COMPLIANCE INSIGHT, INC

Special Report

by: Troy Fugate, Chief Compliance Officer

Trends in Ancillary Material Oversight

Successfull Outcomes to Your Product Approvals

Special Report: Regulatory Inspection Trends for Human AB Serum

Human AB Serum (HABS) has moved from “helpful reagent” to “regulated input.” Across recent inspections and dossier reviews, FDA and EMA teams are scrutinizing HABS with the same rigor applied to drug-substance components.
The driver is simple: variability or gaps in human-sourced materials can propagate through cell therapy manufacturing, altering product quality, safety profiles, and ultimately patient risk.

Sponsors who still treat HABS like a research consumable are seeing avoidable findings, some rising to clinical questions or holds, while programs that show disciplined raw-material control are moving cleanly through milestones.

Why now

- Risk visibility has improved: Inspectors know upstream materials often dictate downstream outcomes (potency, impurity burden, adventitious agent risk, consistency).
- Maturity expectations have shifted: Even early-phase programs are expected to demonstrate risk-based control over human-derived inputs, not just post-Phase II.
- Global convergence: EU ATMP expectations, FDA CMC guidance, and USP frameworks align around supplier qualification, traceability, viral safety strategy, and defined specifications.

What inspectors ask first

- Donor & pool control: How are donors qualified? What's the pooling strategy (size, gender bias toward male AB), and what risk mitigations (e.g., irradiation) justify it?
- Viral safety package: Which agents are tested (donor + lot), what inactivation/removal validations exist (e.g., gamma irradiation parameters), and how are look-backs handled?
- Manufacturing lineage: Off-the-Clot vs Plasma-Derived Serum, thrombin source (preference for recombinant human), filtration scheme (e.g., 0.1 µm), and aseptic controls during fill.
- Specifications & release: Endotoxin, bioburden/mycoplasma, osmolality, pH, and any functional/lot-to-lot performance testing relevant to the process.
- Traceability & change control: End-to-end chain of identity, COA completeness, supplier audit status, and how changes (donors, processing, test methods) are evaluated and bridged.

The three inspection themes

1. Control Strategy, not paperwork: Agencies want a coherent, risk-based control strategy linking donor eligibility to processing to testing to release criteria to ongoing monitoring. SOPs, COAs, and certificates matter but only insofar as they prove the strategy works.
2. Evidence over assertions: Claims like "irradiation mitigates viral risk" or "limited pooling controls variability" must be backed by qualification/validation data, rationales, or literature with applicability. Boilerplate is being rejected.
3. Lifecycle rigor: Inspectors expect a lifecycle view. Such as initial qualification, periodic re-qualification, supplier re-audits, trending of lot attributes, and formal assessment of any observed process impact.

Common pitfalls we see cited

- Donor eligibility gaps (incomplete travel/behavioral screening; inconsistent retention of donor documentation or look-back procedures).
- Thin viral safety rationales (no parameters, no recovery studies, or validations that don't match actual processing conditions).
- Unclear pooling logic (pool sizes not justified; no link between pool size and residual risk/variability management).
- Process opacity (missing details on clotting agent/thrombin origin, filtration integrity testing, headspace/bioburden controls during filling).
- Under-specified release (tight talk, loose specs e.g., endotoxin limits misaligned with process capability or patient exposure).
- Change control blind spots (supplier method changes, donor geography shifts, or packaging modifications not evaluated for equivalency/bridging).

What "good" looks like

- A Raw-Material File for HABS that reads like a mini-CMC: source and donor eligibility; pooling strategy; process description (including thrombin source and filtration); viral safety plan with supporting data; full specification set; stability rationale; and defined acceptance criteria for supplier lots.
- Supplier lifecycle management: Quality agreement, on-site (or virtual) audits with CAPAs tracked to closure, periodic re-qualification, and surveillance (e.g., lot attribute trending, deviation/complaint monitoring).
- Bridging discipline: When anything changes (donor pool size, irradiation dose, filtration train, test kit), a documented equivalency/impact assessment—and where needed, bridging studies tied to critical quality attributes.
- Process relevance: If HABS influences expansion, phenotype, or potency, include fit-for-use data (e.g., cell growth or function across lots) and predefine what constitutes an acceptable shift.

What to prepare before an inspection

- A single-source HABS dossier (PDF/binder) with COAs, donor/testing summaries, irradiation/filtration validations, supplier audits, and a one-page control strategy map.
- A lot-to-lot trend package (endotoxin, osmolality, any functional readouts) with acceptance bands and deviation handling.
- A change log for the last 24 months—what changed, why, how it was assessed, and what was observed in the process/product afterward.

Bottom line

HABS oversight is now a bellwether for overall CMC maturity. Programs that demonstrate end-to-end control—source to release to lifecycle—sail through inspections. Those that rely on certificates alone are encountering preventable findings, delays, and downstream rework.

What We See

Both FDA and EMA now expect Human AB Serum to meet standards closer to those applied to drug substance components. The four key points to consider:

FDA Trends

- Heightened Scrutiny: FDA inspections increasingly cite lack of control over ancillary materials (e.g., undocumented donor traceability, incomplete viral safety testing).
- 21 CFR Expectations Applied: Even when reagents are "upstream," FDA applies requirements from:
  - 21 CFR 640 & 1271 – donor eligibility & tissue practices.
  - 21 CFR 610.40 – infectious disease testing.
- IND Delays: Companies have faced clinical holds because their human serum or cytokines lacked adequate GMP documentation.
- Data-Driven Justification: FDA now asks firms to submit validation data (e.g., viral inactivation studies for gamma irradiation) even when not explicitly mandated.

EMA Trends

- Directive 2002/98/EC & Annex 2: Applies safety/quality rules for blood and plasma components to materials used in cell and gene therapy (CGT).
- Donor Pool Size Limits: EMA increasingly requires limited donor pools (≤16 donors) unless a validated inactivation step (gamma irradiation, viral clearance) is applied.
- Transparency & Traceability: Sponsors must demonstrate full traceability back to collection sites, including donor travel/health questionnaires.
- Pre-Approval Scrutiny: EMA reviewers now ask for lot release data, supplier audits, and viral inactivation validation during CTA/BLA review—even for non-final product reagents.

Global Alignment & Convergence

- UK MHRA: Post-Brexit, leaning closer to EMA standards but with extra emphasis on supply chain documentation.
- PMDA (Japan): Requires equivalency data for foreign-sourced human serum or ancillary materials.
- NMPA (China): Prefers domestic sourcing; rigorous supplier inspections are common pre-approval.

Industry Takeaway

- Upstream ≠ Low Risk: FDA and EMA may treat ancillary reagents as critical materials.
- Proactive Compliance: Document donor screening, pool size, viral inactivation, and supplier audits as if the material were going into the final drug product.
- Strategic Risk: Waiting until Phase II/III to address these gaps can lead to rework, bridging studies, and regulatory delays.

Trends in Ancillary Material Oversight

FDA: Treat ancillary materials like regulated inputs

- Communicable-disease testing standards for human-sourced materials (HIV, HBV, HCV, HTLV, syphilis, WNV, Chagas) are anchored in 21 CFR 610.40 and related blood regs.
- Donor eligibility, screening, and testing expectations for human cells/tissues are codified in 21 CFR 1271 Subpart C and FDA's donor-eligibility guidance.
- FDA's Gene Therapy CMC Guidance (2018/2020) and the 2024 guidance on human-/animal-derived materials explicitly call for supplier qualification, characterization/controls, traceability, and risk mitigation for ancillary materials used during manufacturing—even if they are not intended to be in the final product.
- FDA's Cell & Gene Therapy Guidance's hub centralizes these expectations and is frequently updated—useful to show recency and breadth to attendees.

What this means for you:

Build donor eligibility, viral-safety, and supplier-control packages for serum and other AMs as if they were "critical raw materials," not casual reagents. (Cross-reference 21 CFR 630/640 for blood operations where applicable.)

EMA (EU): Blood-component rules and ATMP guidance pull AMs into scope

- EU Blood Directive 2002/98/EC sets quality/safety standards for collection, testing, processing, storage, and distribution of human blood and blood components, which sponsors draw on when justifying human-sourced ancillary materials.
- EudraLex Volume 4 (EU GMP):
  - Annex 1 (sterile) and Annex 2 (biologicals) emphasize starting-/raw-material control, traceability, and contamination control; ATMP manufacturers are directed to the Part IV ATMP GMP guideline, but the raw-material control principles remain.
- EMA's ATMP investigational guideline (2024) spells it out: raw materials (e.g., human serum, platelet lysate, trypsin) require defined quality attributes, control strategies, and documentation during development and clinical trials. It cross-links to ICH Q5A(R2) viral safety and other ICH quality guidelines.

Practitioner note on donor pooling

EU assessors increasingly expect firms to justify pool size and risk-mitigation (e.g., validated viral reduction and traceability). Many suppliers now standardize limited pooling specifically to address EU/US expectations (e.g., pooling up to 16 male AB donors with enhanced viral testing and recombinant human thrombin processing). While this "≤16 donors" is a supplier/regulatory-driven practice (not a hard rule in law), you can cite it as an industry response to EU/US review expectations.

Consensus standards reinforce the regulators

- USP <1043> Ancillary Materials for Cell, Gene, and Tissue-Engineered Products lays out a risk-based framework for selection, qualification, testing, and supplier management of AMs (including human serum). Reviewers often expect sponsors to follow these principles.

The net effect (global)

- Upstream ≠ low risk. FDA and EMA increasingly expect AM control packages: donor eligibility and testing, viral-safety strategy (e.g., irradiation/filtration validations from the supplier), supplier audits/quality agreements, and lot-release specs plus change-control. (UK MHRA and other agencies reference the same EU GMP/ATMP framework; PMDA/ICH alignment is visible via the ATMP guideline cross-references.)

The Real Question: "So what?"

Build a raw-material file for Human AB Serum (and other AMs) with: donor eligibility & testing (per 21 CFR 1271 / EU Blood Directive), supplier qualification & CoA package (per FDA CMC and USP <1043>), viral-safety rationale (irradiation/filtration validation from supplier; link to ICH Q5A(R2) in EMA's ATMP guideline), and change-control for any supplier or process shift.

COMPLIANCE INSIGHT, INC

info@compliance-insight.com
513-860-3512
www.compliance-insight.com