ROADRUNNER PHARMACY

Dear Pharmacy Board Member,

As you may know, the FDA is proposing "Guidance for Industry-Compounding Animal Drugs from Bulks Drug Substances." This guidance is remarkable in its restrictions and impact to the veterinary community such as:
-documenting clinical need on each prescription for compounded drugs
-no office stock of compounded medicinals, sterile or otherwise
-scripts to be pet-specific--no flocks, fish or groups of shelter animals
-no allowance for dispensing of acute amounts from office stock

Not only do we find these guidelines contrary to the practice of contemporary veterinary medicine, they are also detrimental to pharmacies, many of whom are no longer making sterile products.

Enclosed is the AVMA response to this proposal which addresses serious deficiencies, intensified record keeping and discusses the need and urgency for compounded sterile items for office use as well as the need to dispense compounds for acute conditions. Additionally, I am enclosing a copy of a letter to the FDA from several congressmen who oppose the FDA's process. They feel the FDA has exceeded its authority and ask that the FDA proposal be withdrawn.

Veterinary medicine is vastly different than human medicine. Vets must deal with numerous species and even more numerous body weights and unusual diseases; human pharmaceuticals rarely meet their needs. Further, industry has abandoned many veterinary products that were unprofitable, notably injectables. Lastly, dispensing small amounts of specialized medication is often essential to a pet's health in the absence of readily available customized strengths and dosage forms.

In spite of recognized shortcomings, some state boards of pharmacy are seriously considering this FDA proposal for incorporation into their own regulations through a Memorandum of Understanding. Roadrunner Pharmacy has been a partner in the veterinary community for more than 16 years; we know how important these issues are to animal health practitioners. As your board addresses veterinary compounding issues, I urge you and your board to oppose these contested FDA guidelines in the presence of an 18 page letter from an organization that represents more than 85,000 veterinarians AND given the serious misgivings from members of Congress. A number of states have granted exclusions, affording unique and often life-saving compounds to veterinarians, both sterile and non-sterile.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

ROBERT L. EATON, JR.
President/CEO
Roadrunner Pharmacy, Inc

711 E. Carefree Highway • suite 140 • Phoenix, Arizona 85085 • Phone (877) 518-4589 • Fax (623) 434-1181
www.RoadrunnerPharmacy.com

AVMA
Our Passion. Our Profession.

August 14, 2015

Mr. Eric Nelson
Center for Veterinary Medicine
Division of Compliance
FDA Center for Veterinary Medicine
7519 Standish Pl
Rockville, MD 20852

RE: [Docket Nos. FDA-2015-D-1176 and FDA-2003-D-0202] Compounding Animal Drugs From Bulk Drug Substances; Draft Guidance for Industry; Availability; Withdrawal of Compliance Policy Guide; Section 608.400 Compounding of Drugs for Use in Animals

Dear Mr. Nelson:

I am writing on behalf of the American Veterinary Medical Association (AVMA), established in 1863 and the largest veterinary medical organization in the world with over 86,500 members. The AVMA's mission is to lead the profession by advocating for its members and advancing the science and practice of veterinary medicine to improve animal and human health.

The AVMA recognizes that the FDA Draft Guidance for Industry #230 sets forth the Food and Drug Administration's (FDA) policy regarding compounding animal drugs from bulk drug substances by state-licensed pharmacies, licensed veterinarians, and facilities that register with FDA as outsourcing facilities under section 503B of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (FD&C Act) (21 U.S.C. 353b). We understand this guidance describes the conditions under which FDA generally does not intend to take action for violations of the following sections of the FD&C Act: section 512 (21 U.S.C. 360b), section 501(a)(5) (21 U.S.C. 351(a)(5)), section 502(f)(1) (21 U.S.C. 352 (f)(1)), and, where specified, section 501(a)(2)(B) (21 U.S.C 351(a)(2)(B)), when a state-licensed pharmacy, licensed veterinarian, or an outsourcing facility compounds animal drugs from bulk drug substances.

Additionally, we recognize that this draft guidance only addresses the compounding of animal drugs from bulk drug substances, and that it does not apply to the compounding of animal drugs from approved new animal or new human drugs. The AVMA was a leader in the development of, and advocacy for, the enactment of the Animal Medicinal Drug Use Clarification Act on behalf of our members and the patients they serve. Extralabel drug use, including the compounding of preparations from FDA-approved drugs, continues to provide access to critical medications and our members continue to rely on this FDA-regulated activity in the practice of veterinary medicine within the confines of the 21 CFR 530.

The AVMA appreciates the FDA's recognition that there is a need for preparations compounded from bulk drug substances. We also share the agency's concern about the use of these preparations when approved alternatives exist that can be used as labeled or in an extralabel manner consistent

with the requirements of FDA's extralabel provisions. The AVMA continues to believe that three circumstances exist wherein compounds prepared from bulk drug substances might be necessary:

- the approved product is not commercially available, or
- the needed compounded preparation cannot be made from the approved product, or
- there is no approved product from which to compound the needed preparation.

While we are formally submitting these comments today, we will continue to assess whether the draft guidance can realistically address the needs of veterinary patients and ask that the FDA continue its dialog with us.

Overarching comments

Drug Availability

Veterinary medicine is unique in that we treat a multitude of species with an even greater number of unique diseases and conditions. Approval of new animal drugs is critical to veterinary medicine and engaging with the Agency in facilitating that process remains a high priority for our Association. However, compounding from bulk drug substances is still a necessary practice for veterinarians because there are, and always will be, a limited number of FDA-approved drug products for the many species and conditions that we treat. Intermittent drug shortages and commercial unavailability of FDA-approved drug products drive the need for compounded preparations within veterinary practice. While FDA has not identified cost as appropriate reason for compounding from bulk drug substances, the AVMA acknowledges that cost can be a reason veterinarians utilize compounded preparations because that is the only way a client can afford to treat their pet.

Our members have clearly conveyed that they need access to safe and efficacious drug products that can be practicably used in their patients. While recognizing FDA's jurisdiction is limited to issues related to safety and efficacy, not cost or commercial availability of drug products, we underscore the increasingly critical need for effective pathways for drug products to achieve legal marketing status. A robust, competitive animal health industry can benefit animal patients by way of increased numbers of legally marketed products that can be prescribed, dispensed or used in the preparation of compounds.

Existing pathways to legal marketing

- We continue to support the concept of user fees, so long as those fees go toward expedited reviews. Increased numbers of both pioneer and nonproprietary approved drug products can help to minimize the impacts of drug shortages.
- FDA's indexing process can be a valuable way to increase the number of legally marketed drug products for use in minor species or in major species with rare conditions. We recognize that indexing provides a process to obtain legal marketing status for eligible products. The indexing process should be utilized to a fuller extent, or revised accordingly, so that well-vetted drugs that have undergone expert panel scrutiny can be used legally for wildlife, aquaria, zoo, aquacultural, and laboratory animal species, and for major species with rare conditions.

Innovative pathways to legal marketing

- In 2010, the FDA published a Federal Register notice FDA-2010-N-0528 seeking comments related to identification of emerging paths toward legal status of drugs that are medically necessary and manufactured using good manufacturing processes. At the time, FDA conveyed that it is open to using both the agency's existing authority and new approaches to

make more drugs legally available to veterinarians, producers, and pet owners. We commended the FDA on its pursuit at the time and urge the FDA to implement innovative strategies to legal marketing. The AVMA stands ready to discuss possible approaches further with FDA.

Non-food minor species

In species including but not limited to zoo animals, laboratory animals, exotic pets, wildlife, aquaria animals, and non-food aquacultural animals, the use of compounded preparations is unquestionably necessary. We urge FDA to carefully consider the critical need for access to compounded preparations within these species, as FDA further refines its guidance. There are few choices of FDA-approved or indexed products available for use in these species; therefore, availability of properly compounded preparations to be maintained for office use in appropriate strengths and formulations, and the ability to mix and dilute medications are necessary to provide adequate veterinary care. Several provisions within this draft guidance should not apply to non-food minor species in their respective environments, such as limiting preparations to be maintained in office for urgent or emergent needs, patient-specific prescriptions, and detailed labeling requirements for compounded preparations maintained for office use.

Federal vs. State Jurisdiction

The licensure of veterinarians is regulated by state governmental authorities. Given this is a federal guidance, not a regulation, coupled with the existence of a wide range of state compounding rules, we would appreciate clarification on how GFI #230 will be enforced by the FDA. State rules regulating compounding in veterinary practice vary greatly. Some even provide substantial permissiveness for veterinarians to obtain preparations compounded for office use, and administer and dispense from the compounded preparations maintained in their office.

- How will the FDA evaluate whether the compounding of animal drugs is done in accordance with the conditions outlined in the guidance?
- Will the FDA rely on state boards of pharmacy and boards of veterinary medicine to enforce provisions within GFI #230, and how will the FDA reconcile discrepancies between state rules and GFI #230?

Enforcement

For many years the AVMA has advocated for, and applauded, the FDA's enforcement of illegal manufacturing activities. The AVMA asserts that large-scale manufacturing of animal drugs under the guise of compounding does not serve to benefit animal health; rather, circumvention of the drug approval process yields substances with unknown safety, efficacy, and potency, potentially allowing disease to progress. Animal drug manufacturers also contend that these compounded preparations result in a supply/demand disincentive for new FDA-approved drug products.

- As FDA is concerned about the use of animal drugs compounded from bulk drug substances, especially when approved alternatives exist that can be used as labeled or in an extralabel manner consistent with the requirements of FDA's extralabel provisions, how does this guidance change the FDA's ability to take action to address these concerns?
- Does the FDA currently have the needed resources and enforcement capabilities to fully enforce all egregious compounding activities, or are new authorities and appropriations necessary for the agency?
- Will the FDA develop and provide a user's guide on implementing the GFI #230 for state boards of pharmacy, state boards of veterinary medicine, individual veterinarians, and pharmacists to follow? We anticipate that time for a transition to the new paradigm will be

needed across stakeholder groups, especially given the wide array of state rules that exist related to veterinary compounding. Some veterinary state boards might not be prepared to inspect veterinary facilities for compliance with standards delineated within GFI #230.

- How will FDA's enforcement of compounded preparations be reconciled with the Drug Enforcement Administration's expectations that preparations containing controlled substances must only be prepared pursuant to patient-specific prescriptions?
- We also encourage FDA to coordinate with all relevant governmental agencies related to use of bulk drug substances in depopulation efforts, which might be needed during large-scale national emergencies. The AVMA stands ready to serve as a resource to FDA related to this topic.

Adverse Event Reporting System

The AVMA contends that there is a need for the continued development and strengthening of adverse event reporting systems for all adverse events, including lack of efficacy. We believe that there must be a strong, science-based, transparent and systematic surveillance system, especially considering the wide scope of species and disease conditions that veterinarians treat. The AVMA supports development of a user-friendly, easy to access form for all adverse events related to compounding. A user-friendly electronic system would be anticipated to promote both reporting by those compounding, and ease of review by FDA. For example, FDA could maintain a database of recently reported adverse events for veterinarians and pharmacists to use as a resource. Sufficient and meaningful data inputs, or adverse event reports, are imperative for a strong reporting system foundation.

- Does the FDA's current 1932a form, as a means of capturing adverse events, provide the robustness FDA needs to detect and act on trends? The AVMA contends that all adverse events associated with compound preparations should be reported, not just serious adverse events. Adverse events related to lack of efficacy should also be collected and analyzed.

Comments on Specific Provisions within Draft GFI #230

Scope of AVMA Comments

The AVMA has chosen to comment on the sections and questions that impact veterinary medicine. We will defer to the pharmacy community for feedback related to the practice of pharmacy and functioning of outsourcing facilities: pharmacist supervision (Section III.A.1. and Section III.C.2); compounding in advance of receipt of a prescription (Section III.A.2); determining and documenting that the compounded drug cannot be made from the FDA-approved drug(s) (Section III.A.5); current Good Manufacturing Practices (cGMP) (Section III.C.4); certain labeling requirements (Section III.C.10); and reporting requirements from 503B of the FD&C Act (Section III.C.8).

Definitions

We request the FDA provide clarification on the following terms:

- "Outsourcing facility"—Draft GFI #230 defines an "outsourcing facility" as a facility that meets the definition of an outsourcing facility under section 503B(d)(4) of the FD&C Act. Section 503B(d)(4) defines an outsourcing facility as a facility at one geographic location or address that (i) is engaged in the compounding of sterile drugs; (ii) has elected to register as an outsourcing facility; and (iii) complies with all of the requirements of that section of the law.

  As the use of outsourcing facilities in veterinary medicine is an entirely new concept, we are still assessing how the requirements for registration as an outsourcing facility would impact

the ability to meet veterinary needs. We wish to underscore that there is a substantial need for both non-sterile and sterile compounded preparations to be maintained for office use in veterinary medicine. We appreciate that the use of outsourcing facilities in the preparation of office stock is intended to increase safety of compounded preparations, yet we caution that use of outsourcing facilities might have the unintended consequence that some preparations of critical importance to animal health may no longer be available due to economic or other business considerations.

We ask the FDA to clarify how it will reconcile the clear discrepancies between statutory language and provisions in various agency documents:

- Specifically, it is our understanding that outsourcing facilities in compliance with Section 503B are only exempt from the *human drug approval requirements* in section 505 of the FD&C Act (21 U.S.C. 355), the requirement to be labeled with adequate directions for use in section 502(f)(1) of the FD&C Act (21 U.S.C. 352(f)(1)), and the track and trace requirements in section 582 of the FD&C Act (21 U.S.C. 360eee-1). How does this guidance impact the facility's exemption from animal drug approval requirements?
- Per the FDA's draft guidance for industry *For Entities Considering Whether to Register As Outsourcing Facilities Under Section 503B of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act,* referenced in draft GFI #230, outsourcing facilities are required to meet certain conditions to qualify. Of particular concern is the requirement that the outsourcing facilities must not compound drugs that appear on a list published by the FDA of drugs that have been withdrawn or removed from the market because the drugs or components of such drugs have been found to be unsafe or not effective *for humans.* We are aware of a number of such compounded preparations needed in veterinary medicine, including but not limited to cisapride, asparaginase, and chloramphenicol. In these cases, the FDA-approved product was withdrawn from the market due to human safety concerns, leaving us with no alternative to treat animal patients.
- An additional concern is that a facility, in order to meet the definition of an outsourcing facility, must be engaged in the compounding of sterile human drugs. The draft guidance clearly states that "you should not register a facility as an outsourcing facility if the only activities conducted at the facility are…animal drugs,…because none of the products produced at the facility would qualify for the exemptions provided in section 503B." A number of pharmacies currently exist that serve the needs of veterinarians and would need to register as an outsourcing facility per GFI #230, but they are explicitly prevented from registering per Section 503B because they do not meet certain requirements and were told not to register by the agency in another Guidance for Industry.

- "Compounding" as defined within 503A does not include mixing, reconstituting, or other such acts that are performed in accordance with directions contained in approved labeling provided by the product's manufacturer and other manufacturer directions consistent with that labeling. Defined within 503B, compounding is the combining, admixing, mixing, diluting, pooling, reconstituting, or otherwise altering a drug or bulk drug substance to create a drug. Is the administration of a bulk drug substance directly to an animal (for example, dissolution of metronidazole powder in aquaria for medical treatment of pet fish) considered compounding, or would administration be considered compounding only if the bulk drug

substance is mixed with another active or inactive ingredient? We ask the FDA to fully clarify its definition of animal drug compounding within this guidance.

- "Bulk drug substance" is defined within 21 CFR 207.3(a)(4) as "any substance that is represented for use in a drug and that, when used in the manufacturing, processing, or packaging of a drug, becomes an active ingredient or a finished dosage form of the drug, but the term does not include intermediates used in the synthesis of such substances." We understand that compressed gases, household items, herbals and homeopathics, and manufactured unapproved drugs such as glucosamine, would be outside the scope of this guidance. We ask the FDA to fully clarify what it considers a bulk drug substance for purposes of this guidance.
    - In its Table 1—Estimated Annual Recordkeeping Burden, please clarify details surrounding FDA's estimate that 75,000 pharmacies will receive approximately 6,350,000 prescriptions for compounded animal drugs annually. From where were these numbers obtained, and are these numbers specific to preparations compounded from bulk drug substances or prescriptions for all compounded preparations?

- "Patient" is defined by the AVMA (https://www.avma.org/KB/Policies/Pages/Model-Veterinary-Practice-Act.aspx) as an animal or group of animals examined or treated by a veterinarian, which would include herds, flocks, groups of shelter animals, laboratory animal colonies or groups, and zoo animal and aquaria collections. We respectfully request the use of this definition for the term "patient."

- "Non-ornamental fish" needs further clarification. Which definition is the FDA using for this term? The FDA-CVM's Program Policy and Procedures Manual *Enforcement Priorities ForDrug Use In Non-Food Fish* includes a definition of "ornamental fish." For purposes of GFI #230, are all fish not included in that definition to be considered "non-ornamental fish" and therefore food-producing animals?

- "Clinical difference" is not expressly defined within Section 503B or in the draft GFI #230. How will "clinical difference" be evaluated by the FDA, or does the FDA intend to seek state enforcement of this component?

- The terms "sale" and "transferred" need to be more clearly defined. For example, does this include the sharing of a compounded preparation between one clinic and a co-owned satellite clinic, between multiple zoological institutions or government agencies, or from one university laboratory to another within the same university system?

Section III.A.

(2) We have serious concerns with the verbiage "The drug is dispensed…for an individually identified animal patient..." AVMA fully supports the requirement that a veterinarian-client-patient relationship must exist for the use of a compounded preparation in an animal patient. However, the requirement that a patient must be 'individually identified' would eliminate the ability for veterinarians to obtain a preparation for a collection of animals, such as in a zoo, laboratory animal research facility or aquarium. In some of these situations, the patient cannot be individually identified or the entire group needs to be treated; it would not be feasible or reasonable to write an individual prescription for each animal.

- We request the FDA delete the words "individually identified" and use the AVMA's definition of "patient": https://www.avma.org/KB/Policies/Pages/Model-Veterinary-Practice-Act.aspx.

(3) "Food-producing animal" defined to include all cattle, swine, chickens, turkeys, sheep, and goats is consistent with our understanding and definition of a "food-producing animal."

The AVMA contends that compounding from bulk drug substances in food-producing animals is medically necessary for certain poison antidotes, euthanasia, and depopulation medications. There must be some allowance for compounding from bulk ingredients for these explicit situations, when there is no FDA-approved product or the approved product cannot feasibly be used per label or in an extralabel fashion. Veterinarians must also be able to legally maintain sufficient quantities of these compounded preparations in their office for urgent administration needs or emergency situations in food animals. Without access, animals would die before the medication could be delivered; for example, methylene blue is needed to treat nitrate toxicosis in cattle in the southeastern part of the USA. We recognize veterinarians' need to ensure food safety, maintain required records, and label drugs appropriately, as required under FDA's extralabel drug use rules. We ask that FDA draft a separate guidance to address these needs.

We are not opposed to the requirement that the prescription or documentation accompanying the prescription for a non-food animal must contain the statement "This patient is not a food-producing animal." The statement also helps to distinguish those patients that could be a food-producing animal in some situations, independent of species (e.g., rabbits, captive elk, captive deer).

We also would appreciate clarification on the wording in the latter half of this provision: "…any other animal designated on the prescription or in documentation accompanying the prescription by the veterinarian as a food-producing animal, regardless of species, is considered to be a food-producing animal."

- Would this mean that a veterinarian would state "This patient is a food-producing animal" to identify for the pharmacist that a bulk drug substance is not to be used?

(4)(a) The AVMA disagrees with the requirement that a pharmacy may compound a preparation using a bulk drug substance that is a component of any marketed FDA-approved animal or human drug only if the change between the compounded drug and the FDA-approved drug would produce a clinical difference. We assert that compounding should be allowable if the approved product is not commercially available for other reasons (i.e., unavailable) and no therapeutic alternatives exist, or if the needed compounded preparation cannot be made from the approved product (such as preparation of metronidazole benzoate for use in a cat) as allowed per Section III.A.5. We ask the agency to amend the provision accordingly. Given the frequency of FDA-approved drug product shortages and backorders, including all marketed FDA-approved drugs is too restrictive for the needs of veterinary patients.

(4)(b) The AVMA has concerns with, and is opposed to, the requirement for a statement from the veterinarian that the compounded preparation "produces a clinical difference for the individually identified animal patient" with an explanation of that difference. We contend that a medical rationale is necessary for use of compounds, and is a more applicable term than "clinical difference." However, we believe documentation of why the compounded preparation was chosen is more appropriate for the medical record.

- Should FDA still choose to require inclusion of a statement in documentation, will the statements be evaluated by the FDA, or does the FDA intend to seek state enforcement of this component?

Additionally, we believe that the term "clinical difference" does not capture other medical needs for compounded preparations, such as certain worker and client safety needs, client compliance, and animal stress situations (e.g., fractious cats). These safety/animal handling needs are not related to clinical differences but rather, the ability to adequately medicate patients.

(5) Related to pharmacists documenting that a compounded preparation cannot be made from an FDA-approved drug, what does the FDA consider to be "acceptable documentation," and to whom will the documentation be provided?

(6)(b) In concept, the AVMA does not oppose the requirement that the statement "There are no FDA-approved animal or human drugs that can be used as labeled or in an extralabel manner under section 512(a)(4) or (5) and 21 CFR part 530 to appropriately treat the disease, symptom, or condition for which this drug is being prescribed" be documented on the prescription or documentation accompanying the prescription, because we believe veterinarians need to carefully consider their therapeutic options. However, the statement could inadvertently discourage use of FDA-approved drugs in preparing compounded medications. For example, we understand that sometimes the best starting ingredient for a pharmacist's preparation of a compounded medication is the FDA-approved drug. If the veterinarian includes the above statement, that essentially would direct the pharmacist to utilize a bulk drug substance. Moreover, the veterinarian writing the prescription would not necessarily know whether the FDA-approved drug or the bulk drug substance is best for the preparation. We wholeheartedly agree with the need for veterinarians to utilize FDA-approved products whenever feasible. We ask that FDA discuss this topic further with the AVMA.

(9) We would like clarification on the statement that "a sale or transfer does not include administration of a compounded drug by a veterinarian to a patient under his or her care." It is our understanding that under the guidance, the compounded preparation may only be dispensed by the pharmacy to the patient's owner or caretaker, a concept with which the AVMA disagrees. Does this provision in some way allow for the veterinarian to receive the compounded preparation from the pharmacy, and then administer and dispense the preparation to the patient's owner or caretaker? The AVMA asserts that the prescribing veterinarian should be able to dispense these preparations to help ensure that the medications are being used and administered appropriately by the client. Such dispensing also keeps the prescribing veterinarian more closely attuned to the current status of the patient should client questions or concerns (such as adverse events) arise.

We request that the FDA amend the provision to allow dispensing: "…a sale or transfer does not include administration of a compounded drug by a veterinarian to a patient under his or her care, or the dispensing of a compounded drug by the veterinarian to the owner or caretaker of an animal under his or her care."

Section III.B.

(1) Again, the AVMA contends that compounding should be done within the confines of a veterinarian-client-patient relationship. However, veterinarians must be able to legally maintain sufficient quantities of compounded preparations in their office for urgent administration needs or emergency situations, including compounds prepared by veterinarians and pharmacies. In fact, the

maintenance of preparations for office use is lawful for veterinarians under some states' rules. We request that the FDA include an allowance for the preparation of compounds by veterinarians in advance of a specific patient's need.

(2) For food animals, the AVMA, again, asserts that a publically available list of bulk drug substances for veterinarians to prepare poison antidotes, euthanasia, and depopulation preparations should be made available.

As previously stated in Section III (A) 3, veterinarians must also be able to legally maintain sufficient quantities of these compounded preparations in their office for urgent administration needs or emergency situations in food animals. Without access, animals would die before the medication could be delivered; for example, methylene blue is needed to treat nitrate toxicosis in cattle in the southeastern part of the USA. We recognize veterinarians' need to ensure food safety, maintain required records, and label drugs appropriately, as required under FDA's extralabel drug use rules. We ask that FDA draft a separate guidance to address these needs.

(3) If the veterinarian is prescribing a medication to be compounded in lieu of an FDA-approved drug, then there is a clinical need that has already been determined by the prescribing veterinarian. Thus the AVMA agrees with the purpose of the provision. We do not support any additional reporting or recordkeeping requirements related to this provision.

We request that the FDA amend the provision to allow for compounding from bulk ingredients if the approved product is not commercially available (either due to a backorder, shortage, or no longer marketed) or if the needed compounded preparation cannot be made from the approved product. As stated with respect to Sec. III.A.4.a., the frequency of FDA-approved drug product shortages and backorders makes inclusion of all marketed FDA-approved drugs too restrictive for the needs of veterinary patients.

(4) The AVMA supports the intentions of this provision as the AVMA believes that an FDA-approved drug product should always be used first and foremost.

(5) The AVMA supports the requirement that veterinarians compounding from bulk drug substances do so in accordance with USP—NF Chapters <795> and <797> (e.g., a sterile drug is compounded in an area with air quality that meets or exceeds ISO Class 5 standards (see USP—NF Chapter <797>, Table 1)).

(6) The AVMA agrees with the requirements for use of bulk drug substances that are accompanied by a valid certificate of analysis and that come from FDA-registered manufacturers.

(7) The AVMA agrees with the provision's allowance for veterinarians to administer the preparation to the patient or dispense to the owner or caretaker. The AVMA also agrees that this should all be done within the confines of a veterinarian-client-patient relationship.

The AVMA contends that dispensing practices by veterinarians should be regulated by individual state boards of veterinary medicine. We would like the FDA to clarify what the agency would consider to be the "transfer" of compounded preparations to another veterinarian or a satellite facility.

Section III.C.

(1) Please see our comments in the section below related to Appendix A. We have reservations about the outline drafted for the creation of such a list and whether patient needs can be met through the use of such a list.

(3) We do not oppose the requirement for a statement on the prescription or supporting documentation that "This drug will not be dispensed for or administered to food-producing animals." Including such a statement is important to help minimize the risk of the medication being used in a food animal.

As stated previously, the AVMA contends that compounding from bulk drug substances in food-producing animals is medically necessary for certain poison antidotes, euthanasia, and depopulation medications. There must be some allowance for compounding from bulk ingredients for these explicit situations, when there is no FDA-approved product or the approved product cannot feasibly be used per label or in an extralabel fashion. Veterinarians must also be able to legally maintain sufficient quantities of these compounded preparations in their office for urgent administration needs or emergency situations in food animals. Without access, animals would die before the medication could be delivered; one example also stated previously is methylene blue, which is needed to treat nitrate toxicosis in cattle in the southeastern part of the USA. We recognize veterinarians' needs to ensure food safety, maintain required records, and label drugs appropriately, as required under FDA's extralabel drug use rules. We ask that FDA draft a separate guidance to address these needs.

(6) As the draft guidance is currently written, outsourcing facilities would be the only way by which a veterinarian could obtain office stock of certain compounded preparations. Many of these preparations are not only needed for immediate in-house administration by the veterinarian but also for dispensing to the patient's owner or caretaker for treatment at home, up to a 14-day timeframe. This allows for dispensing for emerging needs, and to help ensure the drug is going to be effective in a particular patient. It would also help to avoid a client needing two prescriptions for one drug in a short timeframe (which could decrease compliance), and would allow time to detect any immediate adverse events (e.g., intolerance to the drug, such as seen when amlodipine results in inappetence in cats).

We request that the FDA amend the provision to allow dispensing: "…a sale or transfer does not include administration of a compounded drug by a veterinarian to a patient under his or her care, or the dispensing of a compounded drug by the veterinarian to the owner or caretaker of an animal under his or her care." This would bring the provision in line with what is allowed for physicians under Sec. 503B of the FD&C Act.

(9) At this time, the AVMA has reservations related to the requirement that a veterinarian's order state that the product will be used in a manner and in a species that complies with the list of permitted bulk ingredient uses under Appendix A. If any such list is created, it needs to be maintained properly and reflect veterinarians' needs. These concerns will be further addressed in the feedback below on Appendix A.

(10) The AVMA contends that certain information should be incorporated into labels/packaging and generally agrees with inclusion of:

a. Active ingredient(s)
b. Dosage form, strength, and flavoring, if any
c. Directions for use, as provided by the veterinarian prescribing or ordering the drug

d. Quantity or volume, whichever is appropriate
e. The statement "Not for resale."
f. The statement "For use only in [fill in species and any associated condition or limitation listed in Appendix A]."
g. The statement "Compounded by [name of outsourcing facility]."
h. Lot or batch number of drug
i. Special storage and handling instructions
j. Date the drug was compounded, and date of dispensing, if dispensed
k. Beyond use date (BUD) of the drug
l. Name of veterinarian prescribing or ordering the drug
m. The address and phone number of the outsourcing facility that compounded the drug
n. Inactive ingredients
o. The statement "Adverse events associated with this compounded drug should be reported to FDA on a Form FDA 1932a."
p. If the drug is compounded pursuant to a patient specific prescription, the species of the animal patient, name of the animal patient, number of refills if applicable, and name of the owner or caretaker of the animal patient. We wish to underscore that "patient" can also mean a herd, collection or group of shelter animals. We assert that the AVMA's definition of "patient" should be used.

We also request that FDA require all compounded preparations be labeled that they are not FDA-approved products. We believe it is important for consumers to recognize that safety, efficacy, potency and sterility, where applicable, of compounded preparations have not been assessed or verified by the FDA.

Labeling requirements for preparations to be maintained for office use can be difficult for minor species, including but not limited to zoo, aquaria, laboratory-animal, and wildlife collections and/or facilities. For example, some compounds maintained for office use will be used to treat lameness in a number of species in a zoo collection. The labeling requirement as posed in (f) would be particularly difficult in these collections.

Pertaining to Provisions Which Appear in Multiple Sections
Related to Labeling by Pharmacies and Veterinarians (Section III.A.11 and Section III.B.9)
AVMA requests that the labeling requirements for pharmacists and veterinarians include name of client; veterinarian's name and address; identification of animal(s) treated, species and numbers of animals treated, when possible; date of dispensing; name, active ingredient, and quantity of the drug preparation to be dispensed; drug strength (if more than one strength available); dosage and duration; route of administration; number of refills; cautionary statements as needed; beyond use date; and the statement "Compounded by [name, address, and contact number of the pharmacy or veterinarian]." We also assert that compounded preparations should be labeled that they have not been approved by FDA. Patient owners or caretakers should have information available to contact the compounding entity, be it a pharmacy, veterinarian or outsourcing facility.

The AVMA agrees with inclusion of the name of the owner or caretaker and species of animal. AVMA contends that a patient may be an animal or group of animals so the "name" of the animal patient should only be required for prescriptions where applicable and appropriate.

Related to Patient-Specific Prescriptions (Section III.A.2 and Section III.B.1)
Veterinarians must be able to legally maintain sufficient quantities of compounded preparations in their office for urgent administration needs or emergency situations. These cannot be obtained through patient-specific prescriptions. Examples are many, and include: methylene blue to treat nitrate toxicosis; apomorphine to induce emesis in dogs; antibiotics, such as metronidazole, formulated into an appropriate dose for small dogs and cats and a palatable flavor for non-human primates to treat acute diarrhea; and nonsteroidal anti-inflammatory drugs, such as meloxicam, for pain control in small mammals.

This guidance's allowance that preparations that appear in a list will only be available from an outsourcing facility will greatly restrict veterinarians' access to critical medications and hamstring their ability to provide appropriate care in a timely manner. We must ask the FDA to reconsider provisions related to preparations compounded for office use and engage in discussion with the AVMA and the veterinary profession to better ascertain how to best meet the needs of both the FDA and veterinary patients.

Related to Sourcing of, and Information on, Bulk Drug Substances (Section III.A.7, Section III.B.6, and Section III.C.5)
Section III.A.7 states that "Any bulk drug substance used to compound the drug is manufactured by an establishment that is registered under section 510 of the FD&C Act (21 U.S.C. 360) (including a foreign establishment that is registered under section 510) and is accompanied by a valid certificate of analysis." How does the intent related to this statement differ from the intents for Section III.B.6 and Section III.C.5, which both state "Any bulk drug substance used is manufactured by an establishment that is registered under section 510 of the FD&C Act (21 U.S.C. 360) (including a foreign establishment that is registered under section 360(i)) and is accompanied by a valid certificate of analysis"?

The AVMA agrees with the requirement that any bulk drug substance used by either a pharmacy, veterinarian, or outsourcing facility be manufactured by an establishment that is registered under section 510 of the FD&C Act (21 U.S.C. 360) (including a foreign establishment that is registered under section 360(i)) and is accompanied by a valid certificate of analysis.

Related to USP-Related Requirements (Section III.A.8 and Section III.B.5)
The AVMA asserts that compliance with USP guidelines continues to be an element that can be utilized when a veterinarian considers the quality of a compounding pharmacy's preparations. The AVMA supports the requirement that veterinarians, outsourcing facilities, and pharmacists compounding from bulk drug substances do so in accordance with USP—NF Chapters <795> and <797> (e.g., a sterile drug is compounded in an area with air quality that meets or exceeds ISO Class 5 standards (see USP—NF Chapter <797>, Table 1)).

Related to the Sale or Transfer of Compounded Preparations (Section III.A.9 and Section III.B.7)
The AVMA advocates that compounded preparations should not be wholesaled. However, we seek clarification from FDA related to the definition of "sale" and "transfer" as indicated previously in our comments.

Related to Adverse Event Reporting Requirements (Section III.A.10, Section III.B.8, and Section III.C.7)
The AVMA advocates for robust, strong adverse event reporting systems. However, we ask whether the FDA's current 1932a form, as a means of capturing adverse events, provides the robustness FDA

needs to detect and act on trends? The AVMA underscores that all adverse events associated with compounded preparations should be reported by those compounding the preparations, rather than just serious adverse events. Adverse events related to lack of efficacy should also be collected and analyzed.

The AVMA contends there is a need for the continued development and strengthening of adverse event reporting systems for all adverse events, including lack of efficacy. We believe there must be a strong, science-based, transparent and systematic surveillance system, especially considering the wide scope of species and disease conditions that veterinarians treat. The AVMA supports development of a user-friendly, easy to access form for all adverse events related to compounding. A user-friendly electronic system would be anticipated to promote both reporting by those compounding and ease of review by the FDA. For example, the FDA could maintain a database of recently reported adverse events for veterinarians and pharmacists to use as a resource. Sufficient and meaningful data inputs, or adverse event reports, are imperative for a strong reporting system.

Related to the proposed requirement for submission of all adverse events within 15 days, the AVMA asserts that this timeframe is acceptable for veterinarians. We hope that such a timeframe is amenable to pharmacies and outsourcing facilities.

Appendix A, List of Bulk Drug Substances That May Be Used By An Outsourcing Facility to Compound Drugs for Use in Animals

In GFI #230, the FDA conveys its general intent to enforce all adulteration and misbranding provisions of the FD&C Act against entities compounding animal drugs from bulk drug substances if they are not in accordance with provisions delineated within the guidance. The AVMA understands this to mean that while all compounding from bulk drug substances continues to be illegal, those activities not provided for within the confines of GFI #230 are subject to *greater* likelihood of enforcement.

Although we want compounded preparations that veterinarians maintain for office use to be safe, we have concerns that the explicit use of outsourcing facilities might have the unintended consequence of making some preparations unavailable.

The AVMA asserts that use of a compounded preparation should be limited to those individual patients for which no other method or route of drug delivery is practical; those drugs for which safety, efficacy, and stability have been demonstrated in the specific compounded form in the target species; or disease conditions for which a quantifiable response to therapy or drug concentration can be monitored. Needs vary greatly across species treated by veterinarians.

- Zoo animals, laboratory animals, wildlife, exotic pets, camelids, aquaria species, and non-food aquacultural species: These minor species have few FDA-approved animal or human drug products or indexed drugs that can be used as labeled or in an extralabel manner to treat conditions. For example, diminutive dosages and volumes are required for some exotic pets, so office use is critical. Zoo veterinarians have advised they need to have office stock to be able to readily treat lameness or other conditions that can arise at any time among the large collections of animals they treat. For that reason, the importance of having preparations compounded from bulk drug substances in anticipation of the patient's need and available in the hospital or clinic for administration, and dispensing when appropriate, is undeniable.
- Food-producing animals: The AVMA suggests that the FDA draft a separate guidance to address compounding from bulk drug substances for food producing animals. The draft GFI

#230 provides no allowance for the preparation of compounds from bulk drug substances for food-producing animals. The AVMA has advocated for a publically available, current list of bulk drug substances that can be legally compounded within a veterinarian-client-patient relationship specific and limited to euthanasia, depopulation, and poison antidote compounds for food-producing animals. There currently exist no FDA-approved animal or human drug products or indexed drugs that can be used for these specific needs. Therefore, it is imperative that veterinarians have these preparations available and in their clinic when the need arises. Not only is compounding from bulk drug substances necessary for food-producing animals, the FDA must allow for the preparations to be obtained in anticipation of a specific patient's need (i.e. via a nonpatient-specific prescription or prescription order) for treating certain toxicoses and for euthanasia or depopulation.

- Dogs, cats, and horses: While there are a number of FDA-approved drug products for dogs, cats and horses, there remain circumstances where there is no FDA-approved drug product available to treat a particular animal with a particular condition, because either no drug product is approved for a specific animal species or no approved drug product is available or feasible for use under the extralabel drug use provisions. For example, some shelters receive 20,000 to 30,000 animals per year and have immediate needs that require compounded preparations for adequate treatment. Another example is the need for compounded buprenorphine when an owner is unable to adequately medicate their painful cat with the injectable or oral treatment at home. In instances such as these, having access to these compounded preparations for administration and dispensing by the veterinarian is critical to preventing animal suffering and death.

The criteria that all substances must meet to be included on the list are challenging.

- As asked previously, will the identified "significant safety concern specific to the use of the bulk drug substance to compound animal drugs" be related to safety concerns for humans or for animal patients? For example, cisapride was removed from the market due to human safety concerns, but is critical in feline medicine. We contend that safety concerns related to the use of compounded medications in human medicine should have no bearing on their use in animal patients in most circumstances.
- Additionally, evidence clearly indicating the ineffectiveness of a substance to be used should be a criterion by which the substance is not included on the list.

We have concerns related to the feasibility of creating an all-encompassing list of bulk drug substances within the paradigm framed by FDA, with supporting documentation as outlined in the Docket No. FDA-2015-N-1196. In lieu of the list, we contend that compounding from bulk drug substances should be allowed in three general sets of circumstances: the approved product is not commercially available, the needed compounded preparation cannot be made from the approved product, or there is no approved product from which to compound the needed preparation.

AVMA will be providing a separate set of comments pursuant to the Federal Register notice titled, "List of Bulk Drug Substances That May be Used by an Outsourcing Facility to Compound Drugs for Use in Animals."

Specific Topics for Comment

Should the final guidance address the issue of FDA-approved animal and human drugs that are in shortage or are otherwise unavailable (e.g., disruptions in the manufacture or supply chain; business

decisions to stop marketing the drug; drug is subject to Agency action based on safety, effectiveness, or manufacturing concerns)?
The AVMA is committed to the continued availability of medicinal products that are pure, safe, potent and efficacious for animals. While we recognize that many factors can impact a manufacturer's decision or ability to produce and make FDA-approved drug products available, the short and long-term breaks in availability or complete withdrawal of a product from the market make access to compounded preparations even more important. Lack of information regarding why the products have been removed from the market and when they might return causes frustration and uncertainty for veterinarians and pet owners as they plan for treatment of patients.

Accordingly, the AVMA contends that the lack of commercially available FDA-approved drug products is a valid reason for veterinarians to prescribe compounds prepared from bulk drug substances for patients. For example, ticarcillin-clavulanic acid is critical for treatment of certain types of bacterial otitis externa in dogs and must be compounded when commercially unavailable. We ask that the final guidance address the issue of compounding preparations from bulk drug substances when the FDA-approved drug products are unavailable for any reason. As requested earlier in our comments, does the FDA have the needed resources to address and minimize impacts of drug unavailability on patient care? Additionally, what protocols and procedures will FDA follow to assure that timely notification is made regarding emerging drug shortages that impact veterinary medicine and notification when the drug is once again commercially available? And how does FDA know when a shortage of a human FDA-approved drug will impact veterinary medicine?

How should these situations be addressed in the final guidance?
The AVMA contends that a robust, nimble, current drug shortage list should be made publically available. While we do not yet have a recommendation on whether this action should be incorporated into the provisions delineated within GFI #230, implemented elsewhere for the agency to manage, or maintained by an external stakeholder(s), appropriate resources must be dedicated toward its continual upkeep. In the interim, any role that the FDA plays with regard to identification of drug shortages needs to be well-informed and more broadly encompassing than the current list housed at
http://www.fda.gov/AnimalVeterinary/SafetyHealth/ProductSafetyInformation/ucm267669.htm.

How should the final guidance define the terms "shortage" and "unavailable"?
A "shortage" refers to insufficient quantities of a needed FDA-approved product. "Unavailable" means that the FDA-approved product is entirely inaccessible to practitioners. Shortages and unavailability of products may be due to a back order, temporary discontinuation, or other supply interruption, resulting in limited or no accessibility through regular distribution channels.

What criteria should FDA use to determine if an approved animal or human drug is in shortage or otherwise unavailable?
FDA should consider products that are backordered, temporarily discontinued, no longer marketed, or provided intermittently in limited quantities when determining whether a product is in shortage or unavailable.

Do United States Pharmacopeia and National Formulary (USP-NF) [2] chapters <795> and <797> provide suitable standards for animal drugs compounded by veterinarians, and if not, what standards of safety, purity, and quality should apply to animal drugs compounded by veterinarians?
The USP chapters 795 and 797 are suitable standards for compounding from bulk drug substances by veterinarians.

Should licensed veterinarians be able to sell or transfer an animal drug compounded from bulk drug substances by a State-licensed pharmacy or an outsourcing facility to owners or caretakers of animals under the veterinarian's care?
We seek FDA's clarification related to the definitions of "sell," "transfer," and "dispense" before we can provide feedback related to this concept. In general, we assert that the prescribing veterinarian should be able to dispense preparations compounded by pharmacies or outsourcing facilities to his or her clients.

How should FDA apply the condition to identify an individual patient when it is not possible to identify an individual animal (e.g., koi in a koi pond)?
The AVMA contends that a "patient" is an animal or group of animals examined or treated by a veterinarian and does not need to always be individually identified. So long as the licensed veterinarian is meeting the requirements of his/her state veterinary practice act with respect to prescribing, then being able to identify an individual patient when it is not possible is unnecessary.

Should facilities registered as outsourcing facilities under section 503B of the FD&C Act be able to compound animal drugs from bulk drug substances that do not appear on Appendix A for an individually identified animal patient under conditions similar to those applicable to state-licensed pharmacies (i.e., the conditions contained in section III.A. of the draft guidance)?
Yes, so long as the outsourcing facility is a state-licensed pharmacy.

Is additional guidance needed to address the repackaging of drugs for animal use?

- *How widespread is the practice of repackaging drugs for animal use?*
- *What types of drugs are repackaged for animal use, and why are they repackaged?*
- *Have problems been identified with repackaged drugs for animal use?*

We understand repackaging to mean "The act of taking a finished drug product from the container in which it was distributed by the original manufacturer and placing it into a different container without further manipulation of the drug. Repackaging also includes the act of placing the contents of multiple containers (e.g., vials) of the same finished drug product into one container, as long as the container does not include other ingredients." If this is FDA's definition, the AVMA agrees and understands that veterinarians sometimes need to repackage drugs, including compounded preparations, into smaller aliquots for administration by the owner or agent, as long as the repackaging does not affect the stability, efficacy, purity, safety, and potency of the product (e.g., light-sensitive drugs).

Is additional guidance needed to address the compounding of animal drugs from approved animal or human drugs under section 512(a)(4) or (a)(5) of the FD&C Act and part 530?
No. The AVMA was a key leader in the development and advocacy for the Animal Medicinal Drug Use Clarification Act on behalf of our members and the patients they serve. Extralabel drug use, including the preparation of compounds from FDA-approved drugs, continues to be a needed activity in veterinary medicine, and our members continue to utilize this FDA-regulated activity in the practice of veterinary medicine, within the confines of the 21 CFR 530.

Is additional guidance needed to address the compounding of animal drugs from bulk drug substances for food-producing animals?
Yes. The AVMA suggests that the FDA draft a separate guidance to address compounding from bulk drug substance for food producing animals.

1931 N Meacham Rd, Ste 100 | Schaumburg, IL 60173-4360 | p: 800.248.2862 | www.avma.org

The AVMA continues to recommend that there be a publically available, current list of bulk drug substances that can be legally compounded within a veterinarian-client-patient relationship specific and limited to euthanasia, depopulation, and poison antidote compounds for food animal species. If adequate scientific information is not available to determine a withdrawal time, the AVMA contends that the compounded preparation cannot be used in a food animal or the treated animal cannot enter the food supply.

As one condition under which FDA does not generally intend to take action for certain violations of the FD&C Act if this and the other conditions are followed, FDA is proposing that State-licensed pharmacies and veterinarians report any product defect or serious adverse event associated with animal drugs they compound from bulk drug substances to FDA within 15 days of becoming aware of the product defect or serious adverse event. Outsourcing facilities are required to report adverse events associated with the drugs they compound. FDA believes it is important to receive this information from State-licensed pharmacies and veterinarians because there are no other State Departments of Health or Federal Agencies (e.g., the CDC) charged with identifying and tracing animal injuries or disease associated with an animal drug compounded by these entities. FDA has the following specific questions with respect to this proposed condition:

- *How many State-licensed pharmacies and veterinarians compound animal drugs from bulk drug substances and would potentially be reporting product defects and serious adverse events to FDA?*
  We are unaware of any data that could assist in answering this question. Anecdotally, we understand that few veterinarians personally compound from bulk drug substances.

- *Are State-licensed pharmacies and veterinarians reporting the same or similar information to any State regulatory agency (e.g., State boards of pharmacy, State boards of veterinary medicine)? If so, how many reports on average does each State-licensed pharmacy and veterinarian submit to these State agencies each year?*
  It is our understanding that adverse events are grossly underreported to FDA; however, members have conveyed that when they do report an adverse event, they generally report the adverse event to the respective compounding pharmacy. We do not know the actual number of these reports, nor are we aware of the number of events reported by veterinarians to their state boards.

- *For purposes of the guidance, how should FDA define the terms "product defect" and "serious adverse event"?*
  AVMA contends that "serious adverse events" are ones that are fatal, life-threatening, require professional intervention, cause an abortion, stillbirth, infertility, congenital anomaly, prolonged or permanent disability, or disfigurement as referenced in 21 CFR 514.3.

  A "product defect" would include any obvious physical abnormalities, such as consistency, color and precipitant materials or contents, or problems with the amount, type or effectiveness of an ingredient triggered by production errors, poor quality bulk drug substances, or problems with transportation and/or storage. Any obvious physical defects of the container, seal or stopper and of the label of the product container would also constitute a product defect.

AVMA believes lack of efficacy is an adverse event and should be included in any reporting system.

- *Can FDA achieve the same objective of identifying and tracing the source of injuries or disease associated with an animal drug compounded from a bulk drug substance through means other than product defect and serious adverse event reporting, and if so, what other means? For example, would reports of product defects alone achieve the same objective?* We are unable to provide a clear answer without additional definitions for the terms "product defect" and "serious adverse event," which would help inform our understanding and opinion.

We appreciate the opportunity to comment on the draft Guidance for Industry and provide needed feedback on behalf of the AVMA's membership. For questions or concerns regarding the AVMA's comments, please contact Drs. Ashley Morgan (amorgan@avma.org; 202-289-3210) and Lynne White-Shim (lwhite@avma.org; (800) 248-2862 ext. 6784).

Sincerely,

W. Ron DeHaven, DVM, MBA
CEO and Executive Vice President

October ##, 2015

Commissioner Stephen Ostroff, M.D.
Food & Drug Administration
10903 New Hampshire Ave
Silver Spring, MD 20993

Dear Commissioner Ostroff:

We are writing to express our serious concern with FDA's proposed "Guidance for Industry - Compounding Animal Drugs from Bulk Drug Substances", which the agency issued on May 19, 2015. Through a draft guidance, FDA is proposing a new regulatory scheme for compounded animal drugs that prohibits veterinarians from properly treating their animal patients. These fundamental changes are proposed despite the fact that Congress has not passed any statute giving FDA the broad authority it would need to make such a substantial change in animal health.

Under the proposed guidance, veterinarians would be singled out as the only health care professionals required to document in writing a clinical need before they can prescribe a medication. The draft guidance mandates very specific language that veterinarians must include on each and every prescription for a compounded preparation. This represents an unprecedented and dangerous intrusion into the state-regulated practice of veterinary medicine

The draft guidance also eliminates the ability of veterinarians to maintain an office stock of medications from compounding pharmacies that are necessary for animal health. This access to important compounded medications, commonly referred to as "office use," is permitted under most state laws. Office use of compounded medications is critical in the practice of animal health because veterinary clinics often serve as emergency rooms and hospitals for animals, and certain compounded medications must be immediately available in order to insure proper patient outcomes.

Through the draft guidance, the agency establishes and authorizes §503B outsourcing facilities to compound and distribute medications for veterinary use. When Congress established that category of FDA-registered and regulated facilities within the Drug Quality and Security Act of 2013, it was specific to the provision of sterile drug products for human use. The agency has far exceeded its authority by presuming to extend these entities into veterinary medicine.

This proposed guidance takes portions of the statute related to compounding contained in the Drug Quality and Security Act and attempts, without authorization and through a guidance document, to apply these provisions to animal drug compounding despite the fact that the Act is expressly limited to human compounding. If FDA believes that fundamental changes are needed in the regulation of animal drug compounding, the agency should instead submit a specific legislative proposal for Congress to consider. As a result, we ask that you withdraw this proposed guidance.

Thank you for your attention in this matter. We look forward to the withdrawal of this proposed guidance and please do not hesitate to contact our offices if you require any further information.

Sincerely,

Matt Salmon
Member of Congress

Kurt Schrader
Member of Congress

Contact Greg Soften (greg.safsten@mail.house.gov) in Rep. Salmon's office, or Chris Huckleberry (huck@mail.house.gov) in Rep. Schrader's with questions and to sign onto the letter.