DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES
FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION

1. DISTRICT OFFICE ADDRESS & PHONE NO.
6000 Metro Dr. Suite 101
Baltimore, MD 21215
410 779 5454

TO

2. NAME AND TITLE OF INDIVIDUAL
Krupakar Paul Thadikonda, PHD President & CEO

3. DATE
1/13/10

4. FIRM NAME
Eminent Services Corporation

5. HOUR
9:15 a.m.
p.m.

6. NUMBER AND STREET
7495 New Technology Way

7. CITY AND STATE & ZIP CODE
Frederick, MD 21703

8. PHONE # & AREA CODE
240-629-1972

Notice of Inspection is hereby given pursuant to Section 704(a)(1) of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetics Act [21 U.S.C. 374(a)][1] and/or Part F or G, Title III of the Public Health Service Act [42 U.S.C. 262-264][2]

9. SIGNATURE *(Food and Drug Administration Employee(s))*
Rachel Harrington

10. TYPE OR PRINT NAME AND TITLE *(FDA Employee(s))*
Meridith K Rose, CSO
Rachel Harrington, CSO Blaine McInmake CSO

[1] Applicable portions of Section 704 and other Sections of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act [21 U.S.C. 374] are quoted below:

Sec. 704. (a)(1) For purposes of enforcement of this Act, officers or employees duly designated by the Secretary, upon presenting appropriate credentials and a written notice to the owner, operator, or agent in charge, are authorized (A) to enter, at reasonable times, any factory, warehouse, or establishment in which food, drugs, devices, or cosmetics are manufactured, processed, packed, or held, for introduction into interstate commerce or after such introduction, or to enter any vehicle being used to transport or hold such food, drugs, devices, or cosmetics in interstate commerce; and (B) to inspect, at reasonable times and within reasonable limits and in a reasonable manner, such factory, warehouse, establishment, or vehicle and all pertinent equipment, finished and unfinished materials, containers, and labeling therein. In the case of any person (excluding farms and restaurants) who manufactures, processes, packs, transports, distributes, holds, or imports foods, the inspection shall extend to all records and other information described in section 414 when the Secretary has a reasonable belief that an article of food is adulterated and presents a threat of serious adverse health consequences or death to humans or animals, subject to the limitations established in section 414(d). In the case of any factory, warehouse, establishment, or consulting laboratory in which prescription drugs, nonprescription drugs intended for human use, or restricted devices are manufactured, processed, packed, or held, inspection shall extend to all things therein (including records, files, papers, processes, controls, and facilities) bearing on whether prescription drugs, nonprescription drugs intended for human use or, restricted devices which are adulterated or misbranded within the meaning of this Act, or which may not be manufactured, introduced into interstate commerce, or sold, or offered for sale by reason of any provision of this Act, have been or are being manufactured, processed, packed, transported, or held in any such place, or otherwise bearing on violation of this Act. No inspection authorized by the preceding sentence or by paragraph (3) shall extend to financial data, sales data other than shipment data, pricing data, personnel data (other than data as to qualifications of technical and professional personnel performing functions subject to this Act), and research data (other than data relating to new drugs, antibiotic drugs and devices and, subject to reporting and inspection under regulations lawfully issued pursuant to section 505(i) or (k), section 519, or 520(g), and data relating to other drugs or devices which in the case of a new drug would be subject to reporting or inspection under lawful regulations issued pursuant to section 505(j)). A separate notice shall be given for each such inspection, but a notice shall not be required for each entry made during the period covered by the inspection. Each such inspection shall be commenced and completed with reasonable promptness.

Sec. 704. (a)(2) The provisions of the third sentence of paragraph (1) shall not apply to (A) pharmacies which maintain establishments in conformance with any applicable local laws regulating the practice of pharmacy and medicine and which are regularly engaged in dispensing prescription drugs or devices, upon prescriptions of practitioners licensed to administer such drugs or devices to patients under the care of such practitioners in the course of their professional practice, and which do not, either through a subsidiary or otherwise, manufacture, prepare, propagate, compound, or process drugs or devices for sale other than in the regular course of their business of dispensing or selling drugs or devices at retail; (B) practitioners licensed by law to prescribe or administer drugs, or prescribe or use devices, as the case may be, and who manufacture, prepare, propagate, compound, or process drugs, or manufacture or process devices solely for use in the course of their professional practice; (C) persons who manufacture, prepare, propagate, compound, or process drugs, or manufacture or process devices solely for use in research, teaching, or chemical analysis and not for sale; (D) such other classes of persons as the Secretary may by regulation exempt from the application of this section upon a finding that inspection as applied to such classes of persons in accordance with this section is not necessary for the protection of the public health.

Sec. 704. (a)(3) An officer or employee making an inspection under paragraph (1) for purposes of enforcing the requirements of section 412 applicable to infant formulas shall be permitted, at all reasonable times, to have access to and to copy and verify any records (A) bearing on whether the infant formula manufactured or held in the facility inspected meets the requirements of section 412, or (B) required to be maintained under section 412.

Sec. 704. (b) Upon completion of any such inspection of a factory, warehouse, consulting laboratory, or other establishment, and prior to leaving the premises, the officer or employee making the inspection shall give to the owner, operator, or agent in charge a report in writing setting forth any conditions or practices observed by him which, in his judgment, indicate that any food, drug, device, or cosmetic in such establishment (1) consists in whole or in part of any filthy, putrid, or decomposed substance, or (2) has been prepared, packed, or held under insanitary conditions whereby it may have become contaminated with filth, or whereby it may have been rendered injurious to health. A copy of such report shall be sent promptly to the Secretary.

Sec. 704. (c) If the officer or employee making any such inspection of a factory, warehouse, or other establishment has obtained any sample in the course of the inspection, upon completion of the inspection and prior to leaving the premises he shall give to the owner, operator, or agent in charge a receipt describing the samples obtained.

Sec. 704. (d) Whenever in the course of any such inspection of a factory or other establishment where food is manufactured, processed, or packed, the officer or employee making the inspection obtains a sample of any such food, and an analysis is made of such sample for the purpose of ascertaining whether such food consists in whole or in part of any filthy, putrid, or decomposed substance, or is otherwise unfit for food, a copy of the results of such analysis shall be furnished promptly to the owner, operator, or agent in charge.

Sec. 704(e) Every person required under section 519 or 520(g) to maintain records and every person who is in charge or custody of such records shall, upon request of an officer or employee designated by the Secretary, permit such officer or employee at all reasonable times to have access to and to copy and verify, such records.

Section 704 (f)(1) An accredited person described in paragraph (3) shall maintain records documenting the training qualifications of the person

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES

Food and Drug Administration
Baltimore District Office
Central Region
6000 Metro Drive, Suite 101
Baltimore, MD 21215
Telephone: (410) 779-5454
FAX: (410) 779-5707

FEI: 3001701623

March 23, 2010

Eminent Services Corporation
Attn: Dr. K. Paul Thadikonda,
Ph.D., President & CEO
7495 New Technology Way
Frederick, MD 21703

Dear Mr. Thadikonda,

We are enclosing a copy of the establishment inspection report (EIR) for the inspection conducted at your premises located at Eminent Services Corporation, 7495 New Technology Way, Frederick, MD 21703-9401 on January 13-15, 2010 by U.S. Food and Drug Administration (FDA). When the Agency concludes that an inspection is "closed", under 21 CFR 20.64(d) (3), it will release a copy of the EIR to the inspected establishment. This new procedure is applicable to the EIRs for inspections completed on or after April 1, 1997. For those inspections completed prior to April 1, 1997, a copy of the EIR may still be made available through the Freedom of Information Act (FOIA).

The Agency is working to make its regulatory process and activities more transparent to the regulated industry. Releasing this EIR to you is part of this effort. The copy being provided to you comprises the narrative portion of the report; it reflects redactions made by the Agency in accordance with the FOIA and Title 21, Code Federal Regulations, Part 20. This, however, does not preclude you from requesting, and possibly obtaining any additional information under the FOIA.

If there is any question about the released information, feel free to contact Randy Pack at (410) 779-5455 or write to: Food and Drug Administration, Attention: Randy Pack, 6000 Metro Drive, Ste. 101, Baltimore, MD 21215.

Sincerely,

Christine M Smith

Christine M. Smith
Director, Investigations Branch

Enclosure: Established Inspection Report

TABLE OF CONTENTS

SUMMARY (RCH)

This directed pre-approval inspection and abbreviated GMP inspection of Eminent Services Corporation, a human drug repackager and relabeler, was conducted in accordance with the BLT-DO FY10 work-plan. The pre-approval inspection was conducted following CP 7346.832, "Pre-Approval Inspections". The abbreviated GMP inspection was conducted following 21 CFR Part 211 with inspectional guidance provided by CPGM 7356.002, "Drug Manufacturing Inspections". Both inspections are being reported in FACTS under Assignment ID 5822618 and Operation ID 4585380, under the PAC codes 46832 (PAI) and 56002 (GMP).

The pre-approval inspection was requested by CDER Office of Compliance/Division of Manufacturing and Product Quality to review [redacted].

The GMP inspection covered the firm's one commercial drug product approved for sale and distribution in the US, [redacted].

The previous FDA inspection conducted March 7th and 9th, 2006 was a limited inspection. At the time of the inspection the firm was only performing operations for clinical trial drug products, including researching, manufacturing, repackaging, and relabeling. During the closeout meeting the FDA investigator informed Dr. Krupakar Paul Thadikonda, Ph.D., President & CEO, that given the nature of the firm's current operations, his drug registration would be changed to "voluntary". No FDA-483 was issued to the firm as a result of the inspection.

The current inspection focused solely on the firm's packaging and labeling operations; only the Packaging and Labeling and Quality Systems were covered. No FDA-483 was issued to the firm at the close of the meeting.

No samples were collected and no refusals were encountered.

ADMINISTRATIVE DATA (RCH)

Inspected firm:	Eminent Services Corporation
Location:	7495 New Technology Way Frederick, MD 21703-9401
Phone:	240-629-1972
FAX:	240-629-3298
Mailing address:	7495 New Technology Way Frederick, MD 21703
Email address	pthadikonda@emiserv.com
Website	www.emiserv.com
Dates of inspection:	1/13/2010, 1/14/2010, 1/15/2010
Days in the facility:	3
Participants:	Rachel C. Harrington, Investigator Merideth K. Rose, Investigator Olaide O. Akinmade, Investigator

I, Rachel C. Harrington, Investigator, Baltimore District Office, Merideth K. Rose, Investigator, Baltimore District Office, and Olaide O. Akinmade, Investigator, DFI, arrived at the firm, unannounced on January 13, 2010, presented our FDA credentials and issued an FDA 482, "Notice of Inspection," to Dr. Krupakar Paul Thadikonda, Ph.D., President & CEO **(See Attachment #1).**

Dr. Thadikonda stated he was the most responsible person at the firm. An opening meeting was held at the firm on January 13, 2010 with Dr. Thadikonda, Mr. Hemanth K. Sanagapti, MPharm, QA/QC Manager, and Mr. Arun R. Kantareddy, MCA, Vice President. I explained the purpose of our visit was to conduct a Pre-Approval Inspection for the on-site packaging and labeling operations for [redacted]) as well as a GMP inspection for any commercial products they handled. Dr. Thadikonda stated he had spoken to the BLT-DO Preapproval Manager in November and that they had been awaiting our visit.

On January 15, 2010 a closeout meeting was held with the following individuals present: Dr. Thadikonda, Mr. Sanagapti, Mr. Kantareddy, [redacted], Investigator Akinmade, and myself. No FDA-483 was issued as a result of the inspection, however, three items were verbally discussed at the firm **(See General Discussion with Management Section of this report).** During the meeting the firm management listed above were informed that based on the findings from the inspection a recommendation would be given to the BLT-DO Pre-Approval Manager for approval of the on-site operations associated with [redacted].

This report was written by Investigator Harrington (RCH), Investigator Rose (MKR), and Investigator Akinmade (OOA).

HISTORY (RCH)

The following information was provided to me by Dr. Thadikonda:

Eminent Services Corporation (herein after ESC) was established as an S-Corp in 1997 in Gaithersburg, MD. The goal of the firm was to provide companies with investigational drug management services. The firm expanded in 2000 and then moved to its current 57,000 sq. ft. location in Frederick, MD in 2002. Dr. Thadikonda provided us with a copy of the firm's site map **(See Exhibit #1).**

There have been no changes to major equipment or facilities since the last FDA inspection in 2006. The only major change to upper management since 2006 was the promotion of Mr. Sanagapti to QA/QC Manager in 2007.

ESC is currently registered in FACTS as a human drug warehouse and is listed as "not a workload obligation". I told Mr. Thadikonda that because his firm's operations now include commercial products when he renews his registration, which he stated he was in the process of doing so, he should change his registration to a human drug repackager and relabeler **(See General Discussion with Management Section of this Report, Item #1).** Dr. Thadikonda stated that as soon as he received his electronic signature he would register as a human drug repackager and relabeler. Dr.

Thadikonda provided a copy of a letter from the Office of Regional Operations dated January 5, 2010 showing that ESC had applied for electronic signatures **(See Exhibit #2).**

The firm's hours of operation are 8 A.M. to 5 P.M, Monday through Friday.

The firm's establishment size is 6.

There is no history of regulatory actions regarding this firm. There have been no recalls of commercial products since the last inspection.

Post-inspectional correspondence should be forwarded to:

Eminent Services Corporation
ATTN: Dr. K. Paul Thadikonda, Ph.D, President & CEO
7495 New Technology Way
Frederick, MD 21703

INTERSTATE COMMERCE (RCH)

Dr. Thadikonda stated the firm [redacted], for which they package and label commercial product. ECS ships the finished commercial product (currently only [redacted]) to the following two distributors on behalf of [redacted]:

[redacted]

Mr. Kantareddy estimated that 35% of packaged and labeled [redacted] is shipped to [redacted] and 65% is shopped to [redacted].

Dr. Thadikonda stated the same two distributors would be used for the [redacted] product when they start commercial operations. Mr. Kantareddy could not state the percentage of [redacted] product that would be shipped to each distributor, but believed it would be about the same.

JURISDICTION (RCH)

Dr. Thadikonda provided a list of all commercial products handled by ECS **(See Exhibit #3).** Currently, the firm handles only one commercial drug product (packaging and labeling only), [redacted] which is approved for sale and distribution in the US. Based on the definition provided in the Food, Drug, & Cosmetic Act this product is considered a human drug and is therefore under the jurisdiction of the FDA.

INDIVIDUAL RESPONSIBILITY AND PERSONS INTERVIEWED (RCH)

Dr. Krupakar Paul Thadikonda, President & CEO

Dr. Thadikonda stated he is the most responsible person at ESC. His responsibilities include, but are not limited to, the overall managing of the company, hiring and firing, public relations, internal quality, marketing, and business proposals. Dr. Thadikonda attended the opening and closing meetings and was available for questions during the inspection. Dr. Thadikonda has the duty, power, responsibility, and authority to prevent, detect, and correct violations. Investigator Rose, Investigator Akinmade, and I issued an FDA 482, "NOTICE OF INSPECTION", to Dr. Thadikonda on 01/13/10. Dr. Thadikonda provided pertinent information and records contained in this report.

Mr. Arun R. Kantareddy, MCA, Vice President

Mr. Kantareddy stated he joined the firm's IT department in 2001 working and was promoted to his current position as VP in 2006. His responsibilities include managing the overall operations and the IT department. Mr. Kantareddy stated he has the power and authority to hire and fire as well as the duty, power, responsibility, and authority to prevent, detect, and correct violations. Mr. Kantareddy reports directly to Dr. Thadikonda. He was present for the opening and closing meetings and was available throughout the inspection for questions. Mr. Kantareddy provided pertinent information and records contained in this report.

Mr. Hemanth K. Sanagapati, MPharm, QA/QC Manager

Dr. Thadikonda stated that Mr. Sanagapati has worked in the quality department for seven years and has held his current position since 2007. He is responsible for overseeing the Quality Control Department and has Eminent's final release on all finished products. Mr. Sanagapati does not have the power and authority to hire and fire. He report directly to Dr. Thadikonda. Mr. Sanagapati was present for the opening and closing meetings and was available throughout the inspection to answer questions. Mr. Sanagapati provided pertinent information and records contained in this report.

[redacted]

[redacted] is not an employee at ECS. She arrived from [redacted] on the second day of the inspection, 01/14/10, and was available to answer any questions related to [redacted]. [redacted] was present for the closing meeting and provided limited information contained in this report. I did not ask [redacted] what her responsibilities are.

Dr. Thadikonda provided us with a copy of the firm's Organizational Structure **(See Exhibit #4).**

FIRM'S TRAINING PROGRAM (OOA)

I reviewed Eminent Services Corporation's Training SOP (# 5050.04). Eminent requires each staff member to receive trainings, including in-house, specialty, cGMP, hands-on training, and SOP review. Dr. Thadikonda informed me that each employee is required to take annual cGMP training. The employees are also given training specific to their duty area.

Upon review of the staff training files, some of the trainings include cGMP and QA/QC. Employees also receive job specific training, SOP review, facility, general, specialized as well as investigational drug repository training.

I reviewed a selection of five staff members, which included employees working in QA/QC, Research and Packaging and Labeling. One of the employees reviewed was involved in a deviation (incidence) report. The staff members are identified by their initials: RY, JK, SK, AR and PJ.

All the staff members reviewed received initial SOP training, facility, and specialized training. They also received yearly cGMP training. However, PJ's file indicated that his initial training, which was done in December 2006, did not include cGMP training. He did not receive the initial cGMP training until 2008 and received additional cGMP training in 2009. Eminent's training program appears to be adequate.

MANUFACTURING/DESIGN OPERATIONS (RCH & MKR)

[redacted]

(RCH) On 01/13/10 Dr. Thadikonda guided Investigator Rose, Investigator Akinmade, and myself on a walk-through of the entire facility, including the Quality Area, Label Design and Printing Room, Pharmaceutical Lab, Repository/Warehouse, Manufacturing Suite (Tableting, Encapsulation, Blister-packing), Dispensing/ Weighing Area, Controlled Drugs Cage, Returns Area, Shipping/ Receiving Area, Walk-in Refrigerators/Freezers, Pack and Label Rooms 1 & 2, and Label Storage Room. The inspection focused solely on the areas where commercial drugs were (or would be) handled and therefore did not include the Pharmaceutical Lab, Manufacturing Suite (Tableting, Encapsulation, Blister-packing), Dispensing/ Weighing Area, and Controlled Drugs Cage.

(MKR) Dr. Thadikonda explained the same processes being used currently in the receipt, packaging, labeling and tracking of the approved and marketed product, [redacted], will be used for [redacted] He stated that the firm has not packaged any commercial batches of [redacted] I reviewed the receipt, packaging, labeling and tracking mechanisms for the [redacted] product as the process will mimic the process for [redacted]

(MKR) Receiving

Dr. Thadikonda walked Investigators Harrington, Akinmade and me through the receiving process. He stated [redacted] is received at the firms loading dock where the product label and quantity received is compared to the manifest. Once the inventory is complete the product is assigned a sample number and stored in one of two refrigerators (RT1 and RT2). At the time of receipt, or as soon as an Eminent employee is available, the product will be received into the Investigational Drug Management System (IDMS) system according to procedure 6001.05 "Incoming Shipment Receipt Procedure" (eff. 1/12/09, rev. 3). At the completion of inspection and upon entering the data into IDMS, a sample and inventory label is printed and affixed to the package. The information is reviewed by a supervisor and then filed until the product is sent for packaging.

Packaging components are received and inspected according to procedure 2003.06 "Packaging Components (Supplies) Inspection Procedure" (eff. 2/8/09, rev. 6). A Receiving Inspection Report for Packaging Supplies is used to document the receipt and physical inspection of the packaging supplies. An IDMS part number is assigned to all packaging supplies. A sampling plan is provided in procedure 2003.06 providing the number of units to sample to ensure product meets the approved specifications. *Note: I did not review the approved specifications for packaging components during this inspection.* A sample label is affixed to the packages and a supervisor will perform a final check of the packaging material prior to product packaging.

All primary packaging supplies are received under quarantine, sampled, reviewed and approved upon receipt then stored in a locked room. QA/QC is authorized to release the primary packaging and perform an inspection followed by placing a released seal on each container of the primary packaging with their initials and date.

(RCH) Packaging and labeling

On 1/14/10 Investigators Rose, Akinmade, and I observed a portion of the packaging and labeling of Eminent Lot# 2010B0034 for "Product: [redacted] with a quantity of 1500 cartons of Finished Product Lot# [redacted] **(See Exhibit #8).** During the process a total of five employees (one of which is the project manager) manually label the product and package it into cartons over the course of approximately 5 ½ hours. The batch was packaged in eight portions to ensure the product was never out of refrigeration for longer then four hours. The packaging/labeling process we observed is a follows:

Two employees pull the boxes containing product to be packaged from a specific refrigerator shelf, whose location is identified by the shelf ID# stated on the packing slip → The boxes are placed on a cart and opened in the refrigerator → the product is counted to ensure all product to be packaged and labeled in present → the boxes are retaped close and kept on a cart in the refrigerator → A second cart containing the batch records and labels/packaging materials are brought into the Pack & Label Room from the locked adjacent room → Room clearance and batch issuance is performed by QA → the cart with product is wheeled into the Pack & Label Room from the refrigerator → QA checks to make sure the lot# and sample ID # on all the boxes are correct → The cart is placed back into the

refrigerator → One box is taken into the room to be packaged and labeled → the first employee wipes the naked vial of any moisture → A second employee applies the label → A third employee does a visual inspection to ensure the label is straight and the vial lot #/exp date and [redacted] lot # are correct and then places the vial in the carton (which a 4th employee is folding together) with the instructions → A fifth employee (project manager) places the finished product into a cardboard tray → Once all vials in the box have been packaged and labels the box is brought back to the refrigerator and placed on a different shelf according to the shelf id # in the packing slip → A second box of naked vials is brought to the Pack & Label Room and the process starts anew → Once all 1500 vials have been packed and labeled they are placed back in the refridgerator → QA reconciles the number of leftover labels and cartons → All extra packaging/labeling materials are defaced and placed in the locked shred box.

I asked the project manager, Mr. Raghu Yaramolu, if the employees ever rotate positions over the course of the ~5 ½ hours. Mr. Yarmolu stated they do not. I inquired if he thought it would be difficult for the employee doing the 100% visual inspection to perform that task for multiple hours and he told me since the visual inspection is not the sole check of the lot # and expiration date he felt having the same person perform the task was acceptable. **(See General Discussion with Management Section of this Report, Item # 3).**

Labels and Labeling Control

(MKR) [redacted] the Associate Director and Global Supplier quality & Central Quality Assurance for [redacted] stated labels for bulk packaging are stored in a locked room. [redacted] only ships released components already inspected to Eminent. Upon receipt at Eminent the label is reinspected according to Eminent procedures and stored in a locked room. On 01/14/10 Investigators Harrington, Akinmade and I observed the label printing process for [redacted], exp 09/11. Dr. Thadikonda stated the label printing process is initiated once an approved label request with sample ID is received. The values are entered into the label printer. *Note: I did not document the name, lot number or calibration dates of the label printer used during this process.*

(RCH) Temperature Control

[redacted] stated that [redacted] has performed validation studies on the time the vials can be out of refrigerated temperatures and still be stable. Based on these studies [redacted] has identified 4 hours for the max ambient pack and label time and 1 hour for the max ambient incoming receipt and inspection time. The time out of refrigeration is recorded in the "TIME OUT AT AMBIENT LOG" portion of the batch record to ensure vials are not in the Pack & Label Room for more than pre-determined time limits. During the packaging and labeling of batch # 2010B0034 no vial was at ambient temperature for more than 34 minutes.

The temperature in the refrigerators is monitored at all times. If a refrigerator were to go outside the acceptable range of 2-8 °C an alarm would sound and a list of pre determined contact personal would be notified. Dr. Thadikonda provided a printout from the "FACILITY ENVIRONMENTAL MONITORING REPORT" for 01/13/2010 which shows the temperatures throughout the facility.

The refrigerators used to store commercial products are identified as "RTP1 and RTP2". QA reviews the daily monitoring report to ensure no out of range temperatures occurred without sounding the alarm.

(RCH) Equipment Qualification

I reviewed the equipment qualification No. EEQP0042 titled, "Embossing Machine (Custom Designed) Qualification Protocol" dated August 2, 2005. The firm performed an Installation Qualification (IQ), Operational Qualification (OQ), and Process Qualification (PQ) to ensure the debossing process for cartons used to package commercial drugs meet all required standards. A separate PQ was performed for each of their two commercial products, [redacted](Outside US) and [redacted] (US). The PQ was conducted several times for [redacted] because ESC's client, [redacted] was not satisfied with the debossing at 40 psi, 60 psi, or 75 psi. A final psi of 100 was determined to provide optimum clarity of the lot number and expiration date for the [redacted] product. Dr. Thadikonda stated that the same embossing machine will be used for the [redacted] product. [redacted] stated that [redacted] will request that Eminent perform a PQ on the debossing of the carton used for the [redacted] product once the final packaging has been determined. No deficiencies were noted during review of the IQ, OQ, or PQ documentation for [redacted]

(RCH) Validation

No process validation activities had been done at the time of the inspection for [redacted] However, [redacted] stated that [redacted] will be contracting out the validation studies for the packaging configuration to Nomadic, who supplies the packaging materials, once the final packaging configuration has been determined. Dr. Thadikonda stated that they are planning to perform the validation for the labeling equipment as soon as the final packaging has been determined.

(RCH) Stability

Stability for [redacted] is the responsibility of [redacted]. No stability for the product will be done by ESC.

GMP Inspection - [redacted]

Quality System

(RCH) Deviations/Incidents

I reviewed the firm's SOP titled, "Deviation/Incident Report Processing" prepared 07 Jan 2009 and approved 02/08/09. Dr. Thadikonda provided a list of all Deviations/Incidents for the period of 01/01/2008 thru 12/31/2009 **(See Exhibit #6).** The commercial products are indicated by a check mark. I reviewed the following deviation/incident reports that involved a commercial product sold in the US:

ID# 2008D0018 dated 03/19/2008
ID# 2008D0049 dated 10/03/2008
ID# 2008D0061 dated 12/24/2008
ID# 2009D0040 dated 07/28/2009

I did not observe any deficiencies in the deviation/incident reports I reviewed.

(RCH) Change Control

Dr. Thadikonda provided a list of all "[redacted]Labeling and Packaging Approved Change Controls 2006 – Present" **(See Exhibit # 7)**. I did not have any objections to the change controls.

(MKR) I reviewed the contract agreement between [redacted] and Eminent Services Corp. dated 4/11/08 document number TA-016-01. The contract states [redacted] is responsible for the final product review for commercial supplies; special storage and distribution of products; notifying Eminent within 2 days of receipt of a complaint; the recall of products with the corporation of Eminent Services. Eminent is required to notify [redacted] of deviations and/or investigations as they relate to product labeling and/or packaging and to notify [redacted] of complaints within one day of occurrence.

Packaging and Labeling System

Batch Records

(RCH) Dr. Thadikonda provided us with a list of all production batches for the packaging and labeling of [redacted] for the period between 01/01/2008 and 12/31/2009 **(See Exhibit #5).** I reviewed the following Packaging and Labeling Batch Records:

EMINENT BR # 2008B0029
EMINENT BR # 2008B0678
EMINENT BR # 2008B0120
EMINENT BR # 2008B0234
EMINENT BR # 2008B0319
EMINENT BR # 2008B0486
EMINENT BR # 2008B0846
EMINENT BR # 2009B0243
EMINENT BR # 2009B0447
EMINENT BR # 2009B0723

EMINENT BR # 2009B0777

(RCH) I observed in Batch Record 2008B0678 that the component '[redacted]' with Eminent ID #s 0011-2212 and 0011-2213 were combined when packaging and labeling the batch. I asked Dr. Thadikonda if the firm ever combines different lots received from [redacted] under one Eminent Lot #. Dr. Thadikonda stated the firm never combines different lot numbers into one batch, however, sometimes the same lot from [redacted] will arrive on two different trucks and therefore the same [redacted] lot could receive two different Eminent ID #s. I verified that Eminent ID #0011-2212 and 0011-2213 both had the same [redacted] by reviewing the receiving documents in the firm's Investigational Drug Management System.

MANUFACTURING CODES

Eminent Manufacturing Codes

All documented operations at ECS are given a unique identifying code, including Packaging/Labeling Batch Records, Deviation Reports, Client Complaints, Outgoing Shipments, and Incoming Receipts. The basis for the codes is as follows:

Four digit year – capital letter indicating type of operation – sequential event

Examples:
2009B234 = 234th Packaging/Labeling Batch Record created at ECS in 2009
2008C012 = 12th Client Complaint received at ECS in 2008

The firm combines all products (commercial and clinical) when sequentially numbering their packaging/labeling batch records.

Letter Indicating Codes:
B = Packaging/Labeling Batch Record
D = Deviation
C = Complaint
S = Shipped
R = Received

Sample ID # generated by IDMS (Investigational Drug Management System):

Client # - Sequential Item received for that Client

Example:
0011-2841 = 2,841st item received at ECS through their IDMS system for the client [redacted].

[redacted] *Manufacturing Codes:*

Example lot #: [redacted]

I did not ask the firm to explain the [redacted] manufacturing code system.

Change Control Numbers

Letter "C" - two digit year - sequential # change

Example:
C06-008 = 8th change that occurred in 2006

COMPLAINTS (MKR)

The firm received three complaints on [redacted] since the last inspection. I reviewed all three of the complaints and had no objectionable observations.

2009C0005 received 5/26/09 regarding a batch record not sent to [redacted] for the final approval on the release of a product. The batch record release was delayed as a result. A CAPA was initiated to include the timeliness in the batch release process.

2009C007 received 9/09/09 regarding a shipment time excursion observed during transit. [redacted] stated [redacted] the firm's carrier services, entered into the computer the time the call was received that the product was going to be shipped, rather than the time the product actually shipped, which was two days later. The product was shipped [redacted]

2009C009 received 11/10/09 regarding shipment 2009S3806 airline inadvertently sent shipment to [redacted]. The product was returned to Eminent and was within temperature parameters upon receipt. The shipment was returned to stock. I questioned [redacted] what reassurance the firm had that the product did not deviate from acceptable temperature range while in transit. I noted the shipper was qualified for 122 hours however the shipment was in transit for 7 days. [redacted] stated the airlines are instructed to refrigerate the product between 2 – 8°C. The product was received at Eminent at 4°C.

RECALL PROCEDURES (RCH)

Dr. Thadikonda stated the firm has never had to perform a recall on a commercial product. I reviewed ECS's formal written recall procedure outlined in SOP No.:6013.05 titled, "DRUG PRODUCT RECALLS" dated 13 Jan 2009. The SOP states under part V, "Procedure:", "When a client's product is noted to expire in three (3) months (or a designated time period provided by the client) the client will be notified. Pending approval from the client, EMINENT will then generate an Investigational Drug Recall Notice to be sent to all sites involved by either a mass mailing or fax." I asked Dr. Thadikonda if he would be applying this recall procedure to commercial products. He told me they would not recall commercial products when they were noted to expire in three months. He stated that this only applies to clinical trial drug products. The SOP for Commercial Operations states in the event of a product recall "[redacted] will manage any product recall and Eminent shall follow [redacted] instructions and Eminent SOP# 6013 for quarantine, return, and reconciliation". I explained to Dr. Thadikonda that if the firm plans to use SOP# 6013 for commercial recalls it should be clear as to the proper procedure to be used in a commercial product recall as opposed to a clinical trial product recall. Dr. Thadikonda acknowledged the observation and stated he would have the recall SOP updated **(See General Discussion with Management Section of this Report, Item # 2).**

OBJECTIONABLE CONDITIONS AND MANAGEMENT'S RESPONSE (RCH)

No FDA-483 was issued as a result of this inspection.

REFUSALS

No refusals were encountered during this inspection.

GENERAL DISCUSSION WITH MANAGEMENT (RCH)

On 01/15/10 Investigator Akinmade and I held a closeout meeting with the following individuals present: Dr. Thadikonda, Mr. Sanagapti, Mr. Kantareddy, and [redacted]. Investigator Rose was not present during the closeout meeting.

No FDA-483, "Objectionable Conditions" was issued to the firm as a result of this inspection; however, the following three items were verbally discussed with the firm:

1. *Registration as a Human Drug Repacker/Relabeler.* I told Dr. Thadikonda that when he renews his registration with FDA, which he previously stated would occur sometime in the

next few weeks, he needs to change his status from "drug warehouse" to "human drug repacker/relabeler". Additionally, I explained to Dr. Thadikonda that if the firm ever starts to perform other operations for commercial products, such as manufacturing, he would need to again update his registration to reflect these changes. Dr. Thadikonda stated that as soon as he received his electronic signature he would register as a repacker and relabeler.

2. *Update Recall SOP.* I explained to the firm management that now that his firm is handling commercial drug products, and not just clinical trial drug products, the SOPs should be updated to reflect this. Specifically, the Recall SOP should outline how the firm would handle a commercial product recall since it is different then for a clinical trial product, which is recalled when it is within 3 months of its expiry date. Dr. Thadikonda acknowledged the observation and stated he would have the Recall SOP updated.
3. *Rotation of employees during packaging/labeling.* I told the firm management that they may want to consider rotating the employee who performs 100% visual inspection throughout the ~ 5 ½ hour packaging/labeling process, since the task could be difficult for some to perform for long periods of time. Dr. Thadikonda acknowledged the observation and stated he will look into the process to see if it could be improved.

I informed the firm management listed above that based on the findings from the inspection I would be putting in a recommendation to the BLT-DO Pre-Approval Manager for approval of the on-site operations associated with [redacted] However, I explained that the final decision for approval of the drug application would be made by the CDER (Center for Drugs Evaluation and Research).

ADDITIONAL INFORMATION

N/A

SAMPLES COLLECTED

No samples were collected during this inspection.

VOLUNTARY CORRECTIONS

No FDA-483 was issued during the previous inspection in March 2006.

EXHIBITS COLLECTED

1. Copy of firm site map (1 page).
2. Copy of letter from the Office of Regional Operations dated January 5, 2010 showing that ESC had applied for electronic signatures (1 page).
3. List of all "Commercial Product Handled" by ESC (1 page).
4. Copy of Eminent Services Corporation Organizational Chart (1 page).
5. Copy of a list of all production batches for the packaging and labeling of [redacted] for the period between 01/01/2008 and 12/31/2009 (3 pages).
6. Copy of a list of all Deviations/Incidents for the period of 01/01/2008 thru 12/31/2009 (2 pages).
7. Copy of [redacted] Labeling and Packaging Approved Change Controls 2006 – Present (1 page).
8. Copy of Packaging/Labeling Batch Record for Eminent Lot# 2010B0034 dated 01/12/10 (24 pages).
9. Copy of Facility Environmental Monitoring Report for 01/13/10 (2 pages).

ATTACHMENTS

1. FDA-482, "Notice of Inspection" issued to Krupakar Paul Thadikonda, Ph.D., President & CEO on 1/13/10 (1 page).
2. FDA CDER EES Request for Inspection Report (3 pages).
3. OEI Checklist (2 pages).

Rachel C. Harrington, Investigator

Merideth K. Rose, Investigator

Olaide O. Akinmade, Investigator