1	NEAL R. GROSS & CO., INC.
2	RPTS MORRISON
3	HIF030140
4	
5	
6	EXAMINING IMPLEMENTATION OF
7	THE COMPOUNDING QUALITY ACT
8	TUESDAY, JANUARY 30, 2018
9	House of Representatives
10	Subcommittee on Health
11	Committee on Energy and Commerce
12	Washington, D.C.
13	
14	
15	
16	The subcommittee met, pursuant to call, at 11:00 a.m., in
17	Room 2123 Rayburn House Office Building, Hon. Michael Burgess
18	[chairman of the subcommittee] presiding.
19	Members present: Representatives Burgess, Guthrie, Barton,
20	Upton, Shimkus, Latta, McMorris Rodgers, Lance, Griffith,
21	Bilirakis, Long, Bucshon, Mullin, Hudson, Collins, Carter, Green,
22	Schakowsky, Matsui, Sarbanes, Schrader, Eshoo, DeGette, and
23	Pallone (ex officio).
24	Staff present: Adam Buckalew, Professional Staff Member,

Health; Karen Christian, General Counsel; Kelly Collins, Staff
Assistant; Zachary Dareshori, Staff Assistant; Paul Eddatel,
Chief Counsel, Health; Margaret Tucker Fogarty, Staff Assistant;
Adam Fromm, Director of Outreach and Coalitions; Ali Fulling,
Legislative Clerk, Oversight & Investigations, Digital Commerce
and Consumer Protection; Jay Gulshen, Legislative Clerk, Health;
Ed Kim, Policy Coordinator, Health; Bijan Koohmaraie, Counsel,
Digital Commerce and Consumer Protection; Katie McKeogh, Press
Assistant; Mark Ratner, Policy Coordinator; Jennifer Sherman,
Press Secretary; Danielle Steele, Counsel, Health; Tiffany
Guarascio, Minority Deputy Staff Director and Chief Health
Advisor; Samantha Satchell, Minority Policy Analyst; Kimberlee
Trzeciak, Minority Senior Health Policy Advisor; and C.J. Young,
Minority Press Secretary.

Mr. Burgess. [presiding] I would like to call the subcommittee to order.

And I recognize myself for an opening statement.

Today's hearing marks the Health Subcommittee's first look at the Compounding Quality Act, which passed under Title I of the Drug Quality and Security Act nearly 5 years ago. Prior to then, the last time Congress examined the drug compounding issue was in 1997, when it passed the Food and Drug Administration Modernization Act, touching upon the Food and Drug Administration's authority to regulate compounded drugs and establishing Section 503A in the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act.

A tragic outbreak of fungal meningitis in 2012, when the New England Compounding Center shipped over 17,000 contaminated vials of a compounded steroid medication throughout the country, resulted in one of the worst and most fatal drug safety incidents in the history of the United States, where more than 750 people developed fungal infections in 20 states and, subsequently, 60 people lost their lives. This outbreak prompted Congress to act, with the Energy and Commerce Committee taking the lead in the House, through a series of investigations and a series of hearings on the issue.

Today we will convene two panels of witnesses. And I do want to welcome back Dr. Gottlieb, Commissioner of the Food and Drug

Administration. Thank you for coming back to our subcommittee this morning.

The agency has been very active over the last several months on drug compounding, most recently, releasing the 2018

Compounding Policy Priorities Plan. Your insights today, Dr. Gottlieb, are certainly appreciated.

Later in our second panel, we will hear directly from representatives of the pharmacies, physicians, patients, and manufacturers who will share their perspective on the implementation of Title I under the DQSA. We will also have a patient of the New England Compounding Center to share her personal story from the 2012 incidents and her experience since that time. All of the testimony from today's hearing are critical in our understanding of the compounding issue as the Food and Drug Administration works to strike the proper balance that would continue to advance patient safety while ensuring patients access to compounded medication.

Being a physician who has worked with compounding pharmacists during my time in practice, I know the important role and the value that these individuals serve in the delivery of patient care. Compounded drugs serve a unique need of patients that cannot utilize an FDA-approved product due to, for example, an allergy to one of the product's ingredients or the primary route of the product's administration. Many of us remember the swine

flu epidemic of 5 years when compounding for the anti-flu medications in an elixir form was absolutely critical to protect children who had been recently infected.

Because of the process involved in creating a compounded medication, we all acknowledge the fact that proper oversight is necessary, whether by the Food and Drug Administration itself or a state's regulatory body, such as its board of pharmacy. Preventing poor compounding practices that can lead to contamination or erroneous product strength, quality, and purity is the goal we all aspire to, so that another New England Compounding Center does not happen. Thinking back to that fungal meningitis outbreak, I was not only heartbroken by the patients' lives lost or harmed, but I was also troubled by what seemed to be missed opportunities that could have prevented the tragedy.

Title I of the DQSA accomplished two things. First, the law further clarified the Food and Drug Administration's authority to regulate traditional pharmacy compounding practices under Section 503A, which had seen several court challenges. Second, it added Section 503B to the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetics Act, creating a new category of drug compounders known as outsourcing facilities. These outsourcing facilities engage in larger-scale, national distribution of sterile drugs in bulk quantities and have, thus, heightened statutory requirements, such as complying with good manufacturing processes and being

subject to certain registration, reporting, and inspection requirements.

Over the last 4 years, the Food and Drug Administration has issued numerous draft and final guidance documents, proposed and final rules, and a draft memorandum of understanding to implement the Title I provisions. There has been discussion and debate over the manner that the agency has used to implement Title I.

In my home state of Texas, there already exists in statute the framework and manner in which a compounding pharmacy should conduct its practice. Other stakeholders have also expressed concern around office-use compounding and the prescription requirement. I hope these and other issues in the drug compounding space will be discussed today.

So, I am encouraged by the interest of all the stakeholders involved in this important debate, many of whom are represented today. I am certainly encouraged by the commitment of the Food and Drug Administration with Dr. Gottlieb's commitment to work with Congress in ensuring that patients have access to products that are tailored to their clinical needs while equipping agency officials with the requisite tools to protect public health.

Again, I want to welcome our witnesses and thank you for being here.

And I will recognize Mr. Green, 5 minutes, for an opening statement.

Mr. Green. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, for having this hearing.

In 2012, the interstate distribution of contaminated compounded drug products led to an outbreak of fungal meningitis in 20 states, which tragically resulted in 64 deaths and left 750 people with infections that were often severe and cause long-term damage. The New England Compounding Center, the NECC, the entity responsible for the compounding and shipping of the contaminated drugs, had been the subject of prior complaints and had been investigated by both the FDA and the Massachusetts State Board of Pharmacy. However, in part, because of uncertainty over the validity of Section 503A of the Food, Drug, and Cosmetics Act, it was not clear which copy, the FDA or the state, was on the beat, and the NECC continued to operate.

Unfortunately, while it was the most fatal incident to date, the NECC outbreak was not a one-off event. It certainly wasn't the first tragedy and hasn't proven to be the last. Just last year, we learned that at least 43 patients were left with diminished vision from a steroid antibiotic injection compounded by a Texas pharmacy. FDA studies have found quality problems with drugs compounded in other pharmacies, including sub- and super-potent drugs and contamination. According to one report, from 1990 to 2005, FDA became aware of almost 240 serious illnesses and deaths associated with improperly compounding products, with

the actual number likely to be greater since pharmacies are not required to report adverse events to the FDA. The Pew Charitable Trust published a report in 2014 that identified more than 25 reported compounding errors or potential errors linked to more than a thousand adverse events between 2001 and 2013.

Following that NECC outbreak, Congress finally took action with the Compounding Quality Act, CQA, and the Drug Quality and Security Act, DQSA, was signed into law in 2013. In a sideline, I want to thank my colleagues Congressman Griffith and Congresswoman DeGette because we worked together on a bipartisan basis to solve this problem. It sound to protect patients and provide industry with clarity for drawing a distinct line between the authority between state boards of pharmacy and the FDA. CQA made two key changes in reestablishing the FDA role regarding traditional compounding under Section 503A, creating a new category of drug compounders deemed outsourcing facilities under Section 503B.

The NECC outbreak and other adverse events underscored the need to establish a strong legal framework to provide for safe compounded medications that meet patients' needs while clarifying and strengthening oversight of such drugs to protect public health. There was an obvious need to address the growing number of enterprises that had cropped up during the time of legal uncertainty between the states and the FDA. Many of these

enterprises had come to act like drug manufacturers operating outside FDA's standard oversight, often failing to meet current good manufacturing practices and skirting oversight by inappropriately operating under the guise of 503A pharmacy.

DQSA was not perfect, and like all compromises, not every problem was solved to everyone's satisfaction, and not everyone got exactly what they wanted. During bipartisan, bicameral negotiations, we tried to address as many discrepancies as we could and satisfy the needs of patients, providers, pharmacists, and manufacturers. What is ultimately important is that DQSA fixed the problems that led to the deadly fungal meningitis outbreak and required the FDA to succeed where in the past it had not.

Compounded medications fill an important role in our healthcare system, offer patients an option when an approved drug does not fit their needs. Patients' ability to timely access safe compound drugs is vital, and pursuit of this goal is something I believe we all share. I understand questions remain about the office stock, bulk lists, the memorandum of understanding, the interstate distribution, and copies of FDA-approved products, and other issues. More needs to be done to foster a robust 503B sector, support traditional pharmacists, ensure patient access to needed medications, and inform providers on how they can get the drugs they need when they need them, so they can successfully

207 treat their patients. As the FDA and stakeholders continue to work on the 208 209 implementation of DOSA, and the agency, patients, providers, and 210 industry continue to learn and adjust, I hope we can work together to refine the rules of the road, so patient access isn't unduly 211 212 diminished and patient safety is upheld. 213 Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I yield back my time. 214 Mr. Burgess. The Chair thanks the gentleman. 215 gentleman yields back. 216 Pending the arrival of the full committee chairman, Mr. 217 Walden, let me recognize the gentleman from New Jersey, 5 minutes 218 for an opening statement. Mr. Pallone. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. 219 220 I would like to submit to the record a joint statement from 2.2.1 the Association for Accessible Medicine's Biotechnology 222 Innovation Organization, the National Association of County and 223 City Health Officials, Pew Charitable Trusts, Pharmaceutical 2.2.4 Research and Manufacturers of America, PharMEDium, and Trust for 225 America's Health. If I could ask unanimous consent to have a copy 226 of it --227 Without objection, so ordered. Mr. Burgess. 228 Mr. Pallone. Thank you. 229 [The information follows:] 230

231 | ******* COMMITTEE INSERT 1*******

Mr. Pallone. Mr. Chairman, thanks for holding today's hearing on the Compounding Quality Act, which passed with broad support from stakeholders and bipartisan, bicameral support in Congress in 2013. Passage of the Compounding Quality act was about patient safety. Congress came together in response to the horrible tragedy of actions by the New England Compounding Center, or NECC, that led to 64 people losing their lives. And despite a history of complaints and investigations by both the FDA and the Massachusetts State Board of Pharmacy, NECC was allowed to continue compounding products given to patients on a scale and in a manner that should never have been allowed. The new law was meant to clarify drug compounding laws. It was also supposed to make clear the lines and requirements for traditional pharmacies that want to compound and those pharmacies that compound on a larger scale.

I think we all agree and support maintaining patient access to compounded drug products. Undoubtedly, there are patients with unique medical needs for which a traditional prescription drug product is not appropriate, whether for pediatric patients, seniors, or those with allergies. However, we must all remember that compounded drug products are not without risk. Compounded drug products are not reviewed by FDA prior to coming to the market for safety and effectiveness. Traditional compounding pharmacies are also not required to report on the compounded drug

232

233

234

235

236

237

238

239

240

241

242

243

244

245

246

247

248

249

250

251

252

253

254

products they produce or report adverse events.

While this law was intended to prevent another tragedy like the one at NECC, adverse events associated with compounded drug products are still occurring. Since passage of the law, there have been more than 140 recalls associated with compounded drugs. We have also seen reports of serious health events. For example, just last summer, 43 patients suffered vision impairment after receiving compounded eye injections of a drug containing a combination of a steroid and an anti-infective agent. Also, last year three infants received a compounded morphine preparation that was 25 times the strength that was indicated on the label, resulting in at least one hospitalization. These are just two examples of why clearly identified standards and requirements must be maintained if we are going to protect patient health.

Recently, FDA released the agency's 2018 Compounding Policy Priorities Plan identifying next steps the agency will be pursuing in regards to implementing the Compounding Quality Act, including revisions to current guidance. As FDA moves forward, I would caution the agency to ensure that any revisions that it makes do not enable an environment that could allow for another NECC to occur. We must maintain appropriate patient safeguards and clear lines between what activities are permissible for traditional pharmacies and what activities are permissible for outsourcing facilities. Patient safety and the protection of public health

280	must be at the forefront of any guidance revisions that the FDA
281	considers, and the American people deserve confidence that the
282	drug products they receive are safe and held to strong quality
283	standards.
284	So, I want to thank Commissioner Gottlieb and all of our
285	witnesses for being here today. I want to go beyond just today's
286	hearing, Commissioner, and mention that you have been really great
287	at trying to reach out to Members of Congress, much more so than
288	most of the agency leaders. So, thank you for that. And I look
289	forward to a robust discussion about the implementation of the
290	Compounding Act.
291	I yield back, Mr. Chairman.
292	Mr. Burgess. The Chair thanks the gentleman. The
293	gentleman yields back.
294	The Chair now recognizes the gentleman from Michigan, Mr.
295	Upton, 5 minutes for an opening statement.
296	Mr. Upton. Well, thank you, Mr. Chairman, and I would ask
297	unanimous consent to put Chairman Walden's full statement into
298	the record.
299	Mr. Burgess. Without objection, so ordered.
300	[The prepared statement of the chairman follows:]
301	
302	****** COMMITTEE INSERT 2******

303	Mr. Upton. And also, a letter from our colleague, Mr.
304	Bishop, enter the letter into the record.
305	Mr. Burgess. Without objection, so ordered.
306	[The information follows:]
307	
308	****** COMMITTEE INSERT 3******

Mr. Upton. So, Mr. Chairman, the 2012 outbreak of the fungal meningitis resulting from contaminated steroid injections manufactured by the New England Compounding Center, NECC, was certainly a failure of epic proportions. Of the 753 people that were sickened by the outbreak, 264 called Michigan their home. Yes, we were the largest state hit. Nineteen of the 64 deaths caused by the tragedy were from Michigan, and three of them were constituents of mine.

I was chairman of the full Energy and Commerce Committee at the time that this happened, and we immediately launched a bipartisan investigation to find out what went wrong. I am not going to go through the full history of what happened then, but I will say that those at the NECC who were responsible were, in fact, brought to justice. And this committee crafted legislation to empower the FDA to ensure that the heinous acts of negligence like this one would never happen again. We wanted to fix the problem.

That legislation, the Drug Quality and Security Act, DQSA, is currently being implemented by the FDA, and it takes a number of measures to ensure safety, not the least of which are much-needed restrictions on the use of bulk compounded material as opposed to FDA-approved products when there is not a clinical need to do so.

I am pleased to see the new Commissioner here to update us

on how DQSA implementation is going and what we in Congress can 333 334 do to help move the process along. We appreciate cooperation, 335 and again, the cooperation of Members on both sides of the aisle. And I will yield back the balance of my time. 336 337 Mr. Burgess. The Chair thanks the gentleman. 338 gentleman yields back. 339 And we do want to thank all of our witnesses for taking time to be here today and taking time to testify before the 340 341 subcommittee. Each witness will have the opportunity to give an 342 opening statement, followed by questions from members. 343 have two panels today. 344 The first panel, we will hear from Dr. Scott Gottlieb, the 345 Commissioner of the United States Food and Drug Administration. 346 Dr. Gottlieb, once again, we appreciate your being here 347 today, and you are recognized for 5 minutes for your opening

statement, please.

STATEMENT OF SCOTT GOTTLIEB, COMMISSIONER, UNITED STATES FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION

Dr. Gottlieb. Thank you, Chairman Burgess, Ranking Member Green, members of the subcommittee. I appreciate the invitation to testify at today's hearing on implementation of Title I of the Drug Quality and Security Act.

We are all here together today because, more than 5 years ago, we grappled with the devastating consequences of the 2012 outbreak of fungal meningitis caused by the manufacturer that was compounding under the guise of a state-licensed pharmacy that shipped contaminated compounded drugs throughout the country. It led to more than 750 illnesses and 60 deaths in 20 states.

Because of this tragedy, Congress acted to ensure that something like this would never happen again. No one wants to see another such outbreak occur, and I am personally committed to ensuring that FDA does its part to help prevent future deaths from poor quality compounded drugs.

The 2012 outbreak as well as other issues we have seen through our compounding oversight underscore the need to improve compounding practices and more robust oversight of compounders, supported by close federal and state collaboration. It also highlighted the need for a clear legal framework that would provide for compounding to meet patients' needs while also

equipping the FDA with authorities to address unlawful practices that threaten the public health.

Unfortunately, since enactment of DQSA, there have been other tragedies and cases of serious and unnecessary patient harm which reinforce why our work is so critical. The FDA's compounding program is a priority for the FDA, given its profound public health implications, and we are committed to implementing the DOSA framework.

We have issued 24 draft guidances and final guidances, a final rule, and three proposed rules, and a draft MOU with the states. We have held eight meetings with the Pharmacy Compounding Advisory Committee to discuss 48 bulk drug substances nominated for use in compounding, as well as six categories of drug products nominated for the list of drugs that present demonstrable difficulties for compounding.

On the oversight and enforcement front, since enactment of the DQSA, the FDA has conducted nearly 500 inspections and we have issued more than 180 warning letters advising compounders of significant violations of federal law. We have overseen more than 150 recalls involving compounded drugs, and we have worked with DOJ on multiple civil and criminal enforcement actions and set up a joint task force with them.

But I know there is still a lot left to be done, and I know that there are some who say we haven't implemented certain aspects

of DQSA with the speed you had hoped. We have had our own challenges addressing certain aspects of this complex framework, including our constant challenge to make sure we are striking the right balance between safety and access, and addressing the oftentimes very divergent views on these issues. I want you to know I am personally committed and involved in these efforts and committed to getting these things right, to making sure that we strike a careful balance and take measure of your concerns.

In implementing the DQSA over the years, FDA has aimed to develop policies that support the growth of the outsourcing facility sector. Compounding pharmacies and outsourcing facilities can help meet the legitimate patient needs when an FDA-approved drug is not available to meet such medical needs. We know that we must balance the critical role that compounding plays in helping patients and providers advance public health while ensuring that compounders do so in a manner that protects patients from poor quality compounded drugs and does not undermine the drug approval process.

And so, our actions to date, as well as the comprehensive 2018 Compounding Policy Priorities that we unveiled a few weeks ago, focus squarely on protecting patients from harm and establishing regulatory clarity, so our outsourcing facilities can meet important protections in Section 503B and our quality standards.

One of my key goals is to make it more feasible and lower cost for a large swath of pharmacies to transition to becoming outsourcing facilities, which are subject to greater FDA oversight. We are also working to help ensure patient access to compounded drugs when they need them. For instance, we are taking steps to help providers identify outsourcing facilities that make, or would be willing to make, compounded drugs for office stock to treat patients who have medical need for them.

Let me be clear on one thing. I am committed to getting the things we have committed to done. All of the commitments made under the plan I released two weeks ago will be completed in 2018.

I would like to just close by briefly mentioning another critical public health matter. Today we took new action to address the epidemic of opioid addiction. We took steps to limit the dispensing of Loperamide, an OTC drug, that is increasingly being abused for its opioid-like qualities when it is taken at very high doses and dangerous doses. I hope you will take the time to look at the statement we issued, as we continue to work together to address this critical public health crisis. There is no magic bullet to solving this crisis. It is only going to be through continued and vigilant steps, like the one we took today, that I can hope we can start to reverse some devastating trends.

I look forward to answering your questions today and

421

422

423

424

425

426

427

428

429

430

431

432

433

434

435

436

437

438

439

440

441

442

443

445	continuing to share more with you during the year ahead, as we
446	build on our past efforts as part of our public health mission.
447	[The prepared statement of Dr. Gottlieb follows:]
448	
449	******** INSERT 4******

Mr. Burgess. The Chair thanks the gentleman for his testimony, and we will move into the question portion of the hearing. I will begin with questioning and recognize myself for 5 minutes.

Commissioner, in the information you provided us, you had a list of adverse events associated with drugs prepared by compounding facilities in the past 5 years. Presumably, that is the lifetime of the DQSA. The one at the top of the list has been mentioned by a couple of people on the dais this morning, in Texas, some steroid antibiotic eye injections that caused problems with Is there something more that could have been done in DQSA to prevent this or was the problem found more rapidly because of the tools that you were given in the DQSA? Help us sort of understand. Here is something that happened in my backyard. Is it something that we should have worked harder to prevent or was, in fact, the outbreak less than it would have been because you had tools to use?

Dr. Gottlieb. Well, thank you for the question, Congressman.

I think, as we start to exercise these new authorities, we are learning a lot. The scope of the kind of enforcement activities we take have also changed. In the early days of implementation and historically, a lot of the focus has been on issues of sterility with things like eye drops or things that are

450

451

452

453

454

455

456

457

458

459

460

461

462

463

464

465

466

467

468

469

470

471

472

used intravenously or intramuscular injections.

I think what we are seeing more and more, and where we are starting to focus more of our inspectional activities, is on formulations that are compounded in ways where they might be super-potent. The challenge is that, when the pharmacies make potency errors, it is usually a logarithmic, log error, so thereby a factor of 10 or 20. So, you can get potencies that can cause significant harm.

I think this underscores the need to make sure that, when drugs are being compounded on a wide basis and distributed on a wide basis, it is done in facilities where we can apply GMP standards to them. And this is, in part, why I think Congress contemplated the whole creation of the 503B structure, where drugs that would be used on a wider scale would be compounded under that kind of supervision.

Mr. Burgess. Let me ask you a question. Obviously, it was before your tenure when we had the hearings after the New England Compounding Center problems. But it was clear to some of us during the course of those investigations and the work that the committee did -- and Chairman Upton was correct to reference it; this committee, the full committee took the leadership on this issue. But there were places where the FDA clearly fell short of its responsibility to protect public health, despite what appeared retrospectively to be clear warnings that the New England

Compounding Center was engaged in dangerous activities. So, are you confident that the FDA now has the clear authority it needs to ensure that we don't see a repeat of those things that happened in 2012?

Dr. Gottlieb. I testified at those hearings as a private citizen in 2013 here in Washington. I was working at a think tank at the time and weighed in at the time. I think I felt what Congress contemplated was a framework that gave the FDA the proper tools to provide oversight over this industry. But I think we need to keep in mind that we are now implementing a framework on an industry that is vast, that grew up, that was allowed to grow up largely outside regulatory purview for a long period of time, and retrofitting a regulatory framework back onto an already existing industry is always a difficult task.

Do I believe the authorities and the tools that we are able to exercise are robust? I do. I think that it is going to take time to get them fully implemented and get the kinds of tools and practices we want applied over that industry. And it is superimposed on an environment where, admittedly -- and people have good arguments on both sides of this debate -- there has been some discussion around how FDA is using those authorities and whether they are using them in an appropriate fashion. I believe we are and I believe we need to continue to move forward.

Mr. Burgess. Yes, I expect we may hear about that this

morning in our second panel. I guess that is the concern. Or what I would like to ask is the efforts that you and the agency have taken to engage the physician community, patient community, other stakeholders, where they may have perhaps the feeling that things have tightened up too much.

Dr. Gottlieb. Well, this isn't going to work unless we are working closely with the providers and the state authorities. This law, Congress contemplated a framework that very much was envisioned where FDA would have close collaboration with medical societies and state authorities, and there was a lot of shared jurisdiction between the federal and the state framework around both the 503A and the 503B facilities. States dually inspect a lot of the 503B facilities.

So, I think it is going to be very important for us to continue to work closely with the state communities and the provider groups. I believe we have. I think that there is more alignment there than perhaps is widely perceived, as obviously some 503A pharmacies that want to engage in certain practices where there is a line that we need to draw to make sure that we are providing the proper oversight, and I think we are going to hear about that tension today. I think that is a large place where we still have some area of disagreement.

Mr. Burgess. Very well. I want to be respectful of everyone's time because we do have a long hearing today. I am

going to recognize Mr. Green for 5 minutes for questions.

Mr. Green. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Thank you, Dr. Gottlieb, for being here this morning, but also the good work you are doing at the FDA.

I appreciate the continued emphasis the FDA has put on the issue of compounding drugs and hope to keep working with the agency on implementation in our shared goal of striking the right balance, so we can promote patient access without compromising patient safety. I am encouraged to see the FDA is actively working to implement the patient safety measures that are included in the DQSA.

In particular, I am pleased to see that FDA is taking steps to encourage registration of 503B outsourcing facilities. In your 2018 Compounding Policy Priorities Plan you suggested the FDA will be taking a more risk-based approach to the development and implementation of current good manufacturing practices, or CGMPs. I understand FDA is working on revising the 2014 draft guidance to apply CGMP requirements in a way that is tailored to the nature of the specific operations conducted by an outsourcing facility and move away from one-size-fits-all. I appreciate the agency's goal of improving patient safety by making the regulatory framework more flexible by recognizing volume as a factor in its risk-based evaluation.

Can you elaborate more about the agency's thinking around

what has been referred to as "503B-light"?

Dr. Gottlieb. Thanks for the question, Congressman.

What I am envisioning is a framework where -- the GMP standards are not a fixed standard. It is a risk-based standard. We want to try to devise that framework in a way where we could titrate the level of the regulatory touch to what the facility is doing, the size of the facility, how many drugs they are developing, how they are shipping them, whether the drugs are oral drugs or they are parenteral drugs that are going to be injected, which would be sterile drugs and have higher risk.

The idea is that, by trying to adjust the level of the regulatory oversight to the level of risk, we could potentially allow more 503A facilities to make the conversion into being 503B facilities. That is why we are taking the time to revise that guidance.

There are things where we have some flexibility, like retention of samples, lot release, the stability studies that we require, where if it is a pharmacy doing something on a small scale, not shipping widely, compounding drugs that are relatively low-risk, we might be able to dial back some of that level of regulatory oversight versus someone who is engaging in larger-scale manufacturing. But, again, with the goal of seeing more 503A pharmacies become 503B pharmacies where they are able to engage in the kinds of things that some pharmacies want to do.

594 We want to bring down the cost of doing that. We have done 595 some economic analysis around what it would cost. I think it is 596 still a little bit too expensive to see some of the small 503A 597 pharmacies opting into that. So, we are trying to take another 598 crack at that. 599 Mr. Green. Okay. Thank you. 600 And I do have concerns about the possibility of creating a 601 In the pursuit of flexibility, I am concerned two-tiered system. 602 of the impact this may have on 503B facilities that compound 603 biologics, which are especially vulnerable to degradation. 604 How would you respond to these concerns? Can you tell me 605 how you plan to ensure that CGMPs that apply to 503Bs will hold 606 these facilities to the highest standards of sterility and 607 stability? 608 Maybe I didn't understand that language. 609 [Laughter.] 610 I understand your concerns. Dr. Gottlieb. I share them. 611 The first thing I am going to do is come up with a better name 612 for it than "503B-light," before that takes hold. 613 But I will tell you that we are very mindful of that. So, for example, you reference biological products. They are 614 615 particularly vulnerable to contamination and to bacterial growth. 616 That would be something that would be higher-risk, where we would 617 apply more oversight.

We are talking about trying to create a standard that is flexible, as is all our GMP oversight. It is a risk-based framework. If a pharmacy is engaging in small-scale manufacturing of relatively low-risk products, they wouldn't be subject to all of the same requirements that someone who is engaging in large-scale manufacturing of higher-risk sterile As they move through the continuum of risk, products would be. our level of oversight would increase. It needs to be a flexible standard. It is a flexible standard in every other realm of our regulation. It ought to be here. But you are absolutely right that there is a continuum of risk, and we need to be very mindful that we are matching our regulatory touch appropriately to that level of risk.

Mr. Green. Could you provide, submit your economic analysis for the record, for the committee?

Dr. Gottlieb. I can provide it just off the cuff right here. I mean, when we looked at it -- and again, this was very preliminary work and it is in draft form -- but when we looked at it, we estimated that it would cost a large manufacturer about a million dollars to become a 503B facility, a large pharmacy, and a medium-sized pharmacy, about \$600,000. We think that there are things we can do to further titrate the level of regulatory touch, that there are more buckets. Because, again, a 503A pharmacy that wants to engage in relatively low-risk compounding but still ship,

618

619

620

621

622

623

624

625

626

627

628

629

630

631

632

633

634

635

636

637

638

639

640

642	but they are developing low-risk products on a small scale in small
643	batches, there are ways, I think, to adjust the level of regulation
644	to more appropriately match the level of risk that they are
645	creating.
646	Mr. Green. Well, I understand you want to use resources
647	where the problem is.
648	Dr. Gottlieb. Exactly.
649	Mr. Green. And I appreciate that.
650	Dr. Gottlieb. We want to be efficient.
651	Mr. Green. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I know I am out of my
652	time.
653	Mr. Burgess. The Chair thanks the gentleman. The
654	gentleman yields back.
655	The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas, the vice
656	chairman of the committee, full committee, Mr. Barton, 5 minutes.
657	Mr. Barton. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
658	And, Commissioner, thank you for being here. I want to echo
659	what Mr. Pallone said. You have been accessible, and we
660	appreciate your personal availability to the members of the
661	subcommittee.
662	I have been on this committee for 32 years. We have got an
663	ongoing sense of friction or tension between the FDA and the
664	compounding pharmacist. It is kind of a love-hate relationship.
665	A lot of my compounding pharmacists in Texas are fairly

active in the national compounding associations. They have a feeling that the big, old bad federal FDA picks on them. How would you respond to that? Do you think your FDA picks on compounding pharmacists? Or do you think that they are being a little bit too sensitive?

Dr. Gottlieb. Well, I am not going to comment on their feelings and their motives. I am certainly sensitive to the concerns; I would say that, Congressman. This is an important reason why we want to make sure we are working closely with the states. Because I think if we are working cooperatively with the states, and the states are able to assert their responsibilities and obligations under DQSA, but in concert with us, I think that the more that we can rely on local regulation, the more that local pharmacies are going to feel that they have a closer continuity to the nexus of the oversight, if you will.

Mr. Barton. Okay. Well, that leads to my next question. It is almost like you and I coordinated. I was going to ask this; you were going to answer that; then, I would follow up.

What is the current relationship in terms of a working relationship or a cooperative relationship between the FDA and the state regulatory authorities that oversee compounding pharmacists? Do you think it has improved? When we had the problem back in 2010-2011 that led to the bill that you have talked about, Massachusetts and the federal FDA didn't seem to get along

at all. They didn't talk to each other, didn't share information.

Today would you say that that relationship has improved, is good?

How would you characterize it?

Dr. Gottlieb. Well, I will tell you the relationship is a lot better today and gets better with time. I think it is continuing to expand in terms of the scope of the collaboration and just through the contact we are having with state authorities. Those relationships are important to sound regulation being built. We invite states to join us on inspections. We hold monthly meetings with the National Association of Boards of Pharmacy. We provide training to state compliance officers. There are frequent telecons with state officials.

You don't have to take my word for it. You could look at the GAO report in 2016 that looked at this very question of what the perception was of the states of FDA's communication with the states, and 60 percent said very or somewhat satisfied. They were very or somewhat satisfied with the communication. Now a "D" usually doesn't sound good, but in this context I think it was. It was supportive of my contention that the relationships are much improved from where they were when I was at FDA the last time, prior to NECC. Twenty-three percent reported they were dissatisfied. We want to work on that. I think, hopefully, if I come back here a year from now and we are talking about this, we are going to be able to talk about an even more cooperative

environment.

Mr. Barton. With respect to the opioid crisis, are there some special task forces, special programs, extra effort being utilized right now between the FDA and the state regulatory authorities? And kind of as a secondary question, would you consider the opioid crisis more of a federal issue or a state issue, or is it about 50/50?

Dr. Gottlieb. Well, I think it is an everything issue. I have said before that I think that this is beyond the scope, certainly, of any one agency, but even the federal government, to try to tackle it. We are going to need to work closely with local officials to try to address this crisis. And we have been doing that. We have had a lot of conversations with local officials, state AGs, on different things that we could be doing in collaboration with the states around various aspects of this crisis.

I would say that the one thing that I am still very concerned about is the level of federal oversight in the IMFs, in the international mail facilities. I have spoken with some of the Members about this, and trying to get more resources into those facilities, particularly FDA resources. We play an important role in those facilities doing track and trace and analysis on some of the synthetic fentanyl coming in and doing investigations to trace them back to their source. And that is a big concern

738 II o

739

740

741

742

743

744

745

746

747

748

749

750

751

752

753

754

755

756

757

758

759

760

761

of mine.

The last question, the Pharmacy Compounding Mr. Barton. Advisory Committee currently has no one on it who is a compounding Don't you think there should be at least one voting pharmacist. member who is an actual compounding pharmacist on that committee? Dr. Gottlieb. I am going to be, we are going to be issuing a solicitation probably within days -- the FR notice is with my office -- to solicit a new member or members on that committee. So, there will be an opportunity to expand the composition of that committee. As you know, there are 12 members on that committee. One is appointed by the NABP, one by USP. It leaves 10 members. Of those, seven are licensed pharmacists. I think five are

physicians in total. So, there is good clinical representation. To the extent that someone with a business perspective of being a pharmacist can add to the composition of that committee in a

There is one compounding pharmacist on the committee. He

thoughtful way, that is something we would certainly think about.

Mr. Barton. But he doesn't get to vote.

Dr. Gottlieb. He doesn't get to vote, you are right. We will certainly take this into consideration. I have heard the concerns of Members on this. We will certainly take it into consideration as we think about the new solicitation.

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

Mr. Barton. I would encourage that.

NEAL R. GROSS
COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

is the industry rep.

762 And I yield back. 763 Mr. Burgess. The gentleman yields back. The Chair thanks 764 the gentleman. The Chair recognizes the gentlelady from California, Ms. 765 766 Eshoo, for 5 minutes, please. 767 Ms. Eshoo. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, for holding this 768 hearing. 769 And, Commissioner Gottlieb, it is good to see you, and thank 770 you for your testimony and your work on this issue. 771 We spoke, I think it was last summer, about -- at that point, 772 there was a recent incident of patients being harmed by compounded 773 products. Specifically, there were 50 patients, some of whom 774 went blind after receiving a compounded antibiotic during 775 cataract surgery last July. 776 I was talking to a doctor friend this last week. I said, "What's the most common surgery in the country?" And he said 777 778 So, that really broadens this out when you think of 779 50 patients, some of whom went blind during their cataract 780 surgery. It wasn't too regular for them. 781 Obviously, we need to do everything we can to protect patient 782 safety, so that these incidents stop happening, including, I 783 think, following up on the warning letters. 784 There are two areas that I have always thought that are

absolutely fundamental to what we do, both when I was in county

government and here in the House of Representatives. 786 787 public health and public safety. The two are combined in this 788 issue. So, what I want to ask you is, of the dozens of warning letters 789 790 posted by FDA, how often have you pursued enforcement action? 791 what else can the agency do with its enforcement resources to 792 ensure that compounded drugs are safe? 793 Dr. Gottlieb. I appreciate the question. It gets at 794 something that we are trying to work, which is to improve our 795 collaboration with DOJ to try to make sure that we can bring 796 enforcement action when we see something particularly egregious, 797 so we issue a warning letter and a firm is non-compliant. 798 was the genesis of the task force that we formed with DOJ. Ιt 799 is early days; I think it is yielding dividends in terms of our 800 ability to work cooperatively. But this is something that we are 801 looking at, pushing on, trying to do more of. 802 Have there been any enforcement actions? 803 Dr. Gottlieb. There has absolutely been enforcement 804 actions, and there is activity that we have in progress. 805 Obviously, we are always working on various activities.

Ms. Eshoo. In the two sections of the Compounding Quality
Act -- you know, let me say something, because I listened to the

am hopeful that we will be able to continue to work effectively

with DOJ in this regard.

806

807

808

conversation earlier about the FDA, what Congress did, what 810 811 happened, and then, what Congress did. I think it is important 812 for all of us to recall that the FDA had not been given authority 813 by the Congress in this very area when the tragedy that took place 814 out of Massachusetts, that spread out over the country, took 815 place. So, I know there are a lot of questions to be raised, but 816 the FDA did not have the authority. In my book, I think that the 817 Congress didn't maybe on a proactive basis examine the issue and 818 give the agency the authority. 819 At any rate, in the two sections of the Compounding Quality 820 Act, it defines that drugs may only be compounded from bulk drug 821 substances when FDA-approved drugs are in shortage. 822 recently, the agency announced enforcement discretion related to 823 an interim list of substances that include more than a hundred 824 approved drugs. 825 So, what specific steps are you going to take to ensure that 826 there is a legitimate clinical need for the bulk drug substances 827 currently being used by compounders and how are you going to 828 enforce this? 829 Dr. Gottlieb. I think you are referring to the 503B bulk 830 drugs list, right? 831 Ms. Eshoo. Right. Right. 832 So, as you know, we received about a thousand 833 nominations for different drugs to be on that list.

selected 200 that we allowed onto that list under what we call Category I drugs. Now what we need to do is go through and reexamine all 200 to make sure they belong on that list. And we believe some of them are going to fall off and perhaps many will fall off. Some might be added, but probably many are going to fall off.

We are going to issue in March a guidance document that I outlined in the 2018 plan we put out that is going to define the parameters in which we are going to do those assessments. And then, we need to go through and assess each drug individually, which, as you know, is a resource-intensive process. Each evaluation is between 20 and 80 pages long.

Probably the first complement of drugs that we will render a decision on will be this fall. It is probably going to be a small number. It may be five drugs. But we need to go through that entire list.

But it is important to put in perspective where that 200 came from. Those were drugs that were currently being compounded off of bulk substance at the time that this law was implemented. So, what we effectively did was freeze the market. What we said was we don't want to create more compounding, but we also don't want to start pulling things out of the marketplace and create access issues, especially with respect to the outsources, because we want to see this industry grow up, for one. And on the second hand,

we have now new regulatory tools to assert good manufacturing 858 859 So, we can provide more oversight. So, the idea was 860 to freeze the market while we, then, did those assessments, which 861 is what we are doing now. Thank you very much, Commissioner. 862 I couldn't Ms. Eshoo. 863 mean that more. You are in such an important role in the life 864 So, thank you very much. of our country. 865 Thank you, Mr. Chairman. 866 Mr. Burgess. The Chair now would like to recognize the 867 gentleman from Kentucky, the vice chairman of the Health Subcommittee, Mr. Guthrie. 868 869 Mr. Guthrie. Thank you, and thank you, Mr. Chairman. 870 Thank you, Commissioner, for being here today. I kind of want to follow up on what was just said. 871 872 ago there was a judge in Kentucky, a very prominent citizen, Eddie Lovelace of Albany, Kentucky, who went in for a routine procedure 873 874 and was contaminated with medicine from the New England 875 Compounding Center and died just shortly after what was going to 876 be a routine procedure. Obviously, his family and the whole community is devastated, and Dr. Lovelace is just one person who 877 was affected by this awful outbreak. And this was tragic and it 878 879 is the reason I believe we must ensure compounded drugs are safe 880 while striking a good balance of access to compounded drugs. 881 It is kind of the theme of what you have said this morning,

but I thought I would just give you kind of a more open-ended look at it. Because in your testimony you mention the balance that is needed. And so, I just want to give you the floor to, how are you ensuring that Americans have access to lawfully-marketed compounded drugs while ensuring safety? You have kind of addressed that just earlier, but I just kind of give you the time.

Dr. Gottlieb. I think the way to ensure that, to be very direct, is to make sure this law gets implemented. I think that this was a good vision by Congress and it is a good framework that provides FDA with the tools that it needs to provide proper oversight. We need to now make sure it gets implemented.

I think where we are going to be able to continue to improve sort of the posture of the industry, and the ability of this industry to provide the critical products that patients need and access to drugs, is going to be to try to see the 503B outsourcing sector become more viable. I think many of us, when this law was first implemented, envisioned that that sector would grow much more quickly than it has. And I think if there are things that we can do through regulation, and I think that they are, to help that industry continue to expand, that is going to be important because, ultimately, that is going to provide more access to the kinds of sterile drugs that some people need on a wider scale and need to be distributed to institutions. The 503A facilities provide a critical function on a local level, giving patients

differentiated products through the practice of pharmacy, so that they can get products that are individualized, tailored to their clinical needs.

Mr. Guthrie. Do you think 503A should report adverse outcomes to the FDA?

Dr. Gottlieb. As you know, the bulk of the adverse events that are reported by 503 facilities are typically either not reported or reported to the states. The states do share that information with us. They are not directly reported to FDA.

Would it help FDA target its inspections better if they had access to that information more readily? I would have to say it would. It would make it more efficient. A lot of our inspections of 503A facilities are for-cause inspections, are on the basis of information. But I think that this is also an area where, through our cooperation with the states, we are going to get access to that information where we need it. Because if we are working closely with the states, they are going to help guide us where we should be inspecting. Because, for example, a 503A facility might be engaging in activities that tip it over into being a 503B and subject to the federal scheme.

Mr. Guthrie. Thank you. Thank you for those answers.

And if I could change the subject just for about a minute or so left, I had an oncologist that contacted my office. Her daughter is an intern in the office. I know her pretty well. And

she was stating concern on the shortage of saline, so to change it a little bit. She said it has been exasperated by the flu epidemic this year. We see these shortages in just basic medicines. And so, can you please provide the most recent FDA developments of the saline shortage?

Dr. Gottlieb. There are two different components to this, or, actually, three different components to this. There were these small bags that were in shortage prior to the hurricane that struck Puerto Rico, the 100-milliliter bags that are typically used to dilute drugs and, then, administer drugs to patients. That shortage was exacerbated by the hurricane because one of the primary manufacturers of those bags is located in Puerto Rico and was knocked out of production. That facility is now back in full production. In fact, all the facilities that we have concerns about in Puerto Rico are now back on grid power and most of them are at full production.

And we have brought in additional supply from additional facilities out of manufacturing sites, ex-U.S. manufacturing sites, to make up for that shortfall. So, there should be much more supply coming into the market.

There is also a shortage of the larger-volume bags. While we haven't declared a shortage, there's spot shortages of the 1-liter bags that are used for volume repletion, and those are also being strained by the flu, the flu outbreak. We have taken

954 additional steps to bring in additional supply of the 1-liter bags 955 as well. 956 There is also some tight supply of the empty 1-liter bags 957 because a lot of compounding pharmacies and hospitals, when they 958 can't get access to filled bags, they buy empty bags and fill them 959 themselves in a compounding-type facility. 960 We have taken additional steps. We are going to have more 961 to say about this on Thursday. I was going to put it out today, 962 but we were delayed in getting our information out. We are going 963 to be putting out a statement on Thursday talking about the steps 964 we are taking to get more of those empty bags onto the market. 965 Some of those were manufactured in Puerto Rico. 966 I will just close by saying that the time it takes for a bag 967 to go from the manufacturing line to your hand in the hospital 968 as a clinician is about six weeks. I don't know this isn't a more efficient supply chain, but that is what I have been quoted. 969 Ιt 970 takes weeks for it to make its way to the provider setting. 971 so, the additional supply that we have brought on -- and it is 972 substantial -- is going to take some time to flow through the 973 market. 974 Thank you for your attention to that. Mr. Guthrie. You all 975 have been really good to work with. 976 Thank you.

The Chair thanks the gentleman.

Mr. Burgess.

978 gentleman yields back. 979 The Chair recognizes the gentlelady from Illinois, 5 minutes 980 for questions, please. Ms. Schakowsky. Thank you, Dr. Gottlieb. But I want to 981 982 apologize that I missed much of your testimony. We have a number 983 of hearings going on that I had to be at. 984 I also wanted to thank you for meeting with some of us about 985 Essure, the contraceptive device that I know has harmed many 986 women, from meeting with some of those women. So, I hope we can 987 continue that conversation because I am very concerned about it. 988 Most people presume that the prescription that the doctor 989 writes for them, and they fill it, is safe and effective. This 990 is true because the FDA is considered the absolutely gold standard in drug review. 991 992 We have all talked about now the 64 people who tragically 993 died because of this drug at the New England Compounding Center. 994 So, obviously, that was an impetus for passing the Compounding 995 Quality Act to improve safety. 996 And so, I wanted to just say that drugs that enter the 997 bloodstream, the eye, the spine, are supposed to be sterile, but 998 the FDA has received adverse events reports that these compounded 999 products were contaminated, reminiscent of the problems at the

NEAL R. GROSS
COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

There have also been reports of sub-/super-potent drug

NECC.

1000

products in 2016. Three babies received compounded morphine that was 20 times stronger than the label indicated. One of those infants had to be rushed by helicopter to a nearby children's hospital.

So, here's my first question: Commissioner Gottlieb, the FDA has been active in implementing the Drug Quality and Security Act. There have been over two dozen guidance documents issued, four rules, numerous public engagements focused on proper implementation of this law. While these are meaningful steps, what more can we do to reduce the number of adverse events associated with compounded drug products?

Dr. Gottlieb. I will just start out by echoing your concerns, Congresswoman. All drugs have risks. We know that. But I don't think anyone should be put at risk because a drug was improperly manufactured. At the very least, we should guarantee that a drug that purports to be manufactured in a certain way and purports to be sterile is actually a sterile product. That is the bedrock and the essence of what we are trying to achieve with respect to the authorities under this law.

I think that there are things that we can do going forward, including continued implementation. We have heard the concerns of Congress that certain aspects of how we have implemented this have been slower than Congress expected. I think we didn't fully appreciate the complexity of this law. But I think, as we

continue to implement this framework, we are going to be able to exert even better and more efficient oversight. And that is going to increase the level of safety and assuredness that the public can have.

I think there is more that we can do on the enforcement side as well, getting back to the other question. That is going to be an area that we continue to look at, both in terms of what we are doing, how we target our inspections based on what we are learning, looking at issues like potency now because we see those coming up more, as well as what additional resources we can put against it.

This is a program -- and I don't want to get too deep into the resource question; I will save it for an appropriations hearing, but --

Ms. Schakowsky. Feel free. Feel free.

[Laughter.]

Dr. Gottlieb. But this is a program where we do operate by in some cases begging, borrowing, and stealing from other aspects of the agency, other parts of the agency. For example, the team that I have, the policy team in the Drug Center that is working on the guidance development that you referenced and a lot of this policy development, is four people. They borrow resources from the review divisions, but, remember, those reviewers that they are tapping have PDUFA goals and BSUFA goals and GDUFA goals.

1050 They have user fee goals against their time that they have to 1051 prioritize their time in certain ways. 1052 So, I think that there is certainly an opportunity to think 1053 about how we can grow this program in ways that could better 1054 address some of those safety issues. 1055 Ms. Schakowsky. What more do you think the FDA could and 1056 should do to ensure safety at 503A compounding pharmacies? 1057 I think getting in place the MOU is going to Dr. Gottlieb. 1058 be an important step. The MOU will provide for adverse event 1059 reporting back to FDA through the states. And so, I think that as we get that framework in place, I think that there is going 1060 1061 to be a lot more we could do to better target our inspectional 1062 resources in areas of risk, in areas where the 503A facilities might be crossing into being a 503B facility that would be subject 1063 1064 to GMP standards. 1065 So, I am hopeful. We are making good progress on that. We I am hopeful that, as we get 1066 are going to have it out this year. 1067 that agreement in place with the states, that is going to increase 1068 our level of oversight. 1069 Ms. Schakowsky. Well, we will be looking at that. 1070 you very much. 1071 I yield back. 1072 The gentlelady yields back. The Chair thanks Mr. Burgess. 1073 the gentlelady.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan, 5 minutes for questions, please.

Mr. Upton. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

And, Dr. Gottlieb, it is good to see you here again. We appreciate your go-to attitude in trying to get things right. We understand that and we are with you every step. We appreciate your work on opioids, something that impacts every one of our districts.

And I have to say, as we worked on the Cures legislation out of this committee, the \$500 million extra that we added to the FDA budget was almost a no-brainer. So, we appreciate the work of your crew, and we want to make sure that you have the resources to make sure that things, in fact, are safe and that you are not missing any steps.

I have got a couple of specific questions for you. Hopefully, I can get through all three.

It is critical that, until the clinical need list is issued, the FDA not permit bulk drug substances to be used in compounding, absent a final determination of clinical need, once all statutory criteria have been satisfied. Can you confirm that, once the FDA has identified its criteria for clinical need, that bulk drug substances, including those that the FDA has currently placed in Category I, would not be permitted to be used in compounding, absent such a determination?

1098 Well, we have put out the essential copies Dr. Gottlieb. of this, which you know, the essential copies guidance. 1099 1100 going to have the criteria for the development of the bulk drugs 1101 list for the 503B facilities, which is what I believe you are 1102 referring to, because we are further along on the bulk drugs lists 1103 for the 503B facilities, we will have that criteria out in March. 1104 And by the end of the year, we will have specified some bulk drugs 1105 that should either come on or off that list. There could be some 1106 that fall out pretty quickly from that list, based on safety 1107 considerations or a clear lack of clinical need. And so, we are 1108 going to do those assessments. 1109 Then, we are going to also have to contemplate how we change 1110

our inspectional priorities to prioritize inspecting or taking action on the basis of 503B facilities compounding drugs that might not be on that list. Right now, under our risk-based framework, we need to change some protocols in terms of how we go about looking for some of those other questions, to your point.

Mr. Upton. Is the President's budget going to include more money for inspections?

Dr. Gottlieb. Well, I don't want to get ahead of the President. So, I am not fully aware of what is going to end up in the budget. It is probably a question best put to OMB at this point.

Mr. Upton. It was never Congress' intent that small tweaks

1111

1112

1113

1114

1115

1116

1117

1118

1119

1120

to approve drugs, like minor changes in concentration or inactive ingredients, would satisfy the criteria for clinical need and open the door to compounding from bulk substances under the DQSA.

Would you agree that a clinical need can only be found where there exists a genuine patient need unable to be addressed by approved drug products requiring a significant change from the approved drug?

Dr. Gottlieb. Well, again, Congressman, I don't want to get ahead of my career officials who right now are drafting guidance to define that very question. But the type of definition that you put forward would certainly seem to comport with a reasonable interpretation of what a final standard would be.

Keep in mind, also, that we articulated in the essential copies guidance, and we are going to re-articulate in the guidance that we put out in March, that if there is an FDA-approved product available that you can compound from, you have to compound from that product. So, if a 503B facility is compounding from bulk, but they can otherwise be compounding from an FDA-approved product, for example, diluting it down if they are providing a more dilute formulation to satisfy a certain clinical need, they have to start with that FDA-approved product. That is a principle that we have put forward. I think that is going to address some of the issues that have been raised with respect to what is on and not on the 503B bulks list at this time.

1146 Mr. Upton. And when do you think that order will be made? 1147 That is a principle that I believe we put Dr. Gottlieb. 1148 forward. I believe that is articulated in the copies quidance 1149 that we just put out, but it is going to be re-articulated in the 1150 March quidance that we put out. The question will, then, become, 1151 well, when are you going to take enforcement action solely on the 1152 basis of that issue? Because it is one thing for us to put out 1153 If people don't follow our guidance, we have to take 1154 enforcement action. And that is where I mentioned that we are 1155 going to relook at protocols and how we prioritize our enforcement 1156 activity, on the basis of those kinds of considerations as well. 1157 But, as you know, we have a risk-based framework. 1158 prioritize our limited inspectional resources and enforcement 1159 resources in places where we believe there is direct patient risk. 1160 And we are still in a realm where we are dealing with a lot of 1161 direct patient risk before we just look at, for example, economic harm, although that certainly is within the criteria that we look 1162 1163 at and will be within our protocols. 1164 Mr. Upton. Thank you. I yield back. 1165 Mr. Burgess. The Chair thanks the gentleman. 1166 gentleman yields back. 1167 The Chair recognizes the gentlelady from Colorado, Ms. 1168 DeGette, 5 minutes for questions, please. 1169 Ms. DeGette. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

As Mr. Green mentioned, he and Congressman Griffith and I worked really hard after that terrible tragedy of the New England Compounding Center to come up with our Compounding Quality Act, which was subsequently folded into the Drug Quality and Security Act. We are really proud of that bipartisan work. But, as we are seeing today, it takes constant tweaking and review to make sure that these pieces of legislation are working.

Commissioner Gottlieb, one of the things that I am hearing from a lot of stakeholders about is what to do about office use. A lot of providers are saying that people are having difficulty accessing types of medication because of the requirement that we have for prescription. Now what they say is that these medicines are not lucrative enough to use 503B outsourcing facilities, but that the patients need them. And so, there are shortages.

I want to be clear. I have got strong reservations about undermining or loosening the DQSA's prescription requirement in any way, given the consideration that any move in that direction could have an impact on patient safety. But I do want to make sure that patients with unique needs that cannot be met by FDA-approved medications can get the treatment that they need. It is really a balancing test.

And so, I wanted to ask you if you think there are ways that we can resolve these potential access problems without undermining the prescription requirement and exposing patients

1194 | to unnecessary risk.

Dr. Gottlieb. I appreciate the question, Congresswoman.

To your point, this is one of the tensions that we are grappling with, because we care very much about these access issues that you have highlighted and need to preserve the practice of medicine. And we need to preserve the ability of physicians to get access to these drugs to use in their offices.

We have seen an environment where we see more of the 503Bs doing small batches. About one-third of registered 503Bs do small batches. We are trying to take steps to better match clinicians with 503Bs that either are currently manufacturing drugs they might need, but also historically have manufactured drugs that would be needed, and are willing to run small batches. So, we are starting to post that information prospectively on our website.

I think, as we also try to look at how we can create a more flexible framework for how we apply GMP standards to the 503Bs and see more smaller pharmacies that might want to make a business in doing small batches become 503B facilities, where they are still subject to GMP standards, I think that is going to also help address this.

I made the comment earlier that the 503B sector has not grown as quickly as we had envisioned and had hoped at the time, including myself when I testified before this committee. But I

1218 think that it is still early days, and I still think we are going 1219 to see a robust industry take shape here. 1220 Do you think it would be helpful to work more Ms. DeGette. 1221 on giving timely and transparent information for providers about 1222 which of these facilities are making these compounded 1223 medications? 1224 I absolutely do. We are doing that. Dr. Gottlieb. We do 1225 it now prospectively. We are just starting to really do it, 1226 because we are starting to get those reports electronically. One 1227 of the things we are considering is, can we go back and do it 1228 retrospectively, because we have the histories on what the 1229 facilities used to produce. That could be helpful as well. 1230 Ms. DeGette. It would help those facilities, too. Dr. Gottlieb. It would help the facilities. 1231 1232 We are also going to be issuing either an FR notice to create 1233 a docket to solicit from provider groups input, in a more systematic way solicit input on where they are seeing access 1234 1235 issues around certain products, so that we could, then, see what 1236 steps we could take to try to help provide more efficiency to 503Bs 1237 that might want to make those products. Because, right now, a lot of what we know is anecdotal. 1238 1239 Right. Ms. DeGette. Right. 1240 We want to develop that information on a more 1241 systematic basis.

1242 Ms. DeGette. In a systemic way. 1243 Now one last thing about drug pricing. Some people say that 1244 compounded alternatives to expensive medicines could actually 1245 provide financial relief to patients. But I think there is a real 1246 risk, in that marketing unapproved bulk compounded drugs could 1247 be really risky to patients. I am concerned that some press 1248 reports are already saying this is going on. I just wondered, I don't think that, certainly, the policies that this committee 1249 1250 has endorsed are meant to be using compounded drugs to lower 1251 prescription drug prices if it is at the expense of patient safety. 1252 I am wondering if you can comment very briefly on that. 1253 Dr. Gottlieb. We believe that, if there is an FDA-approved 1254 option available, that is always the best option for the patient 1255 because it is going to provide the greatest assurance of safety 1256 and efficacy for the patient and to the provider. And I also 1257 believe, as you have seen me try to demonstrate through the actions 1258 we have been taking, that there are a lot of avenues we can go 1259 down to try to address the issues of cost and competition in the 1260 marketplace. And we will continue to do that. 1261 Ms. DeGette. So, it is not one or the other really? 1262 Dr. Gottlieb. It is not one or the other. 1263 Ms. DeGette. I thank you. 1264 Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I yield back. 1265 Mr. Burgess. The Chair thanks the gentlelady. The

gentlelady yields back. 1266 1267 The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois, Mr. 1268 Shimkus, 5 minutes for questions. 1269 Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Shimkus. 1270 And, Scott, it is great to have you here. I appreciate the 1271 testimony. 1272 This is a tough issue we have wrestled with for a long time. 1273 I think my colleague, Congresswoman DeGette, just actually kind 1274 of wove the story and the concerns that I have, and when we talk 1275 to some of our folks in different congressional districts. 1276 1277 1278

So, the 503A and the 503B issue, for me, it always comes down to the small-town, rural compounder and the way these rules will be etched or the memorandum of understanding or the batch size and the mileage distance, especially when you have got a rural district -- for me, it is 33 counties, five hours north and south drive, a three-hour east-to-west drive. It is a little different environment than a metropolitan area and a different area of the return on investment based upon what you are producing. You are not really going to manufacture for a large group, but in a small And then, you might have across-state-line issues, especially in a rural area on the Illinois-Indiana border. I see my colleague, Mr. Griffith, nodding his head.

So, can you kind of weave for the small pharmacist compounder, who I haven't had personally any problems as far as

1279

1280

1281

1282

1283

1284

1285

1286

1287

1288

1290	I have represented that area he is trying to address this being
1291	able to provide what is being requested of him. Sometimes it is
1292	even these issues with the I am not a doctor you know, the
1293	eye drop issue for the optometrist who doesn't have the shots in
1294	the doctor's office, although it is something they need
1295	immediately, in essence. And there is not a prescription because
1296	the person hasn't come in yet to be able to get the prescription.
1297	And then, you have a delay of providing the medicine.
1298	So, for that small compounder, what should he take home from
1299	my vague question?
1300	[Laughter.]
1301	And what assurances can you give him that we are trying to
1302	allow him to continue the work he has been doing?
1303	And I know we have got our veterinarian here, too. These
1304	guys also use their compounding ability in veterinarian medicine.
1305	So, a veterinarian would ask the compounder in rural America. So,
1306	he needs to be there for not just humans, but also for the animal
1307	health that he also is able to provide for the veterinarian.
1308	Dr. Gottlieb. I can go a lot of different ways with this
1309	question.
1310	Mr. Shimkus. Well, I went a lot of ways with the questions.
1311	[Laughter.]
1312	Dr. Gottlieb. But I will go right to where I think you are
1313	going, which is the question of the prescription requirement and
	d

whether or not that small-town pharmacist who is providing drugs over a large geographic area still needs to have a prescription in hand in order to provide a drug back and the difficulty of doing it over a large geographic expanse I think is the essence of what you are asking.

The bottom line is that we believe that the line of demarcation for what constitutes the practice of pharmacy versus what constitutes drug manufacturing has to remain the prescription. I mean, the practice pharmacy, if you go and look at the bylaws of states and how they define a practice pharmacy, I did that before coming to the hearing. I spent my weekend looking at that. Embedded in the bylaws of state boards of pharmacies is the idea of the prescription and the named patient. That is the essence of what it means to be practicing pharmacy.

We also understand that Congress contemplated other thresholds and struggled with it, and arrived back at the prescription being the line of demarcation, both 20 years ago when 503 was originally drafted, as well as when it was recodified in DQSA. Because other kinds of schemes that were contemplated, volume-based schemes, for example, didn't provide the kind of delineation that you could apply a regulatory structure to. We can't regulate against "we'll know it when we see it." We need a clear line that we can force against and we can enforce against with our limited resources.

1338 As far as veterinary medicine is concerned, as you know, we 1339 recently pulled the guidance that sought to define what our 1340 regulation was going to look like in that realm. And we pulled 1341 that for a variety of reasons, but, largely, because we don't think 1342 I will say we will be reissuing that this year. we got it right. 1343 But I will say that the issues around compounding in the veterinary 1344 space are different than issues around compounding in the human 1345 The practice of pharmacy in the veterinary space is a 1346 different kind of practice of medicine than it is in the human 1347 And so, our framework will also look different. It will 1348 be reflective of the practice of veterinary medicine. 1349 Mr. Shimkus. All right. Thank you. 1350 Mr. Burgess. The Chair thanks the gentleman. The 1351 gentleman yields back. 1352 The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oregon, Dr. 1353 Schrader, 5 minutes for questions, please. 1354 Mr. Schrader. Well, thank you. 1355 And I thank my colleague for asking some good questions about veterinary medicine. That is near and dear to our heart. 1356 1357 We use compounders a lot in our practice, I don't think inappropriately, but, as you alluded to, the size of the animal, 1358 1359 the different metabolism of an animal, the lack of a particular 1360 drug that has worked historically that is affordable for my 1361 patients, I mean that is a different beast to some degree.

appreciate the thoughtfulness that USDA under your guidance and FDA is actually approaching the whole veterinary guideline issue. So, I want to thank you for that.

While I have had a lot of experience in using compounders in smaller communities to make sure my patients get the best medication possible, I am new to the regulatory framework with all this. I don't profess to be knowledgeable. So, my questions might be a little arcane and pretty obvious.

But the whole 503B opens up a potential, as I think you have alluded to and some of the questions have alluded to, problem for circumventing a lot of the regulatory framework that our generic manufacturers, for instance, have to apply. What are the major differences -- well, first, I will say I fully support the continued definition of pharmacy prescription. It has to have a prescription to be able to do that. I think that is for the safety of any patient, human or animal. That is critical, and I urge you to continue to use that as a very bright line.

But, having said that, then what do you see as the big demarcation between your 503B regulatory framework versus your generic regulatory framework? How do you see that as different, and what constitutes the guidelines there?

Dr. Gottlieb. Right. By generic, I think you mean 503A, traditional pharmacy compounding, 503B being the outsourcing facility. And the difference is the prescription, whether or not

that the drug is being compounded on the basis of a named patient in response to a lawful prescription from a provider. That is the traditional practice of pharmacy. That is a 503A compounder.

A 503B compounder is engaging in manufacturing. They are manufacturing either in small batches or on a larger scale, not in response to individual prescriptions that they have received from a provider, but in anticipation of orders, and they are doing advanced shipping. They might be doing what we all office stock. They might be shipping to providers to allow those products to be stocked inside the offices.

That is traditional manufacturing. There is no way around it. Whether you do it with 10 units or you do it with 100 units, you are engaging in manufacturing, and those circumstances, instead of applying the traditional regulatory framework where they would be subject to regulations around the sanitary conditions, which is what you would apply to 503A pharmacy, in the context of the 503B setting you are applying GMP standards, some form of GMP, not GMP-light, but some form of GMP. I don't want to call it "GMP-light".

Mr. Schrader. So, similar to the generic manufacturing that would go on?

Dr. Gottlieb. Subject to good manufacturing practices, I mean, good manufacturing practices, as I said at the outset, are not a fixed standard. They are risk-based. And so, they look

different depending on the manufacturer that you are evaluating. But it would be some form of GMP standards that you would be applying. You would be doing lot release, sterility testing, batch testing. You would be retaining samples. You would provide for the compounding in a sterile environment if you are compounding a sterile product. So, you would be applying the GMP standards, traditional GMP standards.

Mr. Schrader. Whatever level you are approaching that manufacturer?

Dr. Gottlieb. There are basic principles of regulation with respect to the good manufacturing practices. So, when we say "level," I think that there are things you can do to make it less expensive if you are doing it on a smaller scale. So, for example, you require a lot of small batches. If you are only going to be making a small batch, if you are only shipping a small amount, you would require that facility to retain a lot of samples. There are ways that you can apply the GMP standards in fashion that comports with the level of the volume and the level risk you are creating. And that is what we are seeking to do in the more flexible framework that we are contemplating.

Mr. Schrader. So, I guess the last question: what do you see as the role with the state regulatory framework versus the federal regulatory framework. The interstate commerce piece would, obviously, be a federal purview. How do you juxtapose the

state regulatory framework on these 503A and, more importantly, the 503B pharmacies?

Dr. Gottlieb. The MOU is going to define sort of the interplay between the state and the federal scheme and the level of activity that a 503A can engage in that might cross it into being subject to federal oversight because it is engaging in interstate commerce, interstate activity. And we have talked about various thresholds, about how much product can cross a state line before a compounder should or ought to be subject to at least our attention, to make a decision on whether or not it is subject to, should be subject to FDA oversight.

Here again, this is not going to be a fixed standard when we are contemplating this. It is not going to be, if you ship 31 products, you are subject to the federal scheme, but if you had only shipped 30, you would be fine. We are going to try to take a risk-based approach here as well, and it is going to be based on volume, percentage of products you are shipping across the state line, the kinds of products you are shipping across the state line, the manner in which you are doing it. And so, we are going to have a threshold in which we want notification by the states, but, then, we are still going to make an independent decision whether or not it should be subject to a federal inspection because of the activity.

And the essence is, if I could just close, the essence is

1458 that, if a pharmacy is engaging -- if a pharmacy is subject to 1459 state regulation, but is shipping most of its product out of state, 1460 it can't be subject to state regulation anymore. Because if you 1461 are in New Jersey and you are subject to the New Jersey Board of 1462 Pharmacy and New Jersey inspectors, but most of your products are 1463 going to New York, the New York inspectors don't know. Then, they 1464 can't provide the oversight that they need to in a trace-back. 1465 So, it is important that the states be aware of what is going on 1466 within their states. 1467 Mr. Schrader. Very good. Thank you. 1468 And I yield back. 1469 Mr. Burgess. The Chair thanks the gentleman. 1470 The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey, Mr. 1471 Lance, 5 minutes for questions. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. 1472 Mr. Lance. 1473 And thank you for being here, Commissioner. The district I serve provides innovative medicines for 1474 1475 patients across the country. Protecting these patients is, of 1476 course, a top priority for all of us, and so is protecting the 1477 FDA's gold standard. As the Drug Quality and Security Act is 1478 implemented, we need to ensure that we provide the incentive for 1479 innovator and generic manufacturers to go through the FDA process.

To do this, we need to make sure that commercially-available drug

products cannot be copied. How is the agency protecting patients

1480

and the gold standard as you implement the Drug Quality and Security Act?

Dr. Gottlieb. Well, Congressman, thanks for the question. I would like to assert that we are protecting the interest of patients by implementing this statute and making sure that we continue to move through the regulatory steps to, for example, finalize the 503B bulks list, finalize the guidance on sanitary conditions, finalize the list on bulk substances that the 503A facilities can compound from, make sure we get the MOU in place, so we can provide proper oversight of 503B and 503A facilities, in concert with the states, and work closely with our state partners. And so, we are going to continue to work through that.

With respect to the first part of your question about just the sort of economic issues inherent in situations where a compounder might be copying a drug that is otherwise an FDA-approved product, we have asserted in the copies guidance certain activities that we would believe fall outside the scheme contemplated by DQDA. We are going to reassert those in the guidance that we issue in March with respect to the criteria for what should and shouldn't be on the bulk drugs list. Then, it is going to be a question of taking enforcement action where we see companies or compounders engaging in activity that falls outside that scheme that we both articulated in our guidance as well as Congress contemplated in the statute. That is what we

are going to be focused on doing.

I will say, thought, our enforcement activities will be, as they should be, guided by patient risk, first and foremost. But we will be baking into our protocols in terms of how we take enforcement action the kinds of considerations that you talked about, because that is what Congress has asked us to do.

Mr. Lance. Thank you.

I was pleased to see that the agency's 2018 Compounding Policy Priorities Plan -- and I am interested to hear more about the forthcoming flexible risk-based approach to current good manufacturing practices. Recognizing the agency's goal to increase the number of 503B outsourcing facilities, recognizing the compliance costs for larger 503B facilities and the investment necessary to satisfy the statute, is the agency concerned that the multi-tiered 503B regulatory approach may affect incentives for these facilities?

Dr. Gottlieb. Well, quite the opposite, we feel that we hope that by taking a tiered approach based on risk, we might provide the opportunity for more 503A pharmacies to step across the line into being 503B pharmacies and consider it worth the economic investment. Becoming a 503B pharmacy is not without some investment in cost for most 503A facilities. They don't have the kinds of facilities to be subject to GMP oversight. And so, it is going to require some investment. But we are hoping that we

1530 could provide a framework where more facilities can find it, have 1531 the ability to make the capital investments and raise the capital 1532 necessary to make those investments because they see a better 1533 opportunity on the other side of that in terms of trying to 1534 increase their volume and increase the kind of activity that they 1535 are engaged in. We think by having more 503A facilities converting to being 503B facilities, it is going to facilitate 1536 1537 access and, also, give them the ability to grow. 1538 A 503A facility that is trying to engage in some low level 1539 of manufacturing, even if they can do it under the radar of regulators, if they grow to a certain proportion, eventually, they 1540 1541 are going to pop up. And so, they are basically capped under this 1542 legislation. If they step across that threshold and become a 1543 503B, they have much more latitude to engage in broader 1544 manufacturing. 1545 Mr. Lance. Thank you, Commissioner. And, Mr. Chairman, I yield back 27 seconds. 1546 1547 Mr. Burgess. The Chair thanks the gentleman. 1548 The Chair recognizes the other gentleman from New Jersey, 1549 the ranking member of the full committee, Mr. Pallone, 5 minutes 1550 for questions. 1551 Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Pallone. 1552 I wanted to ask you about this issue of distribution versus 1553 Section 503A of the law prohibits a pharmacist, dispensing.

pharmacy, or healthcare provider from distributing compounded drug products across state lines that exceed 5 percent of the total prescriptions distributed or dispensed unless the product is compounded in a state that has entered into a memorandum of understanding with FDA that addresses the distribution of inordinate amounts of compounded drug products and provides for investigation by the state into complaints associated with compounded drug products that are distributed interstate. And FDA released a draft MOU in February 2015 that proposed defining inordinate amounts for purposes of interstate distribution to no greater than 30 percent of all products distributed or dispensed.

So, in terms of this distribution versus dispensing,

Commissioner, some have suggested that the MOU is only intended
to apply to drugs that are distributed without a prescription.

What is your view about the purpose of the MOU and the public health
purpose it serves? Are there some drugs, such as those dispensed
directly to patients, which could be excluded consistent with that
purpose?

Dr. Gottlieb. Well, in my weekend reading of pharmacy bylaws, the other observation that I had is that the bylaws make specific reference to the word "dispense" as part of their definition of what constitutes the practice of pharmacy. It is our view, and we feel strongly, that the practice of pharmacy always contemplates the dispensing of the drug. Now in certain

circumstances the drug is going to be dispensed and, then, distributed across state lines, and that is where the MOU comes into play. The MOU contemplates drugs that are dispensed and shipped across state lines, and shipping is a form of distribution, as I think you all agree. But we think that dispensing is part and parcel of the activity of practicing pharmacy, and no drug, no compounded drug can be distributed without first being dispensed, because dispensing is the act of creating that patient-specific prescription.

And I will just say, and sort of to address the elephant in the room, because this has been contemplated as one of the sort of beliefs in terms of why DQSA might have contemplated something different with respect to office stock than FDA's current interpretation of how we perceive the law to have been written, I don't think that defining, redefining the practice of pharmacy, which involves the activity of dispensing a product to a patient, is a good way to try to create a framework for office stock. I am open to the debate about office stock and the merits of it. I think we have been clear from the agency's standpoint the risks that we feel it creates if a 503A facility is getting engaged in it. But I would hate to see the practice of pharmacy redefined as a sort of backdoor into that. I think if we are going to have a discussion about the merits of 503A facilities engaging in some level of manufacturing and shipping, we ought to just do that

directly.

1602

1625

1603 Mr. Pallone. All right. Then, let me get to my second 1604 Recently, you announced the agency's intention to 1605 modify the allowable percentage of compounded drug product 1606 distributed into a state to effectively eliminate the 30-percent 1607 threshold and, instead, implement certain reporting requirements that will be triggered at a 50-percent threshold. 1608 1609 strikes me as a weakening of an important patient protection and 1610 in contrast to what you have noted in your testimony is the stated 1611 goal of this provision in the statute, which says, and I quote, 1612 "Preventing compounders reportedly operating under the 1613 exemptions in Section 503A from growing into conventional 1614 manufacturing operations making unapproved drugs and operating 1615 a substantial portion of their business interstate without 1616 adhering to current good manufacturing practice requirements and other provisions intended to ensure the manufacture of quality 1617 So, would you explain how increasing the allowable 1618 1619 threshold for interstate distribution to 50 percent is consistent 1620 with the goal of the statute of preventing compounders from making 1621 unapproved drugs and operating a substantial portion of their 1622 business interstate without adhering to the CGMPs? 1623 Dr. Gottlieb. Well, I appreciate the question, Mr. 1624 I don't see it as a weakening. I see it as a

strengthening, because we are going from a hard threshold of 30

percent to a risk-based threshold of 50 percent. It is not 50 percent -- it is not 49 percent and you are all good, and 51 percent and you are now subject to a different scheme. There are going to be other tests that we apply to make assessments about what the appropriate scheme is for a particular facility.

It is the case, though, that there are facilities -- for example, a border-state pharmacy that develops TPN, total parenteral nutrition; a home infusion company that provides patient-specific, named patient products on a prescription basis and might ship more widely that are engaging in the traditional practice of pharmacy; they are doing it on the basis of named patients in response to an individual prescription, but they might be shipping more of those products. They might be lower-risk, too, depending on what they are doing.

And so, the reality is that there is a lot of different kinds of pharmacies situated across the spectrum in terms of the activity that they are engaged in. And we don't think a sort of fixed standard where there is a fixed line based just on volume makes the most sense. We want a volume-based standard, but also a standard that allows us to make an assessment about what the kind of activity is. And it is another effort on our part to be risk-based. I think, ultimately, our enforcement is stronger when we are taking a risk-based approach.

Mr. Pallone. All right. Thanks a lot.

1651 Mr. Burgess. The Chair thanks the gentleman. 1652 gentleman yields back. 1653 The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia, 5 minutes 1654 for questions, please. 1655 Mr. Griffith. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. Ι 1656 appreciate it greatly. 1657 Let me get the record a little bit straight because I think 1658 it was confused a little bit earlier. While we had criminal 1659 conduct by NECC, we also had timid lawyers at the FDA. Ohio had warned the FDA there was a problem. Colorado had outright banned 1660 1661 NECC from putting products into their state. And FDA was aware 1662 of it and didn't even bother to seek a warrant to go in and see 1663 what was going on. So, as we move forward, let's continue on that. 1664 Also, I think in the next panel there will be some question 1665 about the intent, and you touched on that in your testimony with 1666 Mr. Shimkus a little bit earlier. But I want to go back to when 1667 the bill passed in September of 2013. At that time, now-Ranking 1668 Member Green said, in part, "While I believe the FDA dropped the ball with regards to the NECC, with this law they must succeed 1669 1670 where in the past they failed." And I know you are working hard 1671 on that. 1672 This bill still lacks clarity in many important areas: 1673 office use, how nuclear pharmacies are regulated, and repackaging

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

of sterile products. I look forward to working with my colleagues to provide meaningful oversight of the FDA to make sure another NECC-type outbreak never happens again, and make sure they are using the type of enforcement discretion necessary to preserve patients' access to critical medicine.

In that same press release -- because it was a bipartisan effort, as you heard earlier, Mr. Green, myself, and Ms. DeGette worked hard on trying to get this portion of the DQSA right, and to the best of our ability, although we had some disagreements with our Senate colleagues. I said on that occasion that, "The Drug Quality and Security Act leaves a large portion of existing law intact. It also leaves many areas of practice where clarification may still be needed, particularly as it relates to office use, repackaging, and nuclear pharmacies. Along with my colleagues, I will continue working to oversee the FDA's interpretation and implementation of this law."

And I think that is what we are doing today. Some folks have characterized this, because I am leading the push for office use, as wanting to undo everything that DQSA stood for. Obviously, I wouldn't have drafted it and fought hard along with my colleagues to get it, if that was my intent.

But I do have questions. And one of those was raised by your testimony to Mr. Shimkus in answering his questions where you indicated that twice they had decided that you had to have a

prescription in order to issue a drug, and that Congress had made that decision. But I am looking at 503A, little "a" to big "A", and it says, as one of the things, it says, "or is by a licensed pharmacist or a licensed physician in limited quantities before"

-- before -- "the receipt of a valid prescription order for such individual patient."

Obviously, the law -- and that was the old law, which was not changed and which we were assured that the practices weren't going to change at the times we were negotiating this by folks in the Senate saying they didn't want to do this because the FDA wasn't going to change anything. It clearly anticipates that in some cases you won't have a prescription until afterwards. We had debated making sure that a prescription was written within seven days at the time that we were negotiating it. But this seemed acceptable at the time, and the reason that I put that into my statement -- and others may have put it into their statement -- and the statement on the Floor was we were given the assurance that office use was going to remain pretty much the same, and for 503A pharmacies I think that is important.

So, how do you rectify that you think there needs to be a prescription with the actual wording of the law? There are also other references, future-looking references, in the next section.

Dr. Gottlieb. Yes, thank you, Congressman, for the question. I appreciate your longstanding dedication to this

issue and your longstanding work on it. And you and I have had the time to talk about this on many occasions.

With respect to the nuclear pharmacies, I will just say we will be putting out a guidance that will specifically address radiopharmaceuticals.

But, in respect to your specific question about the language you quoted, I believe that that language and we believe that language was contemplating anticipatory compounding, basically, compounding on an expectation that you were going to receive a certain volume of prescriptions. Because we know, with the 503A pharmacies -- and I know you are very familiar with the practice of pharmacy -- sometimes when you mix up one batch, when you are mixing up a batch, you can't just mix up one drug. You mix up 10 at a time or 15 at a time. And you can do that if there is an expectation that you know you get 30 prescriptions a month or 40 prescriptions a month. So, we allow for that.

What we have said in guidance is that you can mix up a level of volume in anticipation of what you your prescriptions might be over the course of a 30-day period to provide that kind of flexibility. That is what I believe the statutory language that you referenced was anticipating and that we have allowed for.

Mr. Griffith. And I disagree, just based on the debate that we had when we were doing this a number of years ago in 2013, because we anticipated there would be continued office use. That

is why we were looking at putting in the seven-day requirement. 1746 1747 And as Ms. DeGette said, there has got to be a balance. 1748 Shimkus said, we are worried about rural areas. 1749 I do appreciate that you are concerned about the state lines 1750 because, having now been made famous by the GEICO commercial where 1751 the lizard jumps from Tennessee to Virginia and back and forth, 1752 and back and forth, that is my district. And so, you have got 1753 a pharmacy on either side of that state line. I mean, you just 1754 turn around and you cross the state line. 1755 The other day I was traveling in my district and I went from 1756 Virginia to West Virginia, to Virginia, to West Virginia, back 1757 to Virginia, then ended up the day going from Virginia to 1758 Tennessee, back into Virginia, and back into Tennessee, and then, 1759 back home in Virginia, just to try to talk to my constituents and 1760 do what I needed to do. So, I appreciate you paying attention to that as you look 1761 at the flexibility side, but I really believe that the existing 1762 1763 law allows for some office use from the smaller folks. 1764 trying to get to the big guys and the larger guys because of the 1765 NECC problem, which was shipping into all the states, not just across the Tennessee line or the Virginia line. 1766 1767 I yield back.

NEAL R. GROSS
COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

Congressman, the impact on small pharmacies.

I understand and appreciate concerns,

Dr. Gottlieb.

1768

1770 Mr. Griffith. And I yield back. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. 1771 The Chair thanks the gentleman. Mr. Burgess. 1772 And the Chair recognizes the gentleman from a similar small 1773 state, Maryland, for 5 minutes. 1774 Mr. Sarbanes. Small, but powerful, and home to the FDA. 1775 Welcome, Commissioner. 1776 People have touched on kind of the partnership, regulatory 1777 partnership between your agency and what happens at the state 1778 I wanted to explore that a little bit more. level. 1779 I was looking at your testimony on page 3, where you talked about the 500 inspections that have been conducted, 503A and B 1780 1781 facilities, since the passage of the new law and the end of the 1782 last fiscal year; how you have observed problematic conditions 1783 during the vast majority of these inspections, overseeing more 1784 than 150 recalls of compounded drugs, issued more than 180 warning You have also worked in close coordination with our 1785 letters. 1786 federal and state partners, sending more than 70 referral letters 1787 to state regulatory authorities for followup on certain 1788 inspectional findings. 1789 So, I am just curious how that is going. I mean, there must 1790 be some states that are better partners than others. Obviously, 1791 you have to rely to a certain degree on those followup inspections. 1792 And maybe without naming specific states, you could give me an 1793 example of a state that is engaged in this partnership in a very

productive and efficient way, and why that is the case, what you would point to as indicating kind of a high standard in terms of the partnership, and the followup, and all the rest of it. And then, maybe give me an example, again without naming the state, of a place where that is not going so well. And what does the agency do, either because it is required to in some element or just because you regard it as your responsibility to help states to get to where they can be the best possible partners in this effort at oversight?

Dr. Gottlieb. Congressman, thanks for the question. To your point, there is a fair degree of variability. I think it would be risky of me to try to characterize a good state and a not-so-good state, because it is not something I have actually asked the question of my folks, and I would want to contemplate it in concert with them. Because the field people, the field team that is engaged in these efforts are going to have the best perspective. We could certainly get you that perspective, but I wouldn't want to mischaracterize the state.

I will say, though, broadly, that what we are seeing directionally is that the states are starting to conform more to DQSA now. And so, there has been discussion, for example, of states' pharmacy bylaws that might allow for certain practices that DQSA we don't believe contemplates. We starting to see more of the states conform their practices, their inspectional

activity, as well as their laws, to be compliant with the DQSA, be consistent with the principles of the DQSA.

For the states that might be moving in a different direction or not moving as quickly in the direction that was envisioned by DQSA, I think what it creates for us is more of a resource burden. Those are the states that we might have to put more resources into to make sure that we are providing the same level of oversight that we would be to a state that is sharing information with us very cooperatively and reporting to us, so we can target our inspections better.

A lot of our inspections are for-cause inspections. A lot of them are based on information we derive from the states. If the states aren't reporting to us as efficiently, then we need to do more work to try to derive that information on our own. It is just a more resource-intensive process.

Mr. Sarbanes. Is there an opportunity to provide, I don't know, technical assistance or other support to the states, as they are trying to come into compliance with this effort?

Dr. Gottlieb. We do that. As the scheme contemplates, we provide a lot of resources or technical assistance within the context of the resources we have available to do this in terms of training to state inspectors, training around inspectional issues that they might need to be aware of as they start to inspect, for example, 503B facilities and do their own GMP inspections.

1842 We do dual inspections with the states. We invite the states in 1843 on our inspections, so that they can both learn alongside of us 1844 as well as dually inspect some of these facilities and share 1845 So, there is a lot of stuff that we are trying to 1846 do in concert with the states. 1847 As I sunk deeper into this and understanding how we were 1848 applying this framework when I re-arrived at FDA 10 months ago, 1849 there were a lot of aspects of this that looked very similar to 1850 FISMA, the framework envisioned in FISMA, where the regulatory 1851 scheme is very much dependent upon a close federal/state 1852 partnership. 1853 Thank you. I yield back. Mr. Sarbanes. 1854 Mr. Burgess. The Chair thanks the gentleman. The 1855 gentleman yields back. 1856 The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia, 5 minutes 1857 for questions, please. 1858 Mr. Carter. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. 1859 And thank you, Dr. Gottlieb, for being here. I want to 1860 commend you and thank you for your adherence to safety, and I think 1861 it is very important. It has been mentioned more than once during this hearing that 1862 1863 there has to be a balance between accessibility and safety. 1864 think that is perhaps one of the areas that I struggle with. 1865 you and I have had many conversations.

I want to ask you, first of all, about the rulemaking process, because that is of great interest to me, being a relatively-new Member of Congress, only in my second term, my third -- I guess I am starting my fourth year now. So, I am getting older, but I am still learning about the rulemaking process.

I noticed that, since the passage of DQSA, that you have used oversight guidance documents to really enforce this and to really enforce what you want the agency to see out there. Although we probably disagree, and we do disagree, you say it is with stakeholder input; I say it has not been with stakeholder input. And I am just wondering how you can justify that, particularly in light of the fact that just recently the Office of the Associate Attorney General issued a new policy to DOJ that guidance policies will not be converted into rulemaking. So, how are you justifying this, that you are going to use guidance policy for rulemaking here?

Dr. Gottlieb. Thank you, Congressman.

We have a long history of issuing non-binding guidance in many contexts. And our guidance practice -- and this question has come up in other contexts well outside this context -- our guidance practices, generally, have been used as a model for other agencies and for OIRA as well in terms of what we do, how we issue guidance, what we use guidance for under the Administrative Procedures Act.

So, I feel confident that, on the whole -- and we can have a debate around any individual guidance -- but I feel confident that, on the whole, we have adhered to good practices in terms of how we promulgated guidance in multiple --

Mr. Carter. I don't mean to interrupt, but you even answered Mr. Upton's, Representative Upton's question about the guidance, that you expected it and that you were using the guidance for enforcement. I mean, you are, essentially, saying that this guidance is going to be enforced.

Dr. Gottlieb. There is --

Mr. Carter. Even though the DOJ has been told that, no, it cannot be converted into rulemaking. Quite honestly, I have not read this from the Associate Attorney General. Perhaps they said this is going to apply to the DOJ, but not to the FDA. I don't suspect that was the case; maybe it is.

Dr. Gottlieb. Well, we could take enforcement action now. We don't need the guidance document in order to take the enforcement action. The guidance document is a way to provide public discussion around how we intend to take our enforcement action. So, we can both inform the public as well as learn from the public. The guidance document itself isn't the basis for the enforcement action, you are absolutely right. We have regulatory authority that has been given to us by Congress.

Mr. Carter. Well, what about stakeholder input? Because

that is something that is very concerning to me, that I don't feel like we have had stakeholder input. I know that you are coming out with a new MOU. My hope is that you are going to have more stakeholder input into that. The existing MOU, although I was not here at the time, I don't think there was sufficient stakeholder input into that.

One thing, in particular, about this is the difference between dispensing and distributing. As you know, the DEA has said that distributing is going to be overseen by the FDA, but the dispensing is going to be overseen by the state boards of pharmacies. Yet, you seem to want to oversee dispensing as well through the FDA.

Dr. Gottlieb. I am not familiar with the particular definition of dispensing and distributing, probably under the Controlled Substances Act, that you have derived from -- I don't know, is it a regulation or a guidance document? So, I can't speak to how the DEA might have defined something in a certain context, again under the Controlled Substances Act, which is my presumption.

We believe that, under this law and under the practice of pharmacy, with products that we regulate, and outside of the context of controlled substances, the practice of pharmacy involves the dispensing of a product, just like the practice of pharmacy involves a patient --

Mr. Carter. But why is it that the FDA thinks that they have to intercede the state boards of pharmacy? That has always been something that the state boards of pharmacies --

Dr. Gottlieb. We need to work with them.

Mr. Carter. Okay. I have got just a few minutes left, just a few seconds left. Now I want to ask you about something that has been brought up by Ms. DeGette, by Mr. Griffith, and that is office use. And that is something that I think you have absolutely got wrong here.

But I want to ask you just from a perspective of a Member of Congress. It is my understanding that not once, not twice, but three times, through appropriations language, that the FDA has been instructed to revisit this and to look at this. In fact, in 2016, it said, "The committee understands the intent of the DQSA was not to prohibit compounding pharmacies from operation under existing 503A exemptions. Therefore, the committee directs the FDA to issue a guidance document on how compounding pharmacists can continue to engage in office-use compounding."

Why do you ignore these? Why have you not ignored it once, not twice, but three times? I don't get it.

Dr. Gottlieb. Congressman, those appropriation riders I believe preceded my arrival at FDA. I would be happy to work with this committee, or anyone in Congress, to contemplate if they want to have a discussion around the statute and what we can do to

1962	continue to improve this on this legislation.
1963	But we have to keep patients in mind and make sure patient
1964	safety drives the decision we make. And remember why we are here.
1965	We are here because pharmacies were engaging in manufacturing
1966	without any standards in place.
1967	Mr. Carter. Dr. Gottlieb, I could not agree with you more.
1968	I commend you on your dedication to safety. Again, we get back
1969	to the balance between access and safety. And that is just you
1970	and I live in different worlds. I mean, you are in a different
1971	world than what I previously was in my career in pharmacy, and
1972	I saw firsthand the access issue and how people struggled with
1973	it. That is just a difference that we have and that I hope that
1974	you will take into consideration in the future.
1975	Thank you very much.
1976	Dr. Gottlieb. Thank you, Congressman.
1977	Mr. Burgess. The gentleman yields back.
1978	So, Dr. Gottlieb, once again, I think we have gotten everyone
1979	on the committee. I will just ask, Mr. Green, do you have a
1980	followup question before we leave?
1981	Mr. Green. No. Oh, I guess we do, Mr. Chairman.
1982	[Laughter.]
1983	Mr. Burgess. I could intuit that.
1984	Mr. Green. Okay. Commissioner, one of the most important
1985	ways FDA is conducting oversight and ensuring compliance with the

DQSA has been through inspections. Since the enactment of the Drug Quality and Security Act, FDA has conducted nearly 500 inspections, issued more than 180 warning letters identifying significant violations of compounding pharmacies, issued more than 70 letters referring to inspectional findings to state regulatory bodies, and overseen more than 120 recalls of compounded products.

Commissioner Gottlieb, as I noted, FDA has conducted hundreds of inspections in compounding pharmacies and identified numerous violations. Will you describe briefly for us some of the violations and conditions FDA found when they were inspecting both 503A compounding pharmacies or 503B outsourcing facilities?

Dr. Gottlieb. I brought some slides with me, if the chairman would let me use them, of some of the things that we found. So, we can close on this, if that is okay. I don't know if we have them teed up.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

This is visible microbial contamination on a ceiling tile in a clean room.

If we go to the next slide, this is a HEPA filter located immediately above an ISO5 workbench that was observed to have a stained surface. The stain was due to a drug product which had exploded due to excessive pressure when forcing non-sterile product through a sterilizing filter, a device used to force the

2010 product sterilizing, in other words, a stainless steel caulking 2011 gun that was not sterilized. 2012 Next slide. This is a sleeve used in the aseptic glovebox 2013 for aseptic manipulation. You can see it is damaged where it is 2014 circled. 2015 Next slide. This is a toaster oven that was used to dry heat 2016 sterilize glassware. The oven wasn't capable, as we can probably 2017 presume, of reaching high enough temperature to be effective for 2018 that purpose. 2019 Next slide. This is a ceiling above the doorway to a clean 2020 room with exposed insulation. This was supposed to be a clean 2021 room that would store products manufactured. Next slide is a kitchen dishwasher that was actually being 2022 supplied with tap water and home detergent and used to clean 2023 2024 equipment, equipment and the utensils that come in contact with 2025 products that were intended to be sterile. 2026 And they jumped my bug. This was a buq. 2027 But, you know, we also saw things like coffee filters being 2028 used to filter particulate matters. We find things that are 2029 deeply concerning. And these are sterile, these are facilities 2030 that are manufacturing sterile products, or at least intended to 2031 be sterile products. 2032 I appreciate the question. 2033 Mr. Green. Thank you.

2034	Mr. Burgess. The Chair observes that debate on the Floor
2035	has proceeded to the point where Mr. McGovern is making some fairly
2036	significant gestures, which usually means he is concluding and
2037	we will be voting shortly. So, I will advise the committee that
2038	we will recess upon the votes that are called on the Floor.
2039	But we thought Ms. McMorris Rodgers was coming back, and she
2040	is. So, I will recognize her.
2041	Mrs. McMorris Rodgers. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
2042	Mr. Burgess. But, again, I observe that the vote on the
2043	Floor is probably very close. Mr. McGovern is making smaller and
2044	smaller circles with his hands, and that usually means we are
2045	getting there.
2046	[Laughter.]
2047	Mrs. McMorris Rodgers. Okay. Very good. Okay.
2048	Well, Commissioner, thanks for being here.
2049	I wanted to ask about the 503As and the 503Bs, and just what
2050	the intent is moving forward as far as preserving them separately,
2051	or what your thoughts are.
2052	Dr. Gottlieb. Well, thank you, Congresswoman, for the
2053	question. On the 503A, are you talking about the bulks list or
2054	just the different facilities?
2055	Mrs. McMorris Rodgers. Well, I understand that you have
2056	issued some guidelines related to 503As, 503Bs, and I wanted just
2057	to understand better what you think the future is for the 503As.

Dr. Gottlieb. Well, I mean, the general question with respect to the 503As is we believe that the 503As, which is a traditional practice of pharmacy, should continue to flourish. We believe it provides an important product for patients, the practice of pharmacy being able to individualize products on the basis of a prescription for an individual patient.

On the 503Bs, we do hope, and we always envisioned, that there would be more facilities converting into being outsourcing facilities. We also believe that more 503A facilities would opt to become 503B facilities. Now, in full disclosure, we have not seen the industry grow up the way we had hoped. We still believe it is early. And we intend to try to promulgate a set of policies that we believe that will, hopefully, provide a flexible regulatory framework based on risk that is going to allow more pharmacies to contemplate becoming 503B facilities. Because there is an argument to be made that, when a pharmacy can become a 503B facility and engage in larger-scale manufacturing, under GMP compliance standards, we are able to apply a level of oversight that ensures the sterility of the products that are being manufactured. That could, hopefully, provide for more patient access.

But, with respect to the 503A facilities that were contemplated in the statute, and always enshrined in statute, that is the traditional practice of pharmacy that we believe should

2058

2059

2060

2061

2062

2063

2064

2065

2066

2067

2068

2069

2070

2071

2072

2073

2074

2075

2076

2077

2078

2079

2080

2082 be preserved and protected, and provides an important opportunity 2083 for patients to get products that are tailored to their unique 2084 clinical needs. 2085 Mrs. McMorris Rodgers. So, you anticipate that they will 2086 be preserved as you move forward, the 503A --2087 Dr. Gottlieb. Well, they are. They are being preserved. 2088 The question becomes the scope of the activity and whether or not 2089 503A facilities can and should be engaging in larger-scale 2090 manufacturing, and manufacturing and distributing products. 2091 we believe that DQSA contemplated a scheme where that kind of 2092 activity would move into the 503B facilities that would be subject 2093 to GMP standards, if you were engaging in manufacturing and 2094 wider-spread distribution. 2095 That is what brought us here. I mean, it was the fact of 2096 pharmacies like NECC engaging in manufacturing under the guise 2097 of a pharmacy license, not subject to standards that ensure the 2098 sterility of those products, that created the risks that brought 2099 Congress to contemplate this new framework. 2100 Mrs. McMorris Rodgers. Okay. Well, I look forward to 2101 talking further about this with you. 2102 Dr. Gottlieb. Thank you. 2103 Will the gentlelady yield? Mr. Griffith. 2104 Mrs. McMorris Rodgers. Yes. Yes, I would be happy to 2105 yield.

2106 Mr. Griffith. And I would just ask, in relationship to 503A, 2107 because we were talking about it earlier, if that didn't 2108 contemplate office use, then why has FDA allowed it up until this 2109 Because that is existing law and was existing law point in time? 2110 before DOSA, and it was allowed. 2111 Dr. Gottlieb. Yes, I mean, it is a good question, 2112 And I was at FDA over part of the time that we 2113 struggled with the 503A statute. As you know, after the Western 2114 States case vacated certain aspects of that law, FDA was on shaky 2115 legal ground with respect to trying to contain and implement that 2116 statute --2117 Mr. Griffith. We know. 2118 Dr. Gottlieb. -- with the division in it. 2119 Mr. Griffith. I know, and, yes, that was, again, timid 2120 lawyering, because that just dealt with advertising. It didn't 2121 have anything to do with anything else, and it was not ruled, the 2122 question of severability was not ruled on by the Supreme Court. 2123 Right. I think what the agency would have Dr. Gottlieb. 2124 said at the time was that it had a difficult time bringing cases 2125 under that statute, and we also at the time faced a lot of pressure from Congress on the implementation of 503A. 2126 I think DOSA was 2127 not only a clarification of the statute and removed the offending provision, but was a clear declaration from Congress that you 2128

wanted the agency to be vigilant with respect to these --

2130	Mr. Griffith. No question about being vigilant. Just we
2131	didn't anticipate eliminating something that had been in practice
2132	under the existing law that we left as the existing law.
2133	But, that being said, also, you showed the pictures of things
2134	you found as problems in compounding pharmacies, but you also
2135	found problems, which is why you do your job, in large
2136	manufacturers as well from time to time. Isn't that correct?
2137	Dr. Gottlieb. Absolutely right.
2138	Mr. Griffith. Thank you very much. I yield back.
2139	Mr. Burgess. The gentleman yields back.
2140	The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas for a unanimous
2141	consent request.
2142	Mr. Green. Mr. Chairman, I would also like to ask the
2143	Commissioner to submit those slides for the record.
2144	Mr. Burgess. Without objection, so ordered.
2145	[The information follows:]
2146	
2147	****** COMMITTEE INSERT 5******

2148 I do have one followup question that I feel Mr. Burgess. 2149 compelled to ask. Because we are going to hear from a patient 2150 in the next panel, and Mr. Guthrie referenced -- I think it was 2151 Mr. Whitfield's constituent in several Congresses ago who came 2152 and talked to us about losing a spouse after the Exserohilum 2153 infection that they acquired. 2154 Does the agency have an opinion on when it is the duty of 2155 a physician or a surgery center or a hospital to inform a patient 2156 that they are receiving a medication from a compounding pharmacy 2157 as opposed to one of the other pharmacies? 2158 Dr. Gottlieb. I don't have a view on that, Congressman. 2159 have seen survey data with respect to that, I think including data 2160 that was developed by Pew. So, I know you have a witness who can speak to that, the development of that data, on the next panel. 2161 2162 As you know, there are labeling requirements for the products 2163 that are produced by the 503B facilities that provide warning information and certain disclosures, but not necessarily that it 2164 2165 was a compounded product. 2166 It doesn't escape me that the witness we had Mr. Burgess. 2167 several Congresses ago, and likely the one we are going to hear from today, may very well tell us that they never had any idea 2168 2169 what a compounding pharmacy was; they never heard of it before.

And now, their lives have been seriously affected by --

Dr. Gottlieb.

2170

2171

Well, I would say that, here again, I think

this gets to the question of the prescription as a line of Because if the prescription is the line of demarcation. demarcation, if you are going into a 503A facility and getting a compounded product, you know that. If you are going into a doctor's office and you are getting a product from that doctor's office, and that was produced by a compounding pharmacy, not subject to sterility standards, you don't know that. That is why it is important, we believe, to have a mechanism in place to make sure that, when those products are being provided in that sort of de-identified way, because you no longer have that relationship to the pharmacist and understand where and how that product was manufactured, that there are standards applied for sterility to how that product was developed.

Mr. Burgess. I also appreciate your comments that this is all about patient safety, and that is why we all want to get it right. We may not agree on everything on the dias here, one side or the other, but we do want to get it right. And we appreciate your efforts in trying to help us get that right.

That will conclude the testimony from the first panel.

Again, we are very close to a series of votes on the Floor. So, I am going to ask that we actually not take a break between panels. We will let Dr. Gottlieb gather his papers up and leave, and just take a second to put the nameplates out. But we probably better proceed directly into the second panel.

2172

2173

2174

2175

2176

2177

2178

2179

2180

2181

2182

2183

2184

2185

2186

2187

2188

2189

2190

2191

2192

2193

2194

2196 I call the subcommittee back to order.

Once again, as we transition to our second panel of witnesses, I do want to thank all of our witnesses for being here and taking time to testify before the subcommittee. Each witness will have the opportunity to give an opening statement, followed by questions from members.

Again, I will advise that we will recess when votes are called on the Floor.

But today we are going to hear from Dr. George Williams,
President-Elect of the American Academy of Ophthalmology; Dr.
Bruce Brod, the Chairman of the Congressional Policy Committee
for the American Academy of Dermatologists; Shawn Hodges, Vice
President, International Academy of Compounding Pharmacists;

Jacob Olson, the President and CEO of Skywalk Pharmacy, on behalf
of the National Community Pharmacists Association; Jenn Adams,
Senior Vice President, Clinical Product Solutions, PharMEDium
Services; Molly Ventrelli, Vice President, Regulatory Affairs,
Fresenius Kabi; Elizabeth Jungman, Director of Public Health of
the Pew Charitable Trusts, and Nancy Dargan, a former patient of
the New England Compounding Center.

We appreciate all of you being here today.

Dr. Williams, you are now recognized for 5 minutes for a summary of your opening statement.

2219	STATEMENTS OF GEORGE WILLIAMS, PRESIDENT-ELECT, AMERICAN ACADEMY
2220	OF OPHTHALMOLOGY; BRUCE BROD, CHAIRMAN, CONGRESSIONAL POLICY
2221	COMMITTEE, AMERICAN ACADEMY OF DERMATOLOGISTS; SHAWN HODGES, VICE
2222	PRESIDENT, INTERNATIONAL ACADEMY OF COMPOUNDING PHARMACISTS;
2223	JACOB OLSON, PRESIDENT AND CEO, SKYWALK PHARMACY, ON BEHALF OF
2224	THE NATIONAL COMMUNITY PHARMACISTS ASSOCIATION; JENN ADAMS,
2225	SENIOR VICE PRESIDENT, CLINICAL PRODUCT SOLUTIONS, PHARMEDIUM
2226	SERVICES; MOLLY VENTRELLI, VICE PRESIDENT, REGULATORY AFFAIRS,
2227	FRESENIUS KABI; ELIZABETH JUNGMAN, DIRECTOR OF PUBLIC HEALTH, THE
2228	PEW CHARITABLE TRUSTS, AND NANCY DARGAN, FORMER PATIENT OF THE
2229	NEW ENGLAND COMPOUNDING CENTER
2230	
2231	STATEMENT OF GEORGE WILLIAMS
2232	Dr. Williams. Chairman Burgess, Ranking Member Green, and
2233	members of
2234	Mr. Burgess. And do be sure your microphone is on and pull
2235	it close.
2236	Dr. Williams. Is it working?
2237	Chairman Burgess, Ranking Member Green, and members of the
2238	committee, I am honored to be testifying to you on behalf of the
2239	American Academy of Ophthalmology on a topic critical to the
2240	practice of ophthalmology.
2241	My name is George Williams. I am a practicing retina
2242	specialist from Michigan. I am also the Immediate Past Secretary

of the American Academy of Ophthalmology; Secretary of Federal Affairs, and current President-Elect for the Academy.

As the world's largest association of eye physicians and surgeons, the Academy seeks to protect sight and empower lives by setting standards for ophthalmic education, advocating for our patients and the public.

Access to safe and effective compounded repackaged drugs is vitally important to the practice of ophthalmology. This is due in large part to the uniqueness of our specialty, as we utilize drugs in dosage forms that differ from other areas of medicine. Effective treatment often requires that drugs be compounded or repackaged in concentrations or doses that are tailored to a patient's specific needs and unusual route of administration to the eye. These drugs are used in the successful treatment of several ophthalmological treatments, including diseases that threaten sight such as age-related macular degeneration.

Ophthalmology's treatment of patients facing sight-threatening diseases such as AMD requires access to drugs known as vascular endothelial growth factor inhibitors, or VEGF inhibitors. These include the FDA-approved anti-VEGF treatments ranibizumab and aflibercept, as well as repackaged bevacizumab, or Avastin. The Academy has long advocated for access to all three treatments, as individual patients may respond differently and have better outcomes with one treatment versus another.

Since the passage of the DQSA, the Academy's advocacy efforts have included focus on protecting access to repackaged Avastin. The Academy is aware of adverse event clusters associated with intravitreal injections of repackaged bevacizumab, including events in Georgia and Florida. Events like these, along with the passage of the DQSA, have led to the necessary changes at compounding pharmacies and improvements in the safety of this treatment.

Because of our efforts since 2013 to track outcomes of patients who receive anti-VEGF therapies, we have been able to gather data on effectiveness and safety of these treatments. The American Academy of Ophthalmology utilized our IRIS registry, which is the nation's largest comprehensive eye disease clinical registry, to track adverse events associated with the use of these products from January of 2013 to June of 2016. These data clearly showed no statistically-significant difference in adverse events among different anti-VEGF agents, including repackaged Avastin.

Today repackaged Avastin remains a safe and effective treatment option for patients facing sight-threatening disease, and Academy efforts to protect access are ongoing. The new guidance from FDA, which represented a step in the right direction, was recently finalized by the agency. The Academy will continue to engage with the agency, Congress, and compounding facilities to ensure patient access to repackaged bevacizumab.

The Academy is also concerned about continued access to other non-biologic compounds or drugs for office use. The FDA has issued final guidance on office use that we believe threatens access to compounded drugs for such use, requiring patient-specific prescriptions before a compounded drug can be distributed by a traditional compounding pharmacy. We are concerned that policy outlined in the final guidance forces practitioners to rely solely on outsourcing facilities to meet all of their needs for office-use drugs.

I would like to share a few examples of how implementation of the DQSA is having some unintended consequences, is impacting access to compounded and repackaged drugs. This is why the Academy is supporting policy that ensures access to drugs for office space use, such H.R. 2871, the Preserving Patient Access to Compounded Medications Act, introduced by Congressman Morgan Griffith.

I would like to discuss a patient from my state of Michigan. She is a 31-year-old lady who wears soft contact lenses and developed an infection in her eye. She was eventually determined to have a serious infection known as acanthamoeba keratitis. The standard treatment for this is the use of a drug called polyhexylmethyl biguanide. Essentially, this is pool cleaner. This was prescribed, but, unfortunately, it was not available in the state of Michigan. As a result, the patient's

ophthalmologist in Michigan was forced to contact doctors at the University of Illinois-Chicago and to obtain the drug from Chicago. However, Chicago was unable to provide the drug in Michigan, and the patient, suffering from severe eye pain, was forced to drive 225 miles from Michigan to Chicago in order to obtain this therapy. Fortunately, she responded well. But this is an example of the type of problems we have when patients cannot access immediately important therapies.

The Academy has other examples of this involving the use of autologous serum drops that are given topically and have been used for more than three decades. These drugs are critical to the management of severe dry eye. However, due to compounding regulations, many compounding facilities have stopped producing these drops.

In closing, ophthalmology strongly believes that compounded drugs must be produced safely and be subject to critically important testing. We do believe that regulatory policy in this arena can become restrictive and, in turn, negatively impact physicians' ability to properly and effectively treatment patients. It is important that, as implementation efforts move forward, the FDA strives to find a more balanced approach. We believe that increased direct engagement with the physician community is a strong path forward, and we look forward to future opportunities with FDA, Congress, and other stakeholders on these

2339	important issues.
2340	Thank you.
2341	[The prepared statement of Dr. Williams follows:]
2342	
2343	 ****** INSERT 6******

2344

Mr. Burgess. Thank you, Dr. Williams.

2345

Dr. Brod, 5 minutes for an opening statement, please.

STATEMENT OF BRUCE BROD

Dr. Brod. Thank you, Chairman Burgess, Ranking Member Green, and members of the Health Subcommittee.

I am Dr. Bruce Brod. I am pleased to share with you my perspective as a dermatologist, a view that is shared by the American Academy of Dermatology Association.

Dermatologists rely heavily on compounded medications that are medically necessary and life-changing. We safely and effectively prepare and administer low-risk topical and intralesional compounded medications to a wide range of patients, including individuals presenting with special and emergent needs and persons suffering from rare diseases, including children.

Current policy adversely affects the practice of medicine in two significant ways, the first being with respect to maintaining a small supply of office-use compounded medications for administration to patients in our offices. Dermatologists have historically obtained compounded medications from 503A compounding pharmacies for immediate use in the office without the need for a patient-specific prescription. However, current policy now restricts this. While we understand the FDA intended 503B outsourcing facilities to be a meaningful resource for providing physicians with office-use stock, not all office-use compounded medications used by dermatologists are produced by

503Bs, including non-sterile topicals as well as sterile intralesional drugs used for injection in the skin.

The FDA's website reflects a partial list of drugs that registered outsourcing facilities have reported producing, starting December 2016, but ending May 2017. So, the list is retrospective and it is incomplete, and it doesn't indicate if these drugs will be produced in the future. Furthermore, we have no indication that 503Bs will provide flexibility in the various concentrations that we use in our offices.

The FDA lists only the facilities that are registered. Yet, it doesn't contain any contact information, real-time product availability information, or price listing. So, physician practices literally must go on a scavenger hunt for these needed compounds. In addition, dermatologists have reported that the outsourcing facilities have quoted prices that are cost-prohibitive.

If a compounded drug is not available from an outsourcing facility, a patient now requires, first, a trip to the physician office for evaluation and diagnosis, then a trip to the pharmacy to obtain the prescription, and then, thirdly, a followup visit back to the physician to finally have the treatment administered. Those two additional steps impose new burdens on the patient, delayed treatment, and create inefficiencies in our practices.

When compounded medications are handled outside of a

provider's control, there are also major safety concerns regarding proper storage, handling, and application. When the dermatologist cannot be sure how it has been stored between patient pickup at the pharmacy and administration in the office, it calls into question the integrity of the medication.

An additional safety concern is the risk that patients may be tempted to self-administer the drugs prior to returning to the physician's office. Many of the powerful compounds in dermatology are used to destroy unwanted malignant and benign skin lesions. And so, if they are spilled on the skin by patients, they will cause scarring and disfigurement.

The second way current policy adversely affects the practice of medicine pertains to dermatologists' preparation of low-risk sterile and non-sterile medications in the office setting.

Because of the FDA's broad definition of compounding, many simple in-office preparations are considered compounding. Buffering lidocaine, for example, is a widely-used local anesthetic in dermatologic procedures. Without our ability to buffer lidocaine with sterile sodium bicarbonate, patients, including children, will endure painful injections of lidocaine. Using the buffered lidocaine allows us to perform very extensive skin cancer surgeries in an outpatient office setting without the risks and costs of sedation.

Because the FDA considers reconstituting certain

2418 FDA-approved neurotoxins with sterile saline to be compounding, 2419 the FDA's proposed guidelines imply that physician offices are 2420 compounding facilities, subject to the same equipment and process 2421 requirements as high-volume compounders. Many of those 2422 requirements are simply unworkable for dermatology offices, both 2423 structurally and financially. 2424 Accordingly, we are encouraged that the FDA mentions routine 2425 clinical practice and negligible patient risk in its 2018 2426 Compounding Policy Priorities Plan, which states that providers 2427 would not be subject to the same compliance policy in certain 2428 The manner in which we routinely buffer and dilute our 2429 injectable medications in dermatology is really part of our normal 2430 practice of medicine. While we greatly appreciate the FDA and U.S. Pharmacopeia 2431 2432 are working with medical specialties to explore an urgent-use 2433 exemption, we have real concerns that an exemption based on a restrictive timeframe will negatively affect patient access. 2434 2435 The well-being of our patients is our primary concern and 2436 responsibility. On behalf of the American Academy of Dermatology Association, I want to thank you for holding this hearing, and 2437 2438 I am happy to address any questions. 2439 [The prepared statement of Dr. Brod follows:] 2440 2441 TNSERT 7******

2442

Mr. Burgess. Thank you, Dr. Brod.

2443

Mr. Hodges, you are recognized for 5 minutes, please.

STATEMENT OF SHAWN HODGES

Mr. Hodges. Yes, sir. Yes, sir. Good afternoon, committee members.

Mr. Chairman and members of the subcommittee, my name is Shawn Hodges, a pharmacist and owner of Innovation Compounding, a compounding-only pharmacy located in Kennesaw, Georgia, just outside of Atlanta. I also serve as the Vice President of the International Academy of Compounding Pharmacists, IACP, an organization that represents more than 4,000 pharmacists, technicians, students, and members of the compounding community who focus on the specialty of pharmacy compounding. I would like to express my gratitude and appreciate to the Health Subcommittee for taking the time to understand compounding pharmacy and patient access issues from a pharmacist's perspective with the implementation of DQSA.

In 2012, a pharmacy owner who lost sight of his moral compass and violated his oath as a practicing pharmacist violated both state and federal laws and regulations related to quality and safety. As a result, more than 60 lives were lost and hundreds more fell ill, some to this day, nearly five-and-a-half years later. As compounders, our top priority is adhering to the highest-quality compounding standards to prevent something like this from happening again.

Since NECC, all regulatory bodies have made a concerted effort to improve the practice of pharmacy. In November of 2013, the DQSA was signed into law, somewhat clarifying the FDA's joint authority with the state boards of pharmacy, to monitor the quality of pharmacy compounding. State boards of pharmacy also updated pharmacy regulations and hired additional state inspectors to monitor and inspect compounding pharmacies. USP, the organization that sets the standards for governing compounding pharmacies, is revising its standards to continue to ensure best practices of pharmacy compounding, which can reduce the risk of harm to patients and compounding pharmacy employees.

As DQSA is well into its fourth year, I would also like to share with the committee what the professional compounding pharmacy has experienced and provide suggestions on how all pharmacies, state boards, and the FDA can actually strengthen DQSA while protecting access to lifesaving compounded preparations. As I rely the suggestions of IACP and other key pharmacy stakeholders, please note that our overall goal is to encourage an open, transparent dialog with all stakeholders, public and private. We strive to work closely with FDA in developing an appropriate balance between regulating quality and safety without eliminating patient access.

Pharmacies which are compliant and meet USP guidelines and state board of pharmacy rules fear that FDA overreach will impact

patient care. This fear has been substantiated by actions of FDA investigators. My pharmacy team experienced this firsthand in an FDA inspection that lasted for 11 days over a period of 4 months.

It is important to acknowledge that the FDA investigations were fulfilling their assigned duties and expressed a keen interest in the quality of our preparations. For that, I had the utmost respect for them. However, many requests about our pharmacy had little to do with the quality of our compounded preparations, but were, rather, in how we operated our pharmacy practice that is regulated by the boards of pharmacy. Luckily, our pharmacy team employed attorneys who are knowledgeable of both state and federal pharmacy laws and regulations to advise FDA that they were inspecting outside the scope given to them under the law. Many of our fellow compounding pharmacists have had similar experiences.

I would also like to share IACP's concerns as it relates to the memorandum of understanding between FDA and the states, which could limit patient access for preparations that are only available across state lines. Last week we were encouraged by Commissioner Gottlieb's 2108 Compounding Policy Priorities Plan that states he would rescind the current draft MOU and prepare a new draft for public comment. However, we still remain concerned that the FDA proposes to define distributing and dispensing as one and the same. As noted in all other federal

and state regulations, these are two distinct activities. If this is not corrected, the impact on patient access to medications will be detrimental, particularly for patients near state borders who rely on compounded medications from neighboring states.

Another of our primary considerations for review is the role of office-use compounding. I regularly hear from prescribers who need compounded medications for office use that they cannot obtain from outsourcing facilities in small dosages necessary to expeditiously meet patients' needs. The fundamental concept of office use from 503A pharmacies offers solutions to prescribers who are faced with unique challenges, whether a dentist needs a fast-acting, liquid anti-anxiety drug on hand in case an autistic child may have a panic attack or a hospice nurse that suddenly needs a compounded nausea medication because she has terminally-ill patient who is not responding to a manufactured product. The purpose of office use is to support prescribers who otherwise do not have access to a GMP product.

In closing, we at IACP want to be clear that our goal isn't to interfere with FDA's inspections on quality, but to ensure that FDA investigators who inspect compounding pharmacies are aware of and spec within the boundaries of FDCA. They also must have a working knowledge of USP standards and relevant state regulations. Likewise, we don't seek to weaken the DQSA in a way that will allow pharmacies to operate as drug manufacturers. Our

2540	goal is to have an open and consistent dialog with Congress and
2541	the FDA to establish policies that more effectively balance
2542	patient safety with patient access, because patient access is a
2543	patient safety issue.
2544	We thank you for the opportunity to appear here today and
2545	provide our input, and we do look forward to continuing to work
2546	with you on these common goals.
2547	[The prepared statement of Mr. Hodges follows:]
2548	
2549	******* INSERT 8******

2550 Mr. Burgess. Thank you, Mr. Hodges.

2551 Mr. Olson, you are recognized for 5 minutes. And because

2552

2553

a vote has been called, we will take your testimony, and then, we will have to recess until after the votes. So, you may proceed.

STATEMENT OF JACOB OLSON

Mr. Olson. Thank you. Thank you, Chairman Burgess,
Ranking Member Green, and members of the subcommittee. Thank you
for conducting this hearing on compounding.

My name is Jake Olson, and I am the pharmacist and owner of Skywalk Pharmacy. We have four locations in the greater Milwaukee area, serving patients of Children's Hospital of Wisconsin and clinics. I am testifying on behalf of the National Community Pharmacists Association. NCPA represents America's community pharmacists, including the owners of more than 22,000 independent community pharmacies that dispense nearly half of the nation's prescriptions.

In 2003, I had the unique opportunity to open Skywalk Pharmacy as an independently-owned community pharmacy which would serve as the outpatient pharmacy for the Children's Hospital of Wisconsin, the first of its kind in the United States. My pharmacies specialize in treating pediatric patients with routine ear infections to cystic fibrosis, cancer, and organ transplants. I compound only non-sterile preparations and I am compliant with USP 795 standards. I am licensed only in Wisconsin. I do not ship compounded medications across state lines, and compounding comprises 20 percent of my business.

Many of my pediatric patients have health conditions that

require medications that have not undergone FDA approval. In many cases drug manufacturers do not produce a commercially-available product in the necessary dosage form or strength for these patients' needs. Physicians call on me to help under these circumstances when compounding is the only option for their patients.

I am here today as a healthcare provider and small business owner to present some of my experiences and those of my fellow independent pharmacists regarding the FDA's implementation of the Compounding Quality Act.

First, it is imperative the state boards of pharmacy retain oversight of pharmacy compounding. I am not eligible to register as an outsourcing facility, nor would it make sense for me to do so. The dispensing of custom-made medications should continue to be regulated by the boards of pharmacy, as all other medical license profession practices are.

Second, physician office-use compounding needs are not being met. We used to provide compounds for dentists to treat pediatric patients who would present with urgent issues. However, we stopped doing this in 2013 due to the uncertainty caused by DQSA and conflicting Wisconsin state law. Dentists still request this compounded medication to be on hand in the event that a patient needs this treatment. Because I am no longer providing dentists with this office-use compound, the dentist now has to close up

the tooth, have the patient leave, come down to my pharmacy, pick up a prescription, and then, return to the dentist. This cannot happen in the same day. So, the child will continue with an infected tooth until the dentist can reschedule an appointment. Most of these patients are innercity children with Medicaid. Transportation is a huge issue, and sometimes it will take a week or longer to get them to come back. All the while, the child is suffering.

Third, not all office-use compounding needs can be met by outsourcing facilities. 503B outsourcing facilities provide an important function in meeting the needs of healthcare providers and patients. However, outsourcing facilities are not able to meet the entire office-use market, nor are they able to replace the role of the traditional compounding pharmacies.

Because of the requirements placed on outsourcing facilities and the costs of complying with CGMP, they are not able to compound in small batches; thus, limiting the role they can play in meeting the immediate patient needs for compounds. By prohibiting 503A pharmacies to compound for office use, the FDA is severely limiting access.

Fourth, FDA needs to end inspection reporting discrepancies between manufacturers and compounding pharmacies. I often hear from my fellow compounders who have been inspected by the FDA about the 483 reports that may be issued post-inspection and posted

publicly, like they were today, on FDA's website. I don't understand why these same reports are not also publicly posted for FDA-registered facilities. While FDA publicizes Form 483s and photographs from compounding pharmacy inspections, there is evidence of several of the same observations from CGMP manufacturers with no corresponding publicity. This treatment suggests there is intent by the FDA to sway the public and undermine the confidence that parents have in my ability to take care of their child's medications.

Fifth, the FDA must make changes to the Pharmacy Compounding Advisory Committee and related activities. I am very concerned that not one of the voting members of the committee compounds for human use on a daily basis, considering the committee is making recommendations that can vastly impact the practice of compounding. The previous FDA PCAC had at least three pharmacists with current experience and expertise in compounding. The FDA should select, at minimum, one practicing human compounder on the committee as a voting member.

Lastly, it is very confusing for me, as a compounder, to understand what I can or cannot compound with today because of some of the conflicting information.

In summary, NCPA is committed to working with members of the Health Subcommittee, the FDA, and other stakeholders regarding these important matters for a balanced approach to ensuring

2650	patient access to safe and effective compounded medications.
2651	Thank you.
2652	[The prepared statement of Mr. Olson follows:]
2653	
2654	****** INSERT 9******

2655 Mr. Burgess. Thank you, Mr. Olson. 2656 And I apologize, we were only able to get through half the 2657 We will get to the rest of you immediately after this panel. 2658 It will probably take us 30 minutes to complete series of votes. 2659 that task. 2660 So, the committee stands in recess until immediately after 2661 the votes. 2662 [Recess.] 2663 Mr. Burgess. I think to be respectful of everyone's time, 2664 I am going to call the subcommittee back to order. 2665 expecting other members to show up almost immediately. 2666 But as we recessed for votes, we were about to hear from Jenn 2667 Adams, the Senior Vice President, Clinical Products Solutions from PharMEDium Services. So, Ms. Adams, you are recognized for 2668 2669 5 minutes.

STATEMENT OF JENN ADAMS

Ms. Adams. Thank you. Chairman Burgess, Ranking Member Green, and members of the subcommittee, thank you for the opportunity to participate in today's hearing.

My name is Jenn Adams, and I am the President of PharMEDium Services. On behalf of PharMEDium, I want to thank you for holding this hearing on the implementation of the Compounding Quality Act, which Congress enacted as a part of the Drug Quality and Security Act of 2013.

PharMEDium, which is a subsidiary of AmerisourceBergen, operates four 503B registered outsourcing facilities. I want to briefly describe, as we begin, what PharMEDium does, as our business models tracks exactly what Congress codified in the Compounding Quality Act. Our four facilities prepare ready-to-administer compounded sterile drugs for hospitals, so that they don't have to prepare these medications at a patient's bedside under conditions that could introduce more risks of contamination.

Many sterile drugs, such as injectables, in their FDA-approved form are not manufactured in ready-to-use doses. Therefore, the drugs have to be prepared by diluting or admixing the FDA-approved drug with diluents or other components to achieve the appropriate dose for patient care. We prepare these sterile

drugs into customized preparations, as ordered by our hospital customers. And this is the primary need that outsourcing facilities fulfill. And PharMEDium exclusively compounds using only FDA-approved sterile drugs obtained from registered drug manufacturers. This practice fills a very different role than that of traditional pharmacy compounding, which involves filling an individual patient prescription as required by law.

Based on our experience in serving the needs of hospitals and healthcare systems, outsourcing facilities anticipate the need for drug preparations. We compound those preparations on behalf of our customers, and then, our customers dispense the medications to their patients. The types of drug preparations that are compounded are, by definition, not available from manufacturers; therefore, requiring these more custom formulations to meet the clinical needs of patients.

Both of these distinct types of compounding, by outsourcing facilities and also by traditional pharmacies, we believe are critical in ensuring that patients have access to safe compounded medications when needed.

PharMEDium was, and remains, an active supporter of DQSA because we felt strongly that more oversight of our industry was needed. The premise of the DQSA is that outsourcing facilities are subject to FDA oversight and more stringent quality requirements. And as our industry shifts more toward

manufacturing quality standards, significant investment has been and is required in our facilities, personnel, and equipment to comply with these heightened standards. At PharMEDium our investment has, indeed, been quite significant, and the enhancements we have made have been challenging to implement, but we are confident that these improvements are in the best interest of patients and we are committed to continuing on this path in cooperation with the FDA.

Unfortunately, the successful implementation of Section 503B is under a separate threat; namely, from the misuse of bulk drug substances. I mentioned earlier that PharMEDium only compounds from FDA-approved drugs, as opposed to starting from bulk drug substances, which are sometimes referred to as bulk active pharmaceutical ingredients, or API powders.

There are, indeed, circumstances in which it is sometimes necessary to compound from bulk drug substances, such as when an individual patient requires a dose that cannot be achieved when using the FDA-approved manufactured drug as a starting point. But using bulk powders and outsourcing facilities should be the rare exception versus the rule, as it requires using a version of the drug that has not gone through the FDA approval and, therefore, has not benefitted from all of the safeguards that are inherent to FDA's drug approval process, which are designed to mitigate the risks of contamination.

As a result, under the law, bulk powders are only to be used when clinically necessary and not simply substituted for the FDA-approved version of the drug. Nevertheless, right now we are witnessing rampant compounding from bulk drug substances in the marketplace, usually lacking any clinical justification, even for sterile drugs. This is particularly concerning because using bulk drug substances is much less expensive for the compounder; therefore, undercutting demand for the actual approved drugs and creating a loophole for compounders to circumvent the drug approval process.

In light of these and other risks, we remain concerned about the rapid uptake of bulk drug substance powders in place of FDA-approved drugs. As we have learned from history, which demonstrated the tragic impact of poor compounding practice, FDA should make every effort to implement the DQSA in a manner that preserves patient access to important compounded medications and that eliminates opportunities to perform an end-run around clear restrictions of the law.

While we commend FDA's overall efforts to implement DQSA, the agency has not tamped down on this rapidly growing abuse of bulks. Its release of an overly broad interim list of permissible drug bulk substances and its final guidance on what amounts to impermissible copies of approved drugs fail to call out these practices and will not curb these abuses. We appreciate,

however, that FDA announced that it would be releasing a separate draft guidance in March clarifying that bulk drug substances may only be used for compounding when there is a clinical need to compound drugs using these substances. FDA conformed that this restriction protects patient health and the drug approval process, for example, by helping to ensure that outsourcing facilities do not compound using a bulk drug substance when an FDA-approved version can be used to meet patient medical needs.

While this acknowledgment is important, it is even more important that FDA follow this statement up with the promised guidance as soon as possible, revise the guidance on copies, communicate this message to providers who may not be aware of the undisclosed use of bulks, and to rigorously enforce these restrictions. In order to ensure that patients have a reliable and safe source of sterile compounded preparations, it is also important that FDA continue to move forward as quickly as possible in finalizing other 503B policies that will provide certainty and clarity to the outsourcing industry providers and patients. In particular, the lack of final GMP standards for outsourcing facilities has exacerbated ongoing confusion among state regulators, many of whom continue to impose expectations that differ from that of FDA's.

Key congressional proponents champion the DQSA as clarifying the role of the states in regulating traditional compounding, and

2790	outsourcing to be regulated at the federal level. That vision
2791	has not yet been fully realized.
2792	Again, thank you for the opportunity to contribute to this
2793	important dialog. I appreciate it, and I look forward to your
2794	questions.
2795	[The prepared statement of Ms. Adams follows:]
2796	
2797	****** INSERT 10******

2798

Mr. Burgess. Thank you, Ms. Adams.

2799

Ms. Ventrelli, you are recognized for 5 minutes, please.

STATEMENT OF MOLLY VENTRELLI

Ms. Ventrelli. Thank you. Chairman Burgess, Ranking

Member Green, and members of the subcommittee, thank you for the invitation to testify today.

My name is Molly Ventrelli, and I am Vice President of Regulatory Affairs for Fresenius Kabi USA. Fresenius Kabi is a global healthcare company specializing in lifesaving medicines and technologies for infusion, transfusion, and clinical nutrition. We manufacture most of these medicines in Illinois, New York, and North Carolina, and we employ more than 3,000 people in the U.S. Additionally, Fresenius Kabi operates 18 compounding centers around the world, and we are in the process of launching our first U.S.-based 503B compounding center in a suburb of Boston.

We commend FDA's implementation of the DQSA, and we believe that FDA must continue to enforce the strong protections of the DQSA against illegal or improper compounding activity. Patient safety requires strict FDA oversight on outsourcing facility compounding by pharmacies that do not comply with FDA regulations and do not meet the highest standards for quality and CGMP.

Drug compounding plays an important role in the delivery of health care by allowing a pharmacist, by a patient-specific prescription, to tailor a therapy for an individual's unique

needs. But it is critical to ensure the safety of patients receiving these compounded medications. Congress recognized this in drafting the DQSA and established the two regulatory structures, both 503A and 503B. Pharmacies that operate under 503A are those that compound according to specific prescriptions unique to a patient under state board of pharmacy oversight. They do not compound large quantities in advance of a patient prescription.

However, Congress also recognized that some hospitals and healthcare providers may need supplies of medications not made by pharmaceutical manufacturers or not made in a specific dosage form, combination, or strength that is medically required for patients. These products, which need to be on hand, represent unique safety concerns, as they are typically made in larger volumes. So, if they become contaminated or are produced incorrectly, more patients are exposed to harm. Congress required that these 503B facilities adhere to CGMP, rigorous requirements enforced by the FDA, with a full set of quality standards for the manufacturing, processing, packing, release, testing, and storage of pharmaceutical products.

It is important to note that 503B outsourcing facility compounders may not make a drug that is essentially a copy of an approved medicine except under certain highly limited circumstances like drug shortages. One key reason Congress

included this was to preserve incentives for traditional manufacturers to continue to pursue FDA approval through the current NDA and ANDA review process. This protects patient safety and should be upheld.

We support the FDA's efforts to ensure patient safety by timely inspecting 503B compounders and issuing compliance guidance. Fresenius Kabi is currently addressing this now at our site in Massachusetts.

We also commend the FDA for its continued risk-based inspections of unregistered compounding pharmacies. FDA's enforcement of 503A is also important to ensure that facilities that are essentially acting as outsourcers by selling significant amounts of commercially unavailable compounded sterile drugs in the absence of patient prescriptions should register as 503B outsourcers. In the interest of public health, the safety and manufacturing standards of compounders should be held to rigorous standards to ensure patient safety.

Additionally, to uphold patient safety, Congress sought to ensure that FDA-approved drugs would be used as source material by compounders whenever possible. Under the DQSA, compounders should not use bulk active pharmaceutical ingredients as an alternative to compounding from an FDA-approved medicine unless doing so would produce a clinical difference for an identified patient. Fresenius Kabi believes that there could be instances

2872	where several 503B outsourcing compounders are doing exactly this
2873	in contravention of federal law. It is our strong recommendation
2874	that the committee support FDA's rigorous oversight of
2875	pharmaceutical compounding.
2876	Thank you for holding today's hearing, and I welcome any
2877	questions you may have. Thank you.
2878	[The prepared statement of Ms. Ventrelli follows:]
2879	
2880	********* INSERT 11*******

2881

Mr. Burgess. Thank you, Ms. Ventrelli.

2882

Ms. Jungman, you are recognized for 5 minutes, please.

STATEMENT OF ELIZABETH JUNGMAN

Ms. Jungman. Good afternoon. I am Elizabeth Jungman, Director of Public Health Programs at the Pew Charitable Trusts. We are an independent, nonpartisan research and public policy organization with a longstanding focus on drug quality, including compounding. I want to thank you for holding this important hearing.

This committee has a long history of working to protect
Americans from the risk of substandard compounded drugs. Five
years ago, even before we knew the full scope of the fungal
meningitis outbreak, your oversight team investigated how the
crisis began, and you worked with the Senate and across party lines
to pass the DQSA. This legislation is making a difference.

Today I will stress the importance of preserving it.

Efforts to weaken the DQSA pose very real risks for patient safety.

I will also share some new findings showing that DQSA is spurring better compounding oversight in the states.

I was privileged to be among the Senate committee staff that helped develop the DQSA. We knew then the provisions would be met with resistance, but each round of negotiations started with a new count of illnesses and deaths, and it was a powerful motivator to push past that controversy and get the job done.

The meningitis outbreak is, of course, not the only case of

NEAL R. GROSS
COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

harm. As we have heard today, just last year 43 people in Texas had contaminated antibiotics injected into their eyes and several suffered vision loss. Also, last year 41 patients received contaminated injections in a New Jersey clinic. They developed joint infections caused by microorganisms that should only be found in human mouths.

Americans expect their government to play a major role in making food and drugs safe. Eighty-seven percent of Americans think that, according to a Pew Research Center survey.

FDA evaluates the safety and effectiveness for most drugs and sets manufacturing quality standards, but compounded drugs are not subject to those protections, and, thus, should only be used when commercial alternatives won't work. There is a big difference between drugs prepared for a single patient who will use it immediately and drugs prepared in bulk quantities for use at some undetermined future date.

Compounding for a single patient is a traditional part of pharmacy practice. The risks of dangerous contamination are relatively low and the impact for errors is contained. States oversee patient-specific compounding and mandate quality standards.

But, if compounded drugs are going to be kept onhand, so-called office stock, the risks are greater. They are often stored for some period of time, increasing the chance that

contaminates like bacteria and fungus can grow. And since they are not tailored to specific patients, they products are frequently produced in bulk, multiplying the consequences of any error.

That is why Congress created outsourcing facilities. In exchange for meeting appropriate manufacturing standards, outsourcing facilities can compound drugs without prescriptions. Congress has decided twice, first 20 years ago and again in 2013, that traditional compounding should require a patient-specific prescription. If compounders want to sell stock supplies, they must invest in the equipment, training, and specialized personnel necessary to mitigate the risk. That dividing line between stock supply and individual prescription creates accountability.

This committee's investigation demonstrated the importance of clear and enforceable lines, so that facilities and their regulators know who is responsible for oversight and what rules apply. The prescription requirement is very clear. Either a patient's name is on the product or it is not.

While FDA regulates outsourcing facilities, states are still the primary regulator of traditional pharmacies, and they play an important role in ensuring the safety of compounded drugs. In 2014, Pew convened an advisory committee of pharmacy regulators, state pharmacy regulators, and other compounding experts to identify best practices for states. Next month, Pew, together

2955 with the National Association of Boards of Pharmacy, will release 2956 a 50-state assessment. 2957 I am happy to say that most states now conform to best practices in two key areas. First, states are widely adopting 2958 2959 quality standards that have been established by the USP, the 2960 United States Pharmacopeia. And second, states are aligning with 2961 federal law on the prescription requirement. 2962 However, there is more work to be done. Ideally, states 2963 should inspect compounding pharmacies every year, but our study 2964 showed that we haven't met this mark. That is why state and 2965 federal regulators must prioritize the most risky operations. 2966 To wrap up, since the DQSA became law, states have made 2967 important changes, and other stakeholders like outsourcing 2968 facilities have made significant investments, too. 2969 undermining that progress, Congress and the FDA must continue to 2970 protect, implement, and enforce the DQSA. Five years ago, this committee acted boldly to draw clear 2971 2972 lines that protect patients from another tragedy. This hearing 2973 reminds us of why we need that law and what could happen if it 2974 is weakened. 2975 I welcome any questions. 2976 [The prepared statement of Ms. Jungman follows:] 2977 2978 INSERT 12*****

2979

Mr. Burgess. Thank you, Ms. Jungman.

2980

Ms. Dargan, you are recognized for 5 minutes, please.

STATEMENT OF NANCY DARGAN

Ms. Dargan. Thank you. Good afternoon, and thank you for the opportunity to be here today.

My name is Nancy Dargan and I live in Brighton, Michigan.

I am going to tell you how a contaminated compounded medication

permanently harmed my health, putting a premature end to my career

and ruining my family's finances and plans for our future.

To begin my story, I have to travel back to early 2012. I was experiencing pain from arthritis in my back and hip, and my primary physician referred me to a pain clinic for periodic injections of a steroid called methylprednisolone, which is a compounded product.

The shots gave me some relief and I continued my busy career, my life as a grant-writer, a business consultant. And everything changed that August. I had driven from my home in Michigan to West Virginia to meet with a new client and help them set up a nonprofit organization. During my stay I began to feel sick, but I didn't think very much of it at first. But the symptoms steadily worsened and I realized I had to cut my trip short.

As I drove home, an excruciating burning sensation developed in my right hip spreading down to my knee. The pain became so unbearable that I had to use my left foot for gas and brakes. I arrived in Michigan completely unable to bear weight on my leg,

and my husband took me immediately to the hospital to figure out

The doctors ordered x-rays, a spinal tap, a biopsy, and several other tests and expressed that my condition was something they had not seen before. They worked to treat my pain, but, initially, had no clear diagnosis. So, they sent me home.

It was there that I got a call from the pain clinic that had They said I potentially received contaminated drugs and should go to the emergency room

By this time, the hospital staff were realizing that my case was not an isolated incident. Other patients were showing up at the hospital with infections and pains similar to mine, and like several of them, I was ultimately diagnosed with a fungal infection.

I underwent surgery and spent two weeks in the hospital. was placed on a maximum dose of a drug called Voriconazole, a very powerful antifungal medicine with severe side effects that seemed nearly as bad as death itself. I took it four times a day for 14 months, even waking in the middle of the night for doses.

After I was discharged, my husband Mike became my caretaker, at great personal expense to him, both mentally and physically. His job was one of the worst a care partner can experience, dealing with the unknown effects of a major medical event. I can't tell

3019

3020

3021

3022

3023

3024

3025

3026

3027

you how many times Mike would come into the room and I would be carrying on a conversation with my daughter, who had died in 1979. That was the result of hallucinations caused by the antifungal medication. I would call out for our pet, and I would get frustrated because he wouldn't respond, and we had had him put down the year before due to cancer.

Through all this nightmare, Mike made sure that I made it to every doctor's appointment, even often three or four per week, on top of other tests, including blood draws every Friday. If something needed to be done, including our household chores, he did it. If something needed to be done around the house, he never left my side unless I was napping and he could get errands run. He was not only my caregiver, but my constant advocate.

Of course, all of this has had a devastating impact on our lives and plans for the future. Financially, we have lost everything to this event. The hospital and doctor bills were astronomical. I lost my ability to maintain self-employment and, regrettably, had to close my business and refer my clients to others.

We had partial ownership in a cabin left to my husband and his sister by his father, but had to sell our interest in this treasured family property which we enjoyed so much and which had such wonderful memories for my husband. I saw the grief in Mike's eyes every time we had to sell something he loved. The financial

3053

3054

3063

3064

3065

3066

3067

3068

3069

3070

3071

3072

3073

3074

3075

3076

toll has threatened our retirement and our independence as we grow older together.

3055 Today, five years after this tragedy began, I still have 3056 recurring symptoms and numerous side effects. I walk with a limp 3057 and cannot get an orthopedic surgeon to consider replacing my 3058 right hip because there are still fungal pockets on my bones. Му 3059 pain levels are always elevated. My disease and treatment have 3060 made me vulnerable to opportunistic infections that have attacked 3061 my kidneys and my sinuses, and I still continue to suffer from 3062 short-term memory loss, and it is getting worse every year.

Before this happened to me, I had never heard of drug compounding, and I never would have imagined coming to Washington to speak about it. But I feel obligated to do so. Sadly, there are many others who have endured as much suffering and more. I weep for the 60-plus families who lost their loved ones to this deadly and preventable outbreak and for the hundreds of patients who live every day with the lasting consequences of illnesses caused by contaminated compounded drugs. Many of these people are friends and neighbors who live in our community, and I am here to speak up for them, too. I don't want another soul to experience what we have.

As a result of contaminated drugs and a failure to oversee them, I am now a person who will spend the rest of my days dealing with a complex illness. It wasn't easy for Mike and I to get here

3077	today. We hope that by sharing our story we can help prevent this
3078	from happening to someone else or anyone else.
3079	Thank you for allowing me to take some of your time, and I
3080	welcome any questions you might have.
3081	[The prepared statement of Ms. Dargan follows:]
3082	
3083	****** INSERT 13******

3084 Thank you, Ms. Dargan. We appreciate your Mr. Burgess. 3085 testimony, and appreciate all of you for spending so much time 3086 with us today. 3087 I am going to yield to Mr. Griffith 5 minutes for questions, 3088 since he was the Representative who was instrumental in moving 3089 this legislation along several years ago. So, Morgan, you are 3090 recognized for 5 minutes. 3091 Mr. Griffith. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I appreciate it 3092 very much, and appreciate all of you being here. 3093 I think sometimes we are talking at cross-purposes because 3094 I don't think any of us want to see somebody like NECC coming back, 3095 because they were operating in a couple of dozen states, if I 3096 remember correctly, in my state and your state, Ms. Dargan --3097 Ms. Dargan. California. 3098 Mr. Griffith. -- and California. They have been kicked 3099 out of Colorado. They were national manufacturers who were lying They weren't your traditional small 3100 about what they were doing. 3101 pharmacy that was doing even small batches. 3102 And so, what we have to do, as Ms. DeGette says, we have to 3103 try to find that balance, because we have situations that, in all 3104 fairness, I wasn't aware that one of the solutions to resolve the 3105 problem was that we were going to have folks going and picking 3106 I forget who it was. I think a couple folks were

talking about the dentist. Mr. Olson? And I think somebody,

maybe Dr. Brod mentioned it, too, that they are having the patients have to go to pick up the drug from the pharmacist because of the new interpretation on 503A. I think we all think 503B and the new stuff is good stuff. It is a question of that balance.

And so, if you could, first, Mr. Olson, and then, Dr. Brod, just tell me quickly about you and your testimony, but what other situations besides the dentist who has to send somebody in and, then, a child has to go through or an adult has to go through pain for a day or two, until the dentist can get them back in?

Mr. Olson. Thank you for the question, Congressman.

The dentist is the most critical one to my office. We have other dental products that we had provided in the past. But I think the other situation that we have is we are having to teach parents to do this themselves at home, instead of me providing it now. So, it is not necessarily an office-use situation, but because I am not able to compound it -- for example, insulin dilutions, we are having to teach parents to dilute their own insulin at home. We are having to teach patients to draw up their own medications at home because we are not allowed to perform that in our pharmacy. And we are just unsure, if we do that, whether we will be violating anything.

Mr. Griffith. Dr. Brod, you had some other examples?

Dr. Brod. Yes, several instances. So, we use cantharidin quite a bit. It is not commercially available. So, we are

relying upon getting it from a compounding pharmacy. 3132 It is used 3133 to treat predominantly children and, also, genital warts, too. 3134 So, you can envision a situation where a child comes in. 3135 They are a little scared to begin with. We recommend cantharidin. 3136 It is painless. Other treatments that we have, such as freezing 3137 or burning, to get rid of warts and molluscum, common skin 3138 infections, are very painful and intimidating. 3139 The parent took off of work. The child is out of school. 3140 We say, "You need a patient-specific prescription." The 503Bs, 3141 these are small batches, so we are having trouble getting them 3142 So, the parent, then, has to go to the at any reasonable cost. 3143 pharmacy, schedule another appointment back into the office. 3144 The other problem, too, is we treat a lot of genital warts 3145 which carry oncogenic viruses. Patients with that don't want to 3146 come in in the first place. A lot of the other treatment 3147 alternatives, especially in patients with skin of color, can cause Things like cantharidin or 3148 dyspigmentation and scarring. 3149 podophyllin are really good options. And diminishing access 3150 creating inefficiencies I think is actually a public health issue. 3151 Mr. Griffith. Do you find that some people, when they find 3152 out they have got to go to the pharmacist and, then, make another 3153 appointment, that they just don't do the treatment at all? 3154 Sometimes they don't do the treatment at Dr. Brod. Yes. 3155 all; they don't come for followup visits, yes.

3156	Mr. Griffith. Does anybody disagree that we all think that
3157	the 503B program as it was originally intended for those medium
3158	to larger folks is a good thing? Anybody disagree with that?
3159	[No response.]
3160	So, we have got to find that balance. Dr. Williams, do you
3161	have examples of where that balance is askew right now?
3162	Dr. Williams. I do, I believe. One of the most devastating
3163	conditions that can occur in your eye is an acute bacterial
3164	infection. This can either be on the surface of the eye, as I
3165	discussed with that patient with a corneal problem, or in the
3166	Mr. Griffith. I am running out of time. So, if I could get
3167	you to cut to the chase?
3168	Dr. Williams. The answer to your question is, yes, we need
3169	office-based access to specific antibiotics that are not
3170	available through the 503B mechanism.
3171	Mr. Griffith. And you don't need a big batch? You just need
3172	a couple of small batches, isn't that correct, from time to time?
3173	Dr. Williams. I just need enough to have on the shelf, so
3174	when that one patient a week comes in, I can take care of him.
3175	Mr. Griffith. And I worry about my rural areas and my folks
3176	who have a problem, suddenly an emergency late at night or on the
3177	weekend, and there is no compounding pharmacy readily available
3178	in that small, rural community. Is that a concern for your
3179	doctors as well?

3180 Dr. Williams. Absolutely. That is one of the most common 3181 scenarios that we hear. 3182 Mr. Griffith. That is what I am hearing, too. 3183 I appreciate all your testimony. I think everybody had some 3184 valid points. I figure we have got to figure out a way. Our job 3185 is to help work with the FDA and find that proper balance. 3186 And with that, Mr. Chairman, I yield back. 3187 Mr. Burgess. Thank you, Mr. Griffith. 3188 I am going to proceed with my 5 minutes for questions. 3189 Green, I will come to him next. I was going to give him time to 3190 collect his thoughts since he just rushed in here. 3191 Dr. Williams, several references have been made to an 3192 ophthalmic preparation that was injected after cataract surgery. 3193 Now a patient comes in for cataract surgery in an outpatient 3194 facility. They are coming in with the expectation that they are 3195 either going to need drops or injection after the surgery, is that correct? 3196 3197 Dr. Williams. That is correct. 3198 Mr. Burgess. So, in that instance, could they not come in with the prescription already in hand or having picked it up 3199 3200 themselves at a pharmacy? What would prevent that from being the 3201 way this would be administered? 3202 So, for an elective procedure such as Dr. Williams. 3203 cataract surgery, that would be a possibility. The drug that the specific episode, it is still not exactly clear what happened. It does not appear to be a contamination in the sense of a microbial or infectious cause. It seems to be that there was a toxicity involved when the two drugs were mixed. And so, it is still not entirely clear exactly what happened. But, even if those patients had had a prescription and brought that in, it probably would not have changed the outcome in this particular case.

Mr. Burgess. Correct. The compounds would have been the same and the doses and the route of administration would have been the same, and the outcome you would predict would be the same. So, I think that is a point well-taken. Just having a prescription does not necessarily protect you in all instances from an untoward event.

In the case of the methylprednisolone acetate -- and I do remember that so vividly from our hearings a couple of years ago -- so, here you have got a compound that has to be preservative-free because it is going into the epidural space and you don't want to damage a nerve with a preservative. And, of course, being a steroid, it reduces the body's ability to fight infection. So, it is like everything culminated in these cases to really create literally one of the worst things that I can recall having ever seen.

In addition to all the sympathy I have for everyone else, the sympathy for the emergency room doctors -- I know we had a

patient here in the previous hearing, and it was so difficult for the attending physicians in the emergency room to really get a grasp of what was going on, similar to other events that have happened in this country. When there was anthrax in the post office here in suburban Washington, the same thing, the emergency room doctors, seeing those patients out of context, it made it very, very difficult for them. Ms. Adams, you referenced the bulk active pharmaceutical ingredients. Can you give us an idea of which bulk pharmaceutical

ingredients you are talking about?

Ms. Adams. Yes, I can. Thank you.

So, when we look at the list, as an example, of the 200 permissible substances in Category I for bulk compounding right now, as we cross-reference that list, we feel that almost half of them have an FDA-approved vial that could be used rather than bulk substances. So, it is a long list that we think needs much revision.

Mr. Burgess. Okay.

And I think important to note, revising the list Ms. Adams. is something that for sure needs to happen. But, in addition to that -- that is not a holistic approach -- we also think that, really, to address the issue beyond just that list of 200 substances, the essentially copy needs to be revised to differentiate between compounding that starts from FDA-approved

3228

3229

3230

3231

3232

3233

3234

3235

3236

3237

3238

3239

3240

3241

3242

3243

3244

3245

3246

3247

3248

3249

3250

3252 vials and compounding that starts from bulk substances. 3253 Mr. Burgess. And are you assisting the agency in revising 3254 that list? 3255 Ms. Adams. We have got a good dialog going with We are. 3256 We have got an opinion, which we have documented for 3257 them, and we are happy to continue to serve as a resource in that 3258 regard. 3259 Mr. Burgess. Very well. 3260 Mr. Olson, again, thank you for being here for the people 3261 that you represent. Let me just ask you, on the FDA's draft 3262 memorandum of understanding, they decided to rescind the original 3263 draft and they are going through significant revisions. States 3264 are going to be required at some point, though, to sign onto this 3265 memorandum of understanding, is that correct? 3266 Mr. Olson. Yes, Congressman, that is my understanding. 3267 Mr. Burgess. And what will be the consequences if a state 3268 decided we are not going to sign onto that memorandum of 3269 understanding? How would that leave you? 3270 It would leave us very conflicted as to what we Mr. Olson. 3271 are supposed to do. Because if we abide by our state laws, that 3272 is what we should be abiding by. But in my situation I am only 3273 licensed in Wisconsin, so I wouldn't have to worry about the 3274 situation specifically. But I would think it would put 3275 pharmacies in bordering towns or bordering areas in a precarious

position to figure out, well, wait, if the state I am in signed it, but the state I am shipping into didn't, then where does that leave me, or vice versa. Even though, to be fair, most of the time if you are shipping into another state, you have to be licensed in that other state as well. So, there is a state license that you would have in both states. It would just be the conflicting memorandum of understanding about whether you can ship and how much you can ship into that state.

Mr. Burgess. Thank you.

And, Dr. Brod, just as an observation, years ago I remember discovering that a little bit of bicarbonate in a vial of lidocaine could make a tremendous difference as to what your patients thought about you. And I didn't realize I was compounding when I was doing that. I just thought I was being a nice guy. But in your testimony you reference that as an episode of compounding, is that correct?

Dr. Brod. A tremendous difference. And in speaking with colleagues who haven't been able to buffer in the office, they say that the patients note a distinctive difference. I mean, we are very reliant on it. We perform extensive surgeries, but we do it in the outpatient setting, Mohs surgery with reconstruction. Having the bicarb to buffer the lidocaine, so that injections in multiple areas of the face are tolerable, it really allows us to do surgery outpatient instead of going into a surgical facility

3300 with sedation and those types of things. So, it is a world of 3301 difference and our patients really appreciate it very much. 3302 Mr. Burgess. Let me just echo, before I yield to Mr. Green, 3303 let me just echo the comments of Mr. Griffith again. 3304 appreciate so much you all being here. We recognize that there 3305 are some issues that we are going to have to work through, and 3306 we appreciate your help in getting there. 3307 Mr. Green, you are recognized for 5 minutes, please. 3308 Mr. Green. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. 3309 I apologize to the panel about being late, but I had a medical I couldn't have any of my great staff deal 3310 that I couldn't do. 3311 with that. 3312 But I want to thank you for being here. And you know that Congressman Griffith and Congressman DeGette and the chairman, 3313 3314 we want to fix it because we want to make sure the system works. 3315 And that is what we did after the tragedies in Massachusetts with 65 people dying. But we appreciate you all being here and giving 3316 3317 your stands on it, so we can actually work through and see what 3318 the solutions will be. 3319 Ms. Jungman, I know the Pew Charitable Trust has done a lot of research on compounded drugs and was actively engaged in this 3320 3321 issue before the DQSA was signed into law and since. I think it 3322 would be helpful to take a step back and get an understanding of 3323 why this law was necessary and how we can support its

implementation in a manner that strikes the right balance between access and safety.

Ms. Jungman. I would be delighted to answer that question, and thank you.

So, as you know, the history of compounding has a long and complicated legal history, right? It has been a part of traditional pharmacy practice for as long as pharmacy has existed. But over time businesses grew up; they were compounding at a larger scale. And Congress first tried to tackle that in the nineties, met some legal challenges that Dr. Gottlieb referred to. And NECC I think really brought to the forefront of everyone's mind the scale of the patient risk that was there.

We have done a lot of work trying to capture the adverse events that have happened in all sorts of facilities from compounding pharmacies, but there is really not a comprehensive way to know what the risks, what the scale of the impact is.

And so, what the DQSA does is draw really clear lines that are designed to ensure that patients have access to the highest quality product that meets their clinical need. So, if you can use an FDA-approved product, that is great. If you can't use an FDA-approved product, then you want a product that is made under appropriate quality standards. And so, there is a balance there that is about both ensuring that the quality standards are appropriate, but that the lines are really clear, so that everyone

knows which side of the line they have to be on.

Mr. Green. I was a state legislator in Texas and we worked with our pharmacy board and trusted them. I know, typically, we have these national legislative groups that have standard pieces of legislation from state to state. So, we do have some kind of commonality between Texas and Louisiana, or whatever. But is there anything like that, so we wouldn't have such 50 different? Is there any agency that does that, and say, "This is the standard way you pharmacy boards deal with it."?

Ms. Jungman. The National Association of Boards of Pharmacy does have a model law that does talk about some of these issues. There is, of course, still state variation. But the research that we will publish in about two weeks, not quite in time for this hearing, will show that states are really beginning to align with, really kind of come into compliance with each other and in line with DQSA.

Mr. Green. What is the history of responsibility between the state boards of pharmacy and the FDA? And how did DQSA change that defining line?

Ms. Jungman. At the time that the NECC outbreak happened there was a lot of confusion. And I think we saw that in the hearings that happened at that time, where there was a lack of clarity about who was supposed to be taking charge of these institutions. And so, the DQSA really stressed accountability

and clear lines for that reason. So, it was, of course, about improving the safety of the products, but it was also about making sure that everyone knew who was, to use the phrase that kept being used at the time, "on the flagpole". Which regulatory agency was in charge of any type of activity?

And so, the Congress at the time -- and you gentlemen know this better than anyone -- considered a lot of different ways of drawing those lines. Could you do it based on volume? Could you do it based on geographic reach? But, ultimately, the prescription requirement was the line that was clear and enforceable, and that was considered to be really important for ensuring that the right quality standards were applied.

Mr. Green. When we had the hearings earlier on the tragedy in Massachusetts, I remember we had FDA and the Massachusetts Pharmaceutical Board, and they looked at each other. Here we were sitting up here and saying, somebody has got to be minding the store, and that is what we are looking for.

States are critical partners in the effort to ensure patient access to safe compounded drugs. And I understand Pew will soon release a report with our National Association of Boards of Pharmacy which assesses best practices that are more achievable by the states. Hopefully, we can have that coordination. Again, we just want somebody to make sure, whether it is the state level or across border lines, the FDA, somebody needs to be minding the

3396 store to make sure we don't have an incident like we did in 3397 Massachusetts, well, literally countrywide, but it originated 3398 there. 3399 Thank you. 3400 Thank you. Ms. Jungman. 3401 Mr. Guthrie. [presiding] Thank you. 3402 And I will now recognize myself for 5 minutes for questions. 3403 Dr. Williams, your testimony has been about the critical need 3404 for office use of compounded drugs. How do we ensure office use 3405 is allowed while protecting patient safety? 3406 Well, I think that is the critical issue we Dr. Williams. 3407 have been discussing all day. We do not think that the 3408 patient-specific prescription contributes to safety in any way. 3409 It would allow us to track the use of drugs perhaps. 3410 the incidents where timely treatment is critical -- and as I 3411 mentioned earlier, infections of the eye, even a delay of an hour 3412 or two will have adverse effects. So, we need to be able to have 3413 these drugs available in office. We can just pull them off the 3414 shelf. And it is just absolutely critical. 3415 I alluded earlier to the pool cleaner for this type of And it sounds crazy that we would use a pool cleaner 3416 infection. 3417 for an infection in the eye, but I can assure you, if you had that infection, you would want immediate access to that treatment. 3418 3419 Mr. Guthrie. Thank you very much.

3420 Ms. Adams, some compounded drugs for ophthalmology are being 3421 done only be a single facility. Do you why this is and was this 3422 the case before DOSA? 3423 Ms. Adams. Thank you. 3424 I don't have specific knowledge of where ophthalmology drugs 3425 are compounded and in what scale. PharMEDium is strictly 3426 sterile-to-sterile compounding in our 503B facilities. 3427 we stand right now, we do not serve the ophthalmology patient 3428 population. So, I don't have specific knowledge of that. 3429 Mr. Guthrie. Would you know anything about that, Dr. 3430 Is it done by a single facility and why is that the 3431 case? Was it the case before DQSA? 3432 Dr. Williams. So, before the DQSA, it was done by a single facility, so-called traditional or 503As. 3433 There are many 3434 ophthalmic drugs that are available through 503Bs, and we 3435 encourage our members to use those. But it is these relatively 3436 rare conditions, but, yet, very potentially catastrophic, where 3437 we need immediate access. And simply writing a prescription and, 3438 then, having the patient have to go get it, if, in fact, they can 3439 get it -- these are drugs that are not typically manufactured or compounded at a high rate. So, for a rural population, it could 3440 3441 be literally hundreds of miles, as I stated in my statement. 3442 Mr. Guthrie. Yes, absolutely. Thank you very much. 3443 I am going to yield the time, my remaining time, to Mr.

3444 Griffith of Virginia.

Mr. Griffith. Mr. Hodges, I am going to ask you a question. It is getting down a little deeper in the weeds, and we still want to reach a balance. But the committee has heard, much to their chagrin, all about my family's allergy issues. And some pharmacies specialize in serving patients with specific needs, such as a drug without a particular dye or ingredient for those patients who do have allergies to those particulars. And they do it because they specialize. They do it in multiple states.

If the shipment of a patient-specific compounded prescription is limited by the memorandum of understanding, will patients be able to get all of these medications from local pharmacies?

Mr. Hodges. Thank you, sir.

Simply put, no, they will not. Not all pharmacies make all products for every type of patient population. So, for instance, we engage in allergy immunotherapy. There is only a handful of pharmacies in the country that offer that. And so, it is particularly a concern for us that we cannot meet these patients' needs because we are not able to provide it, in fear of the MOU, if it is implemented.

And so, what we want to do is work closely with the FDA. We have some ideas about what we can do to ensure the quality and access. We have ideas. But we are looking for a sit-down with

3468 We have requested this year and years prior the Commissioner. 3469 we have sent letters, and we are not getting a response. And so, 3470 what we would like to do is ask that the Commissioner have a 3471 We have some ideas on what we can do. sit-down with us. 3472 But, to answer your question, it would be a problem if the 3473 MOU went into effect, especially for patients that live across 3474 state borders. 3475 Mr. Griffith. All right. I appreciate that. 3476 I will tell you that Commissioner Gottlieb, of all the folks 3477 that we have dealt with at that level, is probably the most responsive that the committee has found. 3478 And so, we will work 3479 towards that. But he is very responsive, tries to listen, tries 3480 to pay attention. And so, it is a good working relationship. 3481 Hopefully, together we can find a balance to the issues that have 3482 been raised by today's hearing. 3483 I appreciate all of you very much. 3484 And I yield back, Mr. Chairman. 3485 Mr. Guthrie. Thank you. The gentleman yields back, and I 3486 yield back my time. 3487 Seeing that there are no further members wishing to ask 3488 questions, I would like to thank all of our witnesses for being 3489 here today. 3490 I would like to submit the statements from the following for 3491 American Society of Health System Pharmacists; the record:

3492	American College of Mohs Surgery; Avella; Outsourcing Facilities
3493	Association; American Society of Cataract and Refractive Surgery;
3494	National Association of Chain Drug Stores; American Pharmacists
3495	Association; a joint statement from the American Academy of
3496	Allergy, Asthma & Immunology and the American College of Allergy,
3497	Asthma and Immunology.
3498	[The prepared statements follow:]
3499	
3500	****** COMMITTEE INSERT 14******

3501	Mr. Guthrie. Pursuant to committee rules, I remind members
3502	they have 10 days to submit additional questions for the record,
3503	and I ask that the witnesses submit their response within 10
3504	business days upon receipt of the questions.
3505	Without objection, the subcommittee is adjourned.
3506	[Whereupon, at 2:43 p.m., the subcommittee was adjourned.]
3507	