testing.
2. Evidence that the facility is GMP-compliant.
3. Confirmation that the description of the manufacturing process of the drug product has not changed (other than the change in facility), or submission of supporting data on the revised description of the manufacturing process if the process has changed.
4. Comparative description of the manufacturing process, if different from the approved process, and information on the controls performed at critical steps of the manufacturing process and on the intermediate of the proposed final product.
5. Summary of the process validation studies and results.
6. Description of the batches and summary of in-process control and release testing results as quantitative data, in a comparative tabular format, for at least three consecutive commercial-scale batches of the pre-change and post-change drug product. Comparative pre-change test results do not need to be generated concurrently; relevant historical testing results are acceptable. Bracketing for multiple-strength products, container sizes and/or fills may be acceptable if scientifically justified.
7. Comparative pre-change and post-change test results for the manufacturer's characterized key stability-indicating attributes for at least three commercial-scale drug product batches produced with the proposed changes and stored under accelerated and/or stress conditions for a minimum of 3 months. Test results that cover a minimum of 6 months in real-time/real-temperature conditions should also be provided. A possibility of 3 months of real-time data could be acceptable if properly justified (for example, it can be proven that the relevant effect, if present, can already be observed within 3 months). Comparative pre-change test results do not need to be generated concurrently; relevant historical results for batches on the stability programme are acceptable. Additionally, the manufacturer should commit to undertake real-time stability studies to confirm the full shelf-life/hold-time of the drug product under its normal storage conditions and to report to the NRA any failures in these ongoing long-term stability studies. Matrixing, bracketing, the use of smaller-scale batches and/or the use of fewer than three batches of drug product for stability testing may be acceptable where justified.
8. Rationale for considering the proposed formulation/filling facility as equivalent.
9. Information describing the change-over procedures for shared product-contact equipment and the segregation procedures, as applicable. If there are no revisions, the manufacturer should state that no changes were made to the change-over procedures.
10. Cleaning procedures (including data in a summary validation report and the cleaning protocol for the introduction of new products, as applicable) demonstrating lack of carry-over or cross-contamination.

Description of change	Conditions to be fulfilled	Supporting data	Reporting category
39. Change in the drug product manufacturing process, involving the following:			
a. Scale-up of the manufacturing process at the	None	1–6	Major

formulation/filling stage	1–4	1–6	Moderate
b. Addition or replacement of equipment (for example, formulation tank, filter housing, filling line and head, lyophilizer)	None	1–7	Moderate
	5	2, 7, 8	Minor
c. Addition of a new scale bracketed by the approved scales or scale-down of the manufacturing process	None	1, 3–5	Moderate
	1–4, 8	1, 4	Minor
d. Addition of a new step (for example, filtration)	3	1–6	Moderate
e. Product-contact equipment change from dedicated to shared (for example, formulation tank, filter housing, filling line and head, lyophilizer)	6, 7	2, 9	Minor

Conditions

1. The proposed scale uses similar/comparable equipment to the approved equipment. Note: Change in equipment size is not considered as using similar/ comparable equipment.
2. Any changes to the manufacturing process and/or to the in-process controls are only those necessitated by the change in batch size (for example, the same formulation, controls and standard operating procedures are utilized).
3. The change should not be a result of recurring events that have arisen during manufacture or because of stability concerns.
4. There is no change in the principle of the sterilization procedures of the drug product.
5. Replacement of equipment with equivalent equipment; the change is considered “like for like” (that is, in terms of product contact material, equipment size and operating principles).
6. The site is approved as a multi-product facility.
7. The change has no impact on the risk of cross-contamination and is supported by validated cleaning procedures.
8. The change does not affect the lyophilization step.

Supporting data

1. Description of the manufacturing process, if different from the approved process, and information on the controls performed at critical steps of the manufacturing process and on the intermediate of the proposed drug product.
2. Information on the in-process control testing, as applicable.
3. Process validation results (for example, media fills), as appropriate.
4. Description of the batches and summary of in-process control and release testing results as quantitative data, in a comparative tabular format, for at least three consecutive commercial-scale

batches of the pre-change and post-change drug product. Comparative pre-change test results do not need to be generated concurrently; relevant historical testing results are acceptable. Bracketing for multiple-strength products, container sizes and/or fills may be acceptable if scientifically justified.

5. Comparative pre-change and post-change test results for the manufacturer's characterized key stability-indicating attributes for at least three commercial-scale drug product batches produced with the proposed changes and stored under accelerated and/or stress conditions for a minimum of 3 months. Test results that cover a minimum of 6 months in real-time/real-temperature conditions should also be provided. A possibility of 3 months of real-time data could be acceptable if properly justified (for example, it can be proven that the relevant effect, if present, can already be observed within 3 months). Comparative pre-change test results do not need to be generated concurrently; relevant historical results for batches on the stability programme are acceptable. Additionally, the manufacturer should commit to undertake real-time stability studies to confirm the full shelf-life/hold-time of the drug product under its normal storage conditions and to report to the NRA any failures in these ongoing long-term stability studies. Matrixing, bracketing, the use of smaller-scale batches and/or the use of fewer than three batches of drug product for stability testing may be acceptable where justified.
6. Information on leachables and extractables, as applicable.
7. Information on the new equipment and comparison of similarities and differences regarding operating principles and specifications between the new and the replaced equipment.
8. The rationale for regarding the equipment as similar/comparable, as applicable.
9. Information describing the change-over procedures for the shared product contact equipment.

Description of change	Conditions to be fulfilled	Supporting data	Reporting category
40. Change in the controls (in-process tests and/or acceptance criteria) applied during the manufacturing process or on intermediates, involving the following:			
a. Narrowing of approved in-process limits	2, 3, 7	1, 4	Minor
b. Addition of new in-process test and limits	2, 3, 6	1–5, 8	Minor
c. Deletion of a non-significant in-process test	2–4	1, 4, 7	Minor
d. Widening of the approved in-process limits	None	1–4, 6, 8	Moderate
	1–3	1, 4, 5, 8	Minor
e. Deletion of an in-process test which may have a significant effect on the overall quality of the drug product	None	1, 4, 6,8	Moderate

f. Addition or replacement of an in-process test as a result of a safety or quality issue	None	1–4, 6, 8	Moderate
41. Change in in-process controls testing site Note: Transfer of in-process control testing to a different facility within a GMP-compliant site is not considered to be a reportable change but is treated as a minor GMP change and reviewed during inspections.	1–3, 5, 6	9	Minor
<p>Conditions</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. There is no change in drug product specification outside the approved limits. 2. There is no change in the impurity profile of the drug product outside the approved limits. 3. The change is not necessitated by recurring events arising during manufacture or because of stability concerns. 4. The test does not concern a critical attribute (for example, content, impurities, any critical physical characteristics or microbial purity). 5. The replaced analytical procedure maintains or improves precision, accuracy, specificity and sensitivity, if applicable. 6. There is no change in the in-process control limits outside the approved limits. 7. The test procedure remains the same, or changes in the test procedure are minor. 			
<p>Supporting data</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Revised information on the controls performed at critical steps of the manufacturing process and on intermediates of the proposed drug substance. 2. Updated drug product specification if changed. 3. Copies or summaries of analytical procedures if new analytical procedures are used. 4. Comparative table or description, where applicable, of current and proposed in-process tests. 5. Description of the batches and summary of in-process control and release testing results as quantitative data, in a comparative tabular format, for one commercial scale batch of the pre-change and post-change drug product (certificates of analysis should be provided). Comparative pre-change test results do not need to be generated concurrently; relevant historical testing results are acceptable. Batch data on the next two full-production batches should be made available on request and reported by the marketing authorization holder if outside specification (with proposed action). The use of a smaller-scale batch may be acceptable where justified. 6. Description of the batches and summary of in-process control and release testing results as quantitative data, in a comparative tabular format, for at least three consecutive commercial-scale batches of the pre-change and post-change drug product (certificates of analysis should be provided). Comparative pre-change test results do not need to be generated concurrently; relevant historical testing results are acceptable. 7. Justification/risk assessment showing that the attribute is non-significant. 			

8. Justification for the new in-process test and limits.			
9. Evidence that the new company/facility is GMP-compliant.			
Description of change	Conditions to be fulfilled	Supporting data	Reporting category
42. Change in the specification/analytical procedure used to release the excipient, involving the following:			
a. Deletion of a test	5, 8	1, 3	Minor
b. Addition of a test	4	1–3	Minor
c. Replacement of an analytical procedure	1–3	1, 2	Minor
d. Minor changes to an approved analytical procedure	None	1, 2	Minor
e. Change from an in-house analytical procedure to a recognized compendial analytical procedure	None	1, 2	Minor
f. Widening of an approved acceptance criterion	None	1, 3	Moderate
g. Narrowing of an approved acceptance criterion	3, 4, 6, 7	1	Minor
<p>Conditions</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Results of method validation demonstrate that the proposed analytical procedure is at least equivalent to the approved analytical procedure. 2. The replaced analytical procedure maintains or improves precision, accuracy, specificity and sensitivity. 3. The change is within the range of approved acceptance criteria or has been made to reflect the new pharmacopoeial monograph specification for the excipient. 4. Acceptance criteria for residual solvents are within recognized or approved acceptance limits (for example, within ICH limits for a Class 3 residual solvent or pharmacopoeial requirements). 5. The deleted test has been demonstrated to be redundant compared to the remaining tests or is no longer a pharmacopoeial requirement. 6. The analytical procedure remains the same, or changes in the test procedure are minor. 7. The change does not result from unexpected events arising during manufacture (for example, new unqualified impurity, change in total impurity limits). 8. An alternative test analytical procedure is already authorized for the specification attribute/test and this procedure has not been added through a minor change submission. 			

Supporting data			
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Updated excipient specification. Where an in-house analytical procedure is used and a recognized compendial standard is claimed, results of an equivalency study between the in-house and compendial methods. Justification of the proposed excipient specification (for example, demonstration of the suitability of the monograph to control the excipient and potential impact on the performance of the drug product). 			
Description of change	Conditions to be fulfilled	Supporting data	Reporting category
43. Change in the standard/monograph (that is, specifications) claimed for the excipient	None	1–4	Moderate
	1–5	1–4	Minor
Conditions			
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> The change is from a House standard to a pharmacopoeial standard/monograph. The change is made exclusively to comply with a pharmacopoeial standard/monograph. There is no change to the specifications for the functional properties of the excipient outside the approved ranges, and no change that results in a potential impact on the performance of the drug product. There is no deletion of tests or relaxation of acceptance criteria of the approved specifications, except to comply with a pharmacopoeial standard/monograph. There is no deletion or change to any analytical procedures, except to comply with a pharmacopoeial standard/monograph. 			
Supporting data			
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Updated excipient specifications. Where a House analytical procedure is used and a pharmacopoeial/compendial standard/monograph is claimed, results of an equivalency study between the House and compendial methods. Justification of the proposed excipient specifications (for example, demonstration of the suitability of the monograph to control the excipient and potential impact on the performance of the drug product). A declaration that consistency of quality and of the production process of the excipient is maintained. 			
Description of change	Conditions to be fulfilled	Supporting data	Reporting category
44. Change in the source of an excipient from a vegetable or synthetic source to a human or animal	None	2–7	Major

source that may pose a TSE or viral risk			
45. Change in the source of an excipient from a TSE risk (for example, animal) source to a vegetable or synthetic source	None	1, 3, 5, 6	Moderate
46. Replacement in the source of an excipient from a TSE risk source to a different TSE risk source (for example, different animal source, different country of origin)	5, 6	2–7	Minor
47. Change in manufacture of a biological excipient	None	2–7	Major
	2	2–7	Moderate
	1, 2	2–7	Minor
48. Change in supplier for a plasma-derived excipient (for example, human serum albumin)	None	3–8	Major
	3, 4	5, 6, 9	Moderate
49. Change in supplier for an excipient of non-biological origin or of biological origin (excluding plasma-derived excipient)	None	2, 3, 5–7	Moderate
	1, 5, 6	3	Minor
50. Change in excipient testing site Note: Transfer of testing to a different facility within a GMP compliant site is not considered to be a reportable change but is treated as a minor GMP change and is reviewed during inspections.	1	10	Minor
<p>Conditions</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. There is no change to the specification of the excipient or drug product outside the approved limits. 2. The change does not concern a human plasma-derived excipient. 3. The human plasma-derived excipient from the new supplier is an approved medicinal product and 			

no manufacturing changes were made by the supplier of the new excipient since its last approval in the country/jurisdiction of the NRA.

4. The excipient does not influence the structure/conformation of the active ingredient.
5. The TSE risk source is covered by a TSE certificate of suitability and is of the same or lower TSE risk as the previously approved material.
6. Any new excipient does not require the assessment of viral safety data.

Supporting data

1. Declaration from the manufacturer of the excipient that the excipient is entirely of vegetable or synthetic origin.
2. Details of the source of the excipient (for example, animal species, country of origin) and the steps undertaken during processing to minimize the risk of TSE exposure.
3. Information demonstrating comparability in terms of physicochemical properties, and the impurity profile of the proposed excipient compared to the approved excipient.
4. Information on the manufacturing process and on the controls performed at critical steps of the manufacturing process, and on the intermediate of the proposed excipient.
5. Description of the batches and summary of results as quantitative data, in a comparative tabular format, for at least three commercial-scale batches of the proposed excipient.
6. Comparative pre-change and post-change test results for the manufacturer’s characterized key stability-indicating attributes for at least three commercial-scale drug product batches produced with the proposed changes and stored under accelerated and/or stress conditions for a minimum of 3 months. Test results that cover a minimum of 6 months in real-time/real-temperature conditions should also be provided. A possibility of 3 months of real-time data could be acceptable if properly justified (for example, it can be proven that the relevant effect, if present, can already be observed within 3 months). Comparative pre-change test results do not need to be generated concurrently; relevant historical results for batches on the stability programme are acceptable. Additionally, the manufacturer should commit to undertake real-time stability studies to confirm the full shelf-life/hold-time of the drug product under its normal storage conditions and to report to the authority any failures in these ongoing long-term stability studies. Matrixing, bracketing, the use of smaller-scale batches and/or the use of fewer than three batches of drug product for stability testing may be acceptable where justified.
7. Information assessing the risk with respect to potential contamination with adventitious agents (for example, impact on the viral clearance studies, or BSE/TSE risk), including viral safety documentation where necessary.
8. Complete manufacturing and clinical safety data to support the use of the proposed human plasma-derived excipient.
9. A letter from the supplier certifying that no changes were made to the plasma derived excipient compared to the currently approved corresponding medicinal product.
10. Evidence that the new company/facility is GMP-compliant.

Control of the drug product

Description of change	Conditions to be fulfilled	Supporting data	Reporting category
-----------------------	----------------------------	-----------------	--------------------

51. Change affecting the quality control testing of the drug product (release and stability),

involving the following:			
Note: Transfer of testing to a different facility within a GMP-compliant site is not considered to be a reportable change but is treated as a minor GMP change and is reviewed during inspections.			
a. Transfer of the quality control testing activities for a non-pharmacopoeial assay (in-house) to a new company not approved in the current marketing authorization or license or to a different site within the same company	None	1, 2	Moderate
	1–3	1, 2	Minor
b. Transfer of the quality control testing activities for a pharmacopoeial assay to a new company not approved in the current marketing authorization or license	None	1, 2	Moderate
	1	1, 2	Minor
Conditions			
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The transferred quality control test is not a potency assay or bioassay. 2. There are no changes to the test method. 3. The transfer is within a facility approved in the current marketing authorization for the performance of other tests. 			
Supporting data			
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Information demonstrating technology transfer qualification for the nonpharmacopoeial assays or verification for the pharmacopoeial assays. 2. Evidence that the new company/facility is GMP-compliant. 			
Description of change	Conditions to be fulfilled	Supporting data	Reporting category
52. Change in the standard/monograph (that is, specifications) claimed for the drug product, involving the following:			
a. A change from a pharmacopoeial standard/	None	1–5	Moderate

monograph to an in-house standard			
b. A change from an in-house standard to a pharmacopoeial standard/monograph or from one pharmacopoeial standard/ monograph to a different pharmacopoeial standard/monograph	1-4	1-3	Minor
53. Change in the specifications for the drug product to comply with an updated pharmacopoeial standard/ monograph	1, 2	1-3	Minor
<p>Conditions</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The change is made exclusively to comply with a pharmacopoeial monograph. 2. There is no change in drug product specifications outside the approved ranges. 3. There is no deletion of tests or relaxation of acceptance criteria of the approved specifications, except to comply with a pharmacopoeial standard/monograph. 4. There is no deletion or change to any analytical procedures, except to comply with a pharmacopoeial standard/monograph. 			
<p>Supporting data</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Revised drug product labelling information, as applicable. 2. An updated copy of the proposed drug product specifications. 3. Where an in-house analytical procedure is used and a pharmacopoeial standard/ monograph is claimed, results of an equivalency study between the in-house and pharmacopoeial methods. 4. Copies or summaries of validation reports if new analytical procedures are used. 5. Justification of specifications with data. 			
Description of change	Conditions to be fulfilled	Supporting data	Reporting category
54. Changes in the control strategy of the drug product, involving the following:			
a. Change from end-product testing to upstream controls for some test(s) (for example, real-time release testing, process analytical technology)	None	1-3, 5	Major
b. Addition of a new critical quality attribute to the	None	1-5	Moderate

control strategy			
c. Deletion of a critical quality attribute from the control strategy	None	1, 5	Moderate
Conditions			
None			
Supporting data			
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Information on the controls performed at critical steps of the manufacturing process and on intermediates of the proposed product. 2. An updated copy of the proposed drug product specifications. 3. Copies or summaries of analytical procedures if new analytical procedures are used. 4. Copies or summaries of validation reports if new analytical procedures are used to monitor the new critical quality attribute at release. 5. Justification and supporting data for each proposed change to the control strategy. 			
Description of change	Conditions to be fulfilled	Supporting data	Reporting category
55. Change in the specification/analytical procedure used to release the drug product, involving the following:			
a. Deletion of a test analytical procedure and/or an acceptance criterion	None	1, 6, 7	Moderate
b. Addition of a test	1, 2, 7	1–3, 5	Minor
c. Replacement of an analytical procedure	None	1–5	Moderate
	4, 5, 8	1, 4, 5	Minor
d. Changes to an approved analytical procedure	None	1–5	Moderate
	1, 3–5	2, 4, 5	Minor
e. Change from an in-house analytical procedure to a	None	1–5	Moderate

recognized compendial analytical procedure	1, 5	1–3	Minor
f. Widening of an approved acceptance criterion	None	1, 5, 7	Moderate
g. Narrowing of an approved acceptance criterion	1, 3, 6, 7	1	Minor
<p>Conditions</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. There is no change to the limits/acceptance criteria outside the approved limits for the approved assays used at release/ stability. 2. The additional test is not intended to monitor new impurity species. 3. The method of analysis is the same (for example, a change in column length or temperature, but not a different type of column or method) and no new impurities are detected. 4. The modified analytical procedure maintains or improves the performance parameters of the method. 5. The change does not concern potency-testing. 6. Acceptance criteria for residual solvents are within recognized or approved acceptance limits (for example, within ICH limits for a Class 3 residual solvent, or pharmacopoeial requirements). 7. The change does not result from unexpected events arising during manufacture (for example, new unqualified impurity, or impurity content outside the approved limits). 8. The change is from a pharmacopoeial assay to another pharmacopoeial assay or the marketing application holder has demonstrated an increased understanding of the relationship between method parameters and method performance defined by a systematic development approach including robustness studies. 			
<p>Supporting data</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. An updated copy of the proposed drug product specification. 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 change to the analytical procedure (for example, demonstration of the suitability of the analytical procedure in monitoring the drug product, including the degradation products) or for the change to the specification (for example, demonstration of the suitability of the revised acceptance criterion to control the drug product). 6. Justification for the deletion of the test (for example, demonstration of the suitability of the revised specification in controlling the final product). 7. Documented evidence that consistency of quality and of the production process is maintained. 			
<p>Reference standards</p>			
Description of change	Conditions to be fulfilled	Supporting data	Reporting category

56. Replacement of a primary reference standard	None	1, 2	Moderate
57. Change of the reference standards from a pharmacopoeial or international standard to in-house (no relationship with international standard)	None	1, 2	Moderate
58. Change of the reference standard from in-house (no relationship with international standard) to a pharmacopoeial or international standard	3	1, 2	Minor
59. Qualification of a new batch of reference standard against the approved reference standard (including qualification of a new batch of a secondary reference standard against the approved primary standard)	1	2	Minor
60. Change to the reference standard qualification Protocol	None	3, 4	Moderate
61. Extension of the reference standard shelf-life or re-test period	2	5	Minor
<p>Conditions</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The qualification of a new standard is carried out in accordance with an approved protocol. 2. The extension of the shelf-life of the reference standard is carried out in accordance with an approved protocol. 3. The reference standard is used for a physicochemical test. 			
<p>Supporting data</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Revised product labelling to reflect the change in reference standard, as applicable. 2. Qualification data of the proposed reference standards or materials (for example, source, characterization, certificate of analysis). 3. Justification of the change to the reference standard qualification protocol. 4. Updated reference standard qualification protocol. 5. Summary of stability testing and results or retest data to support the extension of the reference standard shelf-life. 			

Drug product container closure system			
Description of change	Conditions to be fulfilled	Supporting data	Reporting category
62. Modification of a primary container closure system (for example, new coating, adhesive, stopper, type of glass) <i>Note: The addition of a new container closure system (for example, addition of a pre-filled syringe where the currently approved presentation is only a vial) is considered a change in presentation (see change 35d).</i>	None	1–7	Moderate
	4	3, 7	Minor
	1–3	3	Minor
63. Change from a reusable container to a disposable container with no changes in product contact material (for example, change from reusable pen to disposable pen)	None	1, 3, 6	Moderate
64. Deletion of a container closure system <i>Note: The authority should be notified of the deletion of a container closure system, and product labelling information should be updated, as appropriate.</i>	None	1	Minor
<p>Conditions</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. There is no change in the type of container closure or materials of construction. 2. There is no change in the shape or dimensions of the container closure. 3. The change is made only to improve the quality of the container and does not modify the product contact material (for example, increased thickness of the glass vial without changing interior dimensions). 4. The modified part is not in contact with the drug product. 			
<p>Supporting data</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Revised product labelling information, as appropriate. 2. For sterilized products, process validation results, unless otherwise justified. 3. Update dossier containing information on the proposed container closure system, as appropriate (for example, description, materials of construction of primary packaging components). 4. Results demonstrating protection against leakage, no leaching of undesirable substance, compatibility with the product, and results from the toxicity and biological reactivity tests. 5. Summary of release testing results as quantitative data, in a comparative tabular format, for at least three consecutive commercial-scale batches of the pre-change and post-change drug product. 			

<p>Comparative pre-change test results do not need to be generated concurrently; relevant historical testing results are acceptable. Bracketing for multiple-strength products, container sizes and/or fills may be acceptable if scientifically justified.</p> <p>6. Comparative pre-change and post-change test results for the manufacturer's characterized key stability-indicating attributes for at least three commercial-scale drug product batches produced (unless otherwise justified) with the proposed changes and stored under accelerated and/or stress conditions for a minimum of 3 months. Test results that cover a minimum of 6 months in real-time/real temperature conditions should also be provided. A possibility of 3 months of real-time data could be acceptable if properly justified (for example, it can be proven that the relevant effect, if present, can already be observed within 3 months). Comparative pre-change test results do not need to be generated concurrently; relevant historical results for batches on the stability programme are acceptable. Additionally, the manufacturer should commit to undertake real-time stability studies to confirm the full shelf-life/hold-time of the drug product under its normal storage conditions and to report to the NRA any failures in these ongoing long-term stability studies. Matrixing, bracketing, the use of smaller-scale batches and/or the use of fewer than three batches of drug product for stability testing may be acceptable where justified.</p> <p>7. Information demonstrating the suitability of the proposed container/closure system with respect to its relevant properties (for example, results from last media fills; results of interaction studies demonstrating preservation of protein integrity and maintenance of sterility for sterile products; maintenance of sterility in multidose containers; user testing).</p>			
<p>65. Change in the supplier for a primary container closure component, involving the following</p>			
<p>a. Replacement or addition of a supplier</p> <p><i>Note: A change in container closure system involving new materials of construction, shape or dimensions would require supporting data, such as is shown for change 62 on modification of a primary container closure system.</i></p>	1, 2	1, 2	Minor
<p>b. Deletion of a supplier</p>	None	None	Minor
<p>Conditions</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> There is no change in the type of container closure, materials of construction, shape and dimensions, or in the sterilization process for a sterile container closure component. There is no change in the specification of the container closure component outside the approved acceptance criteria. 			
<p>Supporting data</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Letter from the marketing authorization holder certifying that there are no changes to the container closure system. Certificate of analysis, or equivalent, for the container provided by the new supplier and comparison with the certificate of analysis, or equivalent, for the approved container. 			
Description of change	Conditions to	Supporting	Reporting

	be fulfilled	data	category
66. Change in the specification used to release a primary container closure component or functional secondary container closure component, involving the following:			
a. Deletion of a test	1, 2	1, 2	Minor
b. Addition of a test	3	1, 2	Minor
c. Replacement of an analytical procedure	6, 7	1–3	Minor
d. Minor changes to an analytical procedure	4–7	1–3	Minor
e. Widening of an acceptance criterion	None	1, 2	Moderate
f. Narrowing of an acceptance criterion	8	1	Minor
<p>Conditions</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The deleted test has been demonstrated to be redundant compared to the remaining tests or is no longer a pharmacopoeial requirement. 2. The change to the specification does not affect the functional properties of the container closure component and does not have a potential impact on the performance of the drug product. 3. The change is not necessitated by recurring events arising during manufacture or because of stability concerns. 4. There is no change to the acceptance criteria outside the approved limits. 5. The new analytical procedure is of the same type. 6. Results of method validation demonstrate that the new or modified analytical procedure is at least equivalent to the approved analytical procedure. 7. The new or modified analytical procedure maintains or improves precision, accuracy, specificity and sensitivity. 8. The change is within the range of approved acceptance criteria. 			
<p>Supporting data</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. An updated copy of the proposed specification for the primary or functional secondary container closure component. 2. Rationale for the change in specification for a primary container closure component. 3. Description of the analytical procedure and, if applicable, validation data. 			
<p>Stability</p>			

Description of change	Conditions to be fulfilled	Supporting data	Reporting category
67. Change in the shelf-life of the drug product, involving the following			
a. Extension (includes extension of shelf-life of the drug product as packaged for sale, and hold-time after opening and after dilution or reconstitution)	None	1–5	Moderate
b. Reduction (includes reduction as packaged for sale, after opening, and after dilution or reconstitution)	None	1–5	Moderate
Conditions			
None			
Supporting data			
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Updated product labelling information, as appropriate. 2. Proposed storage conditions and shelf-life, as appropriate. 3. Updated post-approval stability protocol. 4. Justification of the change to the post-approval stability protocol or stability commitment. 5. Results of stability testing under real-time/real-temperature conditions covering the proposed shelf-life generated on at least three commercial-scale batches unless otherwise justified. 			
Description of change	Conditions to be fulfilled	Supporting data	Reporting category
68. Change in the post-approval stability protocol of the drug product, involving the following:			
a. Substantial change to the post-approval stability protocol or stability commitment, such as deletion of a test, replacement of an analytical procedure, or change in storage temperature	None	1–5	Moderate
b. Addition of test(s) into the post-approval stability	1	1, 2, 4, 5	Minor

protocol			
c. Deletion of time point(s) from the post-approval stability protocol within the approved shelf-life	2	4, 5	Minor
d. Replacement of sterility testing by the container/closure system integrity testing	None	1, 2, 4, 5	Moderate
	3	4, 5	Minor
<p>Conditions</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The addition of the test(s) is not due to stability concerns or to the identification of new impurities. 2. Deletion of time point(s) is done according to relevant guidelines (for example,). 3. The method used to demonstrate the integrity of the container/closure system has already been approved as part of a previous application related to the drug product. 			
<p>Supporting data</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Copies or summaries of analytical procedures if new analytical procedures are used. 2. Validation results if new analytical procedures are used. 3. Proposed storage conditions and or shelf-life, as appropriate. 4. Updated post-approval stability protocol, including justification for the change, and stability commitment. 5. Comparative results demonstrating that the approved and proposed analytical procedures are equivalent. 			
Description of change	Conditions to be fulfilled	Supporting data	Reporting category
69. Change in the labelled storage conditions for the drug product or the diluted or reconstituted biotherapeutic products, involving the following:			
a. Addition or change of storage condition(s) for the drug product, diluted or reconstituted drug product (for example, widening or narrowing of a temperature criterion, addition of or change to controlled temperature chain conditions)	None	1–4, 6	Moderate
b. Addition of a cautionary statement (for example, “Do not freeze”)	None	1, 2, 4, 5	Moderate

c. Deletion of a cautionary statement (for example, “Do not freeze”)	None	1, 2, 4, 6	Moderate
<p>Conditions</p> <p>None</p>			
<p>Supporting data</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Revised product labelling information, as applicable. 2. Proposed storage conditions and shelf-life. 3. Updated post-approval stability protocol and stability commitment. 4. Justification of the change in the labelled storage conditions/cautionary statement. 5. Results of stability testing under appropriate stability conditions covering the proposed shelf-life, generated on one commercial-scale batch unless otherwise justified. 6. Results of stability testing under appropriate conditions covering the proposed shelf-life, generated on at least three commercial-scale batches unless otherwise justified. 			

Annex 4: Safety, efficacy and product labelling information changes

The examples of safety and efficacy changes, product labelling information changes and administrative product labelling information changes in this annex are provided for clarification. However, such changes are not limited to those included in this annex. They may also result in changes to the product labelling information for health-care providers and patients, and to inner and outer labels.

Because the amount of safety and efficacy data needed to support a change may vary according to the impact of the change, risk–benefit considerations and product-specific characteristics there is no “one size fits all” approach. This annex, therefore, provides a list of examples of changes in the various categories rather than a detailed table linking each change with the required data needed to support that change (as is provided in Annexes 2 and 3 for quality changes). Marketing authorization holders or applicants are encouraged to contact the authority for guidance on the data needed to support major changes if deemed necessary.

Safety and efficacy changes

Safety and efficacy change supplements require approval prior to implementation of the change and are generally submitted for changes related to clinical practice, safety and indication claims.

The following are examples of safety and efficacy changes requiring data from clinical studies and/or nonclinical studies, post-marketing observational studies or extensive post-marketing safety data:

- Change to the indication:
 - (a) addition of a new indication (for example, treatment of a previously unspecified disease);
 - (b) modification of an approved indication (for example, expansion of the age of use or restriction of an indication based on clinical studies demonstrating lack of efficacy).
- Change in the recommended dose and/or dosing schedule.
- Change to the use in specific at-risk groups (for example, addition of information on use in pregnant women or immunocompromised patients).

- Change to add information on co-administration with other medicines.
- Change to add a new route of administration.
- Change to add a new dosage form (for example, replacement of a suspension for injection with a lyophilized cake).
- Change to add a new strength.
- Change to add a new delivery device (for example, adding a prefilled syringe or pen).
- Change in existing risk-management measures:
 - (a) deletion of an existing route of administration, dosage form and/or strength due to safety reasons;
 - (b) deletion of a contraindication (for example, use in pregnant women);
 - (c) changing a contraindication to a precaution.

Product labelling information changes

Supplements on product labelling information changes should be submitted for changes which do not require clinical efficacy and/or safety data from clinical studies but normally require extensive pharmacovigilance (safety surveillance) data. Product labelling information changes require approval prior to implementation.

The following are examples of product labelling information changes that impact on the clinical use of a product:

- Addition of an adverse event that is identified as consistent with a causal association with administration of the biotherapeutic product concerned.
- Change in the frequency of occurrence of a given adverse reaction.
- Addition of a contraindication or warning (for example, identification of a specific subpopulation as being at greater risk, such as individuals with a concomitant condition or taking concomitant medicines, or a specific age group). These changes may include provision of recommended risk-management actions (for example, ensuring patient awareness of certain risks).
- Strengthening, clarification or amendment of the text of the product labelling information relating to contraindications, warnings, precautions and adverse reactions.

- Revisions to the instructions for use, including dosage, administration and preparation for administration, to optimize the safe use of the biotherapeutic product.

In some cases, the safety-related changes listed above may be urgent and may require rapid implementation (for example, addition of a contraindication or warning). To allow for the speedy processing of such requests, the supplements for these changes should be labelled as “Urgent product labelling information changes” and should be submitted after prior agreement between the authority and the marketing authorization holder.

Administrative product labelling information changes

Administrative product labelling information changes are changes to any of the labelling items which are not expected to have an impact upon the safe and efficacious use of the biotherapeutic product. In some cases, these changes may need to be reported to the authority and approval received prior to implementation, while in other cases reporting may not be required.

Examples of changes which do require reporting to the authority and receipt of approval prior to implementation by the marketing authorization holder include:

- Change in the proper/nonproprietary name or trade name of the biotherapeutic product.
- Change in the name of the marketing authorization holder and/or manufacturer (for example, change of name due to a merger).

Examples of changes which may not require approval by the authority prior to implementation include:

- Updated contact information for the marketing authorization holder (for example, customer service number or website address) or distributor’s name.
- Minor changes to the layout of the product labelling information items or revision of typographical errors without changing the content of the label.
- Update of the existing information for referenced literature without adding or removing references.
- Changes made to comply with an official compendium (for example, change of the common name).

- Minor changes to the text to add clarity in relation to maintaining consistency with common label phrase standards (for example, change from “not recommended for children” to “not for use in children”).

These administrative product labelling information changes (that is, changes not subject to prior approval that have been implemented since the last approved product labelling information) should be included when submitting subsequent PAS for safety and efficacy changes or for product labelling information changes.