

GAO

Testimony

Before the Subcommittee on Health,
Committee on Energy and Commerce,
House of Representatives

For Release on Delivery
Expected at 10:00 a.m. EDT
May 9, 2007

DRUG SAFETY

Further Actions Needed to Improve FDA's Postmarket Decision-making Process

Statement of Marcia Crosse
Director, Health Care





Highlights of [GAO-07-856T](#), a testimony before the Subcommittee on Health, Committee on Energy and Commerce, House of Representatives

Why GAO Did This Study

In 2004, several high-profile drug safety cases raised concerns about the Food and Drug Administration's (FDA) ability to manage postmarket drug safety issues. In some cases there were disagreements within FDA about how to address these issues.

GAO was asked to testify on FDA's oversight of drug safety. This testimony is based on *Drug Safety: Improvement Needed in FDA's Postmarket Decision-making and Oversight Process*, [GAO-06-402](#) (Mar. 31, 2006). The report focused on the complex interaction between two offices within FDA that are involved in postmarket drug safety activities: the Office of New Drugs (OND), and the Office of Drug Safety (ODS). OND's primary responsibility is to review new drug applications, but it is also involved in monitoring the safety of marketed drugs. ODS is focused primarily on postmarket drug safety issues. ODS is now called the Office of Surveillance and Epidemiology.

For its report, GAO reviewed FDA policies, interviewed FDA staff, and conducted case studies of four drugs with safety issues: Arava, Baycol, Bextra, and Propulsid. To gather information on FDA's initiatives since March 2006 to improve its decision-making process for this testimony, GAO interviewed FDA officials in February and March 2007, and received updated information from FDA in May 2007.

www.gao.gov/cgi-bin/getrpt?GAO-07-856T.

To view the full product, including the scope and methodology, click on the link above. For more information, contact Marcia Crosse, (202) 512-7119, crossem@gao.gov.

DRUG SAFETY

Further Actions Needed to Improve FDA's Postmarket Decision-making Process

What GAO Found

In its March 2006 report, GAO found that FDA lacked clear and effective processes for making decisions about, and providing management oversight of, postmarket drug safety issues. There was a lack of clarity about how decisions were made and about organizational roles, insufficient oversight by management, and data constraints. GAO observed that there was a lack of criteria for determining what safety actions to take and when to take them. Insufficient communication between ODS and OND hindered the decision-making process. ODS management did not systematically track information about ongoing postmarket safety issues, including the recommendations that ODS staff made for safety actions. GAO also found that FDA faced data constraints that contributed to the difficulty in making postmarket safety decisions. GAO found that FDA's access to data was constrained by both its limited authority to require drug sponsors to conduct postmarket studies and its limited resources for acquiring data from other external sources.

During the course of GAO's work for its March 2006 report, FDA began a variety of initiatives to improve its postmarket drug safety decision-making process, including the establishment of the Drug Safety Oversight Board. FDA also commissioned the Institute of Medicine to examine the drug safety system, including FDA's oversight of postmarket drug safety. GAO recommended in its March 2006 report that FDA take four steps to improve its decision-making process for postmarket safety. GAO recommended that FDA revise and implement its draft policy on the decision-making process for major postmarket safety actions, improve its process to resolve disagreements over safety decisions, clarify ODS's role in scientific advisory committees, and systematically track postmarket drug safety issues. FDA has initiatives underway and under consideration and that, if implemented, could address three of GAO's four recommendations. In the 2006 report GAO also suggested that Congress consider expanding FDA's authority to require drug sponsors to conduct postmarket studies, as needed, to collect additional data on drug safety concerns.

Mr. Chairman and Members of the Subcommittee,

I am pleased to be here today as you examine the safety of our nation's drug supply. In 2004, several high-profile drug safety cases raised concerns about the Food and Drug Administration's (FDA) ability to manage postmarket drug safety issues. Those cases showed that there were disagreements and potential delays within FDA about how to address serious safety problems. My remarks today are based on GAO's March 2006 report on FDA's postmarket decision-making process (*Drug Safety: Improvement Needed in FDA's Postmarket Decision-making and Oversight Process*, [GAO-06-402](#)). I will also discuss a number of FDA's initiatives to improve its decision-making process, including some that respond to the recommendations we made in that report.¹

In carrying out the work for our report between December 2004 and March 2006, we focused on two offices within FDA's Center for Drug Evaluation and Research (CDER) that are involved in postmarket drug safety activities: the Office of New Drugs (OND) and the Office of Drug Safety (ODS).² While there is some overlap in the activities of OND and ODS, they have different organizational characteristics and perspectives on postmarket drug safety. OND is involved in postmarket drug safety activities as one aspect of its larger responsibility to review new drug applications, and it has the ultimate responsibility to take regulatory action concerning the postmarket safety of drugs. ODS is primarily focused on postmarket drug safety, which includes the review of reports of adverse reactions to drugs. ODS operates primarily in a consultant capacity to OND and does not have any independent decision-making responsibility.

For our report, we interviewed ODS, OND, and other CDER managers and staff, as well as drug safety experts from outside FDA. We also analyzed documents describing internal FDA policies and procedures. In order to obtain an in-depth understanding of FDA's policies and procedures, we conducted case studies of four drugs—Arava, Baycol, Bextra, and

¹The report is available online at www.gao.gov/cgi-bin/getrpt?GAO-06-402. See Related GAO Products at the end of this statement for other GAO reports about FDA's oversight of prescription drugs.

²ODS was renamed the Office of Surveillance and Epidemiology in May 2006. For the purposes of this testimony, we are referring to this office by its former name.

Propulsid—that help to illustrate the decision-making process.³ Each of these drugs presented significant postmarket safety issues that FDA acted upon in recent years, and they reflect differences in the type of adverse event or potential safety problem associated with each drug, the safety actions taken, and the OND and ODS staff involved. To follow up with FDA about its responses to our recommendations and its initiatives to improve its postmarket safety decision-making process, we interviewed four FDA managers, including CDER’s Associate Director for Safety Policy and Communication, in February and March 2007, and received updated information from FDA in May 2007. We did not evaluate the effectiveness of FDA’s efforts to respond to our recommendations. All of our work was conducted in accordance with generally accepted government auditing standards.

In summary, we found that FDA lacked a clear and effective process for making decisions about, and providing management oversight of, postmarket drug safety issues. There was a lack of clarity about how decisions were made and about organizational roles, insufficient oversight by management, and data constraints. We observed that there was a lack of criteria for determining what safety actions to take and when to take them, which likely contributed to disagreements over decisions about postmarket safety. Insufficient communication between ODS and OND’s divisions was an ongoing concern and hindered the decision-making process. For example, ODS did not always know how OND had responded to ODS’s safety analyses and recommendations. ODS management did not systematically track information about the recommendations its staff made and OND’s response. This limited the ability of ODS management to provide effective oversight so that FDA could ensure that safety concerns were addressed and resolved in a timely manner. FDA has faced data constraints that contributed to the difficulty in making postmarket safety decisions. In the absence of specific authority to require drug sponsors to conduct postmarket studies, FDA has often relied on drug sponsors voluntarily agreeing to conduct these studies. However, these studies have not consistently been completed. FDA has also had limited available resources to obtain data from outside sources.

³FDA approved Arava to treat arthritis; Baycol to treat high cholesterol; Propulsid to treat nighttime heartburn; and Bextra to relieve pain. Baycol, Bextra, and Propulsid have since been withdrawn from the market (in August 2001, April 2005, and March 2000, respectively), and the warnings on Arava’s label were strengthened.

FDA has undertaken a variety of initiatives to improve its postmarket drug safety decision-making process. Prior to the completion of our report in March 2006, FDA commissioned the Institute of Medicine (IOM) to examine the drug safety system, including FDA's oversight of postmarket drug safety. FDA also established the Drug Safety Oversight Board in CDER and made other internal changes. Since March 2006, FDA has continued to address its oversight and decision-making shortcomings. In January 2007, FDA issued a detailed response to IOM's recommendations. In our 2006 report, we recommended that FDA revise and implement its draft policy on the decision-making process for major postmarket safety actions, improve its process to resolve disagreements over safety decisions, clarify ODS's role in scientific advisory committees, and systematically track postmarket drug safety issues. FDA has since begun to implement initiatives that we believe could address the goals of three of the four recommendations in our 2006 report. FDA has made revisions to, but not finalized, its draft policy on major postmarket drug safety decisions. FDA has not improved its process to resolve disagreements over safety decisions, and the agency is developing but has not finalized guidance to clarify ODS's role in scientific advisory committees. FDA is in the process of implementing a tracking system.

Background

Because no drug is absolutely safe, FDA approves a drug for marketing when the agency judges that its known benefits outweigh its known risks. After a drug is on the market, FDA continues to assess its risks and benefits. FDA reviews reports of adverse drug reactions (adverse events)⁴ related to the drug and information from clinical studies about the drug that are conducted by the drug's sponsor. FDA also reviews adverse events from studies that follow the use of drugs in ongoing medical care (observational studies)⁵ that are carried out by the drug's sponsor, FDA, or other researchers. If FDA has information that a drug on the market may pose a significant health risk to consumers, it weighs the effect of the adverse events against the benefit of the drug to determine what actions, if any, are warranted.

⁴Adverse event is the term used by FDA to refer to any untoward medical event associated with the use of a drug in humans.

⁵Observational studies can provide information about the association between certain drug exposures and adverse events. In observational studies, the investigator does not control the therapy, but observes and evaluates ongoing medical care. In contrast, in clinical trials the investigator controls the therapy to be received by participants and can test for causal relationships.

The decision-making process for postmarket drug safety is complex, involving input from a variety of FDA staff and organizational units and information sources, but the central focus of the process is the iterative interaction between OND and ODS. OND is a much larger office than ODS. In fiscal year 2005, OND had 715 staff and expenditures of \$110.6 million. More than half of OND's expenditures in fiscal year 2005, or \$57.2 million, came from user fees paid by drug sponsors under the Prescription Drug User Fee Amendments of 2002.⁶ ODS had 106 staff in fiscal year 2005 and expenditures of \$26.9 million, with \$7.6 million from prescription drug user fees.

After a drug is on the market, OND staff receive information about safety issues in several ways. First, OND staff receive notification of adverse event reports for drugs to which they are assigned and they review the periodic adverse event reports that are submitted by drug sponsors.⁷ Second, OND staff review safety information that is submitted to FDA when a sponsor seeks approval for a new use or formulation of a drug, and monitor completion of postmarket studies. When consulting with OND on a safety issue, ODS staff search for all relevant case reports of adverse events and assess them to determine whether or not the drug caused the adverse event and whether there are any common trends or risk factors. ODS staff might also use information from observational studies and drug use analyses to analyze the safety issue. When completed, ODS staff summarize their analysis in a written consult. According to FDA officials, OND staff within the review divisions usually decide what regulatory action should occur, if any, by considering the results of the safety analysis in the context of other factors such as the availability of other similar drugs and the severity of the condition the drug is designed to treat. Then, if necessary, OND staff make a decision about what action should be taken.

Several CDER staff, including staff from OND and ODS, told us that most of the time there is agreement within FDA about what safety actions should be taken. At other times, however, OND and ODS staff disagree about whether the postmarket data are adequate to establish the existence of a safety problem or support a recommended regulatory action. In those

⁶Pub. L. No. 107-188 § 501 et. seq., 116 Stat. 687.

⁷Health care providers and patients can voluntarily submit adverse event reports to FDA. Adverse event reports become part of FDA's computerized database known as the Adverse Event Reporting System.

cases, OND staff sometimes request additional analyses by ODS and sometimes there is involvement from other FDA organizations. In some cases, OND seeks the advice of FDA's scientific advisory committees, which are composed of experts and consumer representatives from outside FDA.⁸ In 2002, FDA established the Drug Safety and Risk Management Advisory Committee, 1 of the 16 human-drug-related scientific advisory committees, to specifically advise FDA on drug safety and risk management issues. The recommendations of the advisory committees do not bind the agency to any decision.

FDA has the authority to withdraw the approval of a drug on the market for safety-related and other reasons, although it rarely does so.⁹ In almost all cases of drug withdrawals for safety reasons, the drug's sponsor has voluntarily removed the drug from the market. For example, in 2001 Baycol's sponsor voluntarily withdrew the drug from the market after meeting with FDA to discuss reports of adverse events, including some reports of fatalities.¹⁰ FDA does not have explicit authority to require that drug sponsors take other safety actions; however, when FDA identifies a potential problem, sponsors generally negotiate with FDA to develop a mutually agreeable remedy to avoid other regulatory action. Negotiations may result in revised drug labeling or restricted distribution. FDA has limited authority to require that sponsors conduct postmarket safety studies.

⁸These committees are either mandated by legislation or are established at the discretion of the Department of Health and Human Services (HHS).

⁹21 U.S.C. § 355(e). FDA may propose withdrawal when, for example, it determines through experience, tests, or other data that a drug is unsafe under the conditions of use approved in its application, there is a lack of substantial evidence that the drug will have the effect that it purports to have or that is suggested in its labeling, or required patent information is not timely filed. Prior to withdrawal, FDA would need to notify the affected parties and provide an opportunity for a hearing. Approval may be suspended immediately, prior to a hearing, if the Secretary of Health and Human Services finds that continued marketing of a particular drug constitutes an imminent hazard to the public health.

¹⁰At this meeting FDA communicated to the sponsor that it was considering proceeding with a withdrawal of the highest dose of Baycol because of its increased risk for a severe adverse event involving the breakdown of muscle fibers.

FDA Lacked a Clear and Effective Decision-making Process for Postmarket Drug Safety

In our March 2006 report, we found that FDA's postmarket drug safety decision-making process was limited by a lack of clarity, insufficient oversight by management, and data constraints. We observed that there was a lack of established criteria for determining what safety actions to take and when, and aspects of ODS's role in the process were unclear. A lack of communication between ODS and OND's review divisions and limited oversight of postmarket drug safety issues by ODS management hindered the decision-making process. FDA's decisions regarding postmarket drug safety have also been made more difficult by the constraints it faces in obtaining data.

Decision-making Process on Drug Safety Lacked Clarity about Criteria for Action and the Role of ODS

While acknowledging the complexity of the postmarket drug safety decision-making process, we found through our interviews with OND and ODS staff and in our case studies that the process lacked clarity about how drug safety decisions were made and about the role of ODS. If FDA had established criteria for determining what safety actions to take and when, then some of the disagreements we observed in our case studies might have been resolved more quickly. In the absence of established criteria, several FDA officials told us that decisions about safety actions were often based on the case-by-case judgments of the individuals reviewing the data. Our observations were consistent with two previous internal FDA reports on the agency's internal deliberations regarding Propulsid and the diabetes drug Rezulin.¹¹ In those reviews FDA indicated that an absence of established criteria for determining what safety actions to take, and when to take them, posed a challenge for making postmarket drug safety decisions.

We also found that ODS's role in scientific advisory committee meetings was unclear. According to the OND Director, OND is responsible for setting the agenda for the advisory committee meetings, with the exception of the Drug Safety and Risk Management Advisory Committee.¹² This includes who is to present and what issues will be discussed by the advisory committees. For the advisory committees (other than the Drug Safety and Risk Management Advisory Committee) it was unclear when ODS staff would participate.

¹¹Rezulin was removed from the market in 2000 because of its risk for liver toxicity.

¹²ODS is responsible for setting the agenda for meetings of the Drug Safety and Risk Management Advisory Committee.

A Lack of Communication and Limited Oversight Hindered the Decision-making Process

A lack of communication between ODS and OND's review divisions and limited oversight of postmarket drug safety issues by ODS management also hindered the decision-making process. ODS and OND staff often described their relationship with each other as generally collaborative, with effective communication, but both ODS and OND staff told us that there had been communication problems on some occasions, and that this had been an ongoing concern. For example, according to some ODS staff, OND did not always adequately communicate the key question or point of interest to ODS when it requested a consult, and as ODS worked on the consult there was sometimes little interaction between the two offices. After a consult was completed and sent to OND, ODS staff reported that OND sometimes did not respond in a timely manner or at all. Several ODS staff characterized this as consults falling into a "black hole" or "abyss." OND's Director told us that OND staff probably do not "close the loop" in responding to ODS's consults, which includes explaining why certain ODS recommendations were not followed. In some cases CDER managers and OND staff criticized the methods used in ODS consults and told us that the consults were too lengthy and academic.

ODS management had not effectively overseen postmarket drug safety issues, and as a result, it was unclear how FDA could know that important safety concerns had been addressed and resolved in a timely manner. A former ODS Director told us that the small size of ODS's management team presented a challenge for effective oversight of postmarket drug safety issues. Another problem was the lack of systematic information on drug safety issues. According to the ODS Director, ODS maintained a database of consults that provided some information about the consults that ODS staff conducted, but it did not include information about whether ODS staff made recommendations for safety actions and how the safety issues were handled and resolved, such as whether recommended safety actions were implemented by OND.

Data Constraints Have Contributed to Difficulty in Making Postmarket Safety Decisions

Data constraints—such as weaknesses in data sources and FDA's limited ability to require certain studies and obtain additional data—have contributed to FDA's difficulty in making postmarket drug safety decisions. OND and ODS have used three different sources of data to make postmarket drug safety decisions, including adverse event reports, clinical trial studies, and observational studies. While data from each source have weaknesses that have contributed to the difficulty in making postmarket drug safety decisions, evidence from more than one source can help inform the postmarket decision-making process. The availability of these data sources has been constrained, however, because of FDA's

limited authority to require drug sponsors to conduct postmarket studies and its resources.

While decisions about postmarket drug safety have often been based on adverse event reports, FDA cannot establish the true frequency of adverse events in the population with data from adverse event reports. The inability to calculate the true frequency makes it hard to establish the magnitude of a safety problem, and comparisons of risks across similar drugs are difficult.¹³ In addition, it is difficult to attribute adverse events to particular drugs when there is a relatively high incidence rate in the population for the medical condition. It is also difficult to attribute adverse events to the use of particular drugs because data from adverse event reports may have been confounded by other factors, such as other drug exposures.

FDA can also use available data from clinical trials and observational studies to support postmarket drug safety decisions. Although each source presents weaknesses that constrain the usefulness of the data provided, having data from more than one source can help improve FDA's decision-making ability. Clinical trials, in particular randomized clinical trials, are considered the "gold standard" for assessing evidence about efficacy and safety because they are considered the strongest method by which one can determine whether new drugs work.¹⁴ However, clinical trials also have weaknesses. Clinical trials typically have too few enrolled patients to detect serious adverse events associated with a drug that occur relatively infrequently in the population being studied. They are usually carried out on homogenous populations of patients that often do not reflect the types of patients who will actually take the drugs. For example, they do not often include those who have other medical problems or take other medications. In addition, clinical trials are often too short in duration to identify adverse events that may occur only after long use of the drug. This is particularly important for drugs used to treat chronic conditions where patients are taking the medications for the long term. Observational

¹³This is due, in part, to the underreporting of adverse events and inconsistency in how those reporting define cases. These limitations have been reported elsewhere. See, for example, D. J. Graham, P. C. Waller, and X. Kurz, "A View from Regulatory Agencies," in Brian L. Strom, ed., *Pharmacoepidemiology* (Chichester: John Wiley & Sons, Ltd., 2000), pp. 109–124.

¹⁴In these trials, patients are randomly assigned to either receive the drug or a different treatment, and differences in results between the two groups can typically be attributed to the drug.

studies, which use data obtained from population-based sources, can provide FDA with information about the population effect and risk associated with the use of a particular drug.

We have found that FDA's access to postmarket clinical trial and observational data is limited by its authority and available resources. FDA does not have broad authority to require that a drug sponsor conduct an observational study or clinical trial for the purpose of investigating a specific postmarket safety concern. One senior FDA official and several outside drug safety experts told us that FDA needs greater authority to require such studies. Long-term clinical trials may be needed to answer safety questions about risks associated with the long-term use of drugs. For example, during a February 2005 scientific advisory committee meeting, some FDA staff and committee members indicated that there was a need for better information on the long-term use of anti-inflammatory drugs and discussed how a long-term trial might be designed to study the cardiovascular risks associated with the use of these drugs.¹⁵

Lacking specific authority to require drug sponsors to conduct postmarket studies, FDA has often relied on drug sponsors voluntarily agreeing to conduct these studies. But the postmarket studies that drug sponsors have agreed to conduct have not consistently been completed. One study estimated that the completion rate of postmarket studies, including those that sponsors had voluntarily agreed to conduct, rose from 17 percent in the mid-1980s to 24 percent between 1991 and 2003.¹⁶ FDA has little leverage to ensure that these studies are carried out.

In terms of resource limitations, several FDA staff (including CDER managers) and outside drug safety experts told us that in the past ODS has not had enough resources for cooperative agreements to support its postmarket drug surveillance program. Under the cooperative agreement program, FDA collaborated with outside researchers in order to access a wide range of population-based data and conduct research on drug safety. Annual funding for this program was less than \$1 million from fiscal year

¹⁵This was a joint meeting of the Arthritis Advisory Committee and the Drug Safety and Risk Management Advisory Committee.

¹⁶Postmarket studies for approved drugs and biologics are included in the percent calculations. See: Tufts Center for the Study of Drug Development, Kenneth I. Kaitin, ed., "FDA Requested Postmarketing Studies in 73% of Recent New Drug Approvals," *Impact Report: Analysis and Insight into Critical Drug Development Issues*, vol. 6, no. 4 (2004).

2002 through fiscal year 2005. In 2006, FDA awarded four contracts for a total cost of \$1.6 million per year to replace the cooperative agreements.

FDA's Initiatives to Improve Postmarket Drug Safety Decision Making

Prior to the completion of our March 2006 report, FDA began several initiatives to improve its postmarket drug safety decision-making process. Most prominently, FDA commissioned the IOM to convene a committee of experts to assess the current system for evaluating postmarket drug safety, including FDA's oversight of postmarket safety and its processes. IOM issued its report in September 2006.¹⁷ FDA also had underway several organizational changes that we discussed in our 2006 report. For example, FDA established the Drug Safety Oversight Board to help provide oversight and advice to the CDER Director on the management of important safety issues. The board is involved with ensuring that broader safety issues, such as ongoing delays in changing a label, are effectively resolved. FDA also drafted a policy that was designed to ensure that all major postmarket safety recommendations would be discussed by involved OND and ODS managers, beginning at the division level, and documented.¹⁸ FDA implemented a pilot program for dispute resolution that is designed for individual CDER staff to have their views heard when they disagree with a decision that could have a significant negative effect on public health. Because the CDER Director is involved in determining whether the process will be initiated, appoints a panel chair to review the case, and makes the final decision on how the dispute should be resolved, we found that the pilot program does not offer CDER staff an independent forum for resolving disputes. FDA also began to explore ways to access additional data sources that it can obtain under its current authority, such as data on Medicare beneficiaries' experience with prescription drugs covered under the prescription drug benefit.¹⁹

¹⁷A. Baciú, K. Stratton, and S. P. Burke, eds., Institute of Medicine of the National Academies, Committee on the Assessment of the U.S. Drug Safety System, *The Future of Drug Safety: Promoting and Protecting the Health of the Public* (Washington, D.C.: Sept. 22, 2006).

¹⁸The draft policy is entitled "Process for Decision-Making Regarding Major Postmarketing Safety-Related Actions."

¹⁹In October 2006, the Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services published a proposed rule that would, when finalized, facilitate access by FDA and others to information about prescription drugs covered by Medicare. See 71 Fed. Reg. 61445 (Oct. 18, 2006).

Since our report, FDA has made efforts to improve its postmarket safety decision-making and oversight process. In its written response to the IOM recommendations, FDA agreed with the goal of many of the recommendations made by GAO and IOM.²⁰ In that response, FDA stated that it would take steps to improve the “culture of safety” in CDER, reduce tension between preapproval and postapproval staff, clarify the roles and responsibilities of pre- and postmarket staff, and improve methods for resolving scientific disagreements.

FDA has also begun several initiatives since our March 2006 report that we believe could address three of our four recommendations. Because none of these initiatives were fully implemented as of May 2007, it was too early to evaluate their effectiveness.

- To make the postmarket safety decision-making process clearer and more effective, we recommended that FDA revise and implement its draft policy on major postmarket drug safety decisions. CDER has made revisions to the draft policy, but has not yet finalized and implemented it. CDER’s Associate Director for Safety Policy and Communication told us that the draft policy provides guidance for making major postmarket safety decisions, including identifying the decision-making officials for safety actions and ensuring that the views of involved FDA staff are documented. According to the Associate Director, the revised draft does not now discuss decisions for more limited safety actions, such as adding a boxed warning to a drug’s label.²¹ As a result, fewer postmarket safety recommendations would be required to be discussed by involved OND and ODS managers than envisioned in the draft policy we reviewed for our 2006 report. Separately, FDA has instituted some procedures that are consistent with the goals of the draft policy. For example ODS staff now participate in regular, bimonthly safety meetings with each of the review divisions in OND.

²⁰HHS, FDA, *The Future of Drug Safety—Promoting and Protecting the Health of the Public: FDA’s Response to the Institute of Medicine’s 2006 Report* (Rockville, Md.: January 2007).

²¹The original draft policy included the market withdrawal of a drug, restrictions on a drug’s distribution, and boxed warnings as major postmarket drug safety decisions.

-
- To help resolve disagreements over safety decisions, we recommended that FDA improve CDER's dispute resolution process by revising the pilot program to increase its independence. FDA had not revised its pilot dispute resolution program as of May 2007, and FDA officials told us that the existing program had not been used by any CDER staff member.
 - To make the postmarket safety decision-making process clearer, we recommended that FDA clarify ODS's role in FDA's scientific advisory committee meetings involving postmarket drug safety issues. According to an FDA official, the agency intends to, but had not yet, drafted a policy that will describe what safety information should be presented and how such information should be presented at scientific advisory committee meetings. The policy is also expected to clarify ODS's role in planning for, and participating in, meetings of FDA's scientific advisory committees.
 - To help ensure that safety concerns were addressed and resolved in a timely manner, we recommended that FDA establish a mechanism for systematically tracking ODS's recommendations and subsequent safety actions. As of May 2007, FDA was in the process of implementing the Document Archiving, Reporting and Regulatory Tracking System (DARRTS) to track such information on postmarket drug safety issues. Among many other uses, DAARTS will track ODS's safety recommendations and the responses to them.

We also suggested in our report that Congress consider expanding FDA's authority to require drug sponsors to conduct postmarket studies in order to ensure that the agency has the necessary information, such as clinical trial and observational data, to make postmarket decisions.

Mr. Chairman, this concludes my prepared remarks. I would be pleased to respond to any questions that you or other members of the subcommittee may have.

For further information regarding this testimony, please contact Marcia Crosse at (202) 512-7119 or crossem@gao.gov. Contact points for our Offices of Congressional Relations and Public Affairs may be found on the last page of this testimony. Martin T. Gahart, Assistant Director; Pamela Dooley; and Cathleen Hamann made key contributions to this statement.

Related GAO Products

Drug Safety: FDA Needs to Further Address Shortcomings in Its Postmarket Decision-making Process. [GAO-07-599T](#). Washington, D.C.: March 22, 2007.

Pediatric Drug Research: Studies Conducted under Best Pharmaceuticals for Children Act. [GAO-07-557](#). Washington, D.C.: March 22, 2007.

Prescription Drugs: Improvements Needed in FDA's Oversight of Direct-to-Consumer Advertising. [GAO-07-54](#). Washington, D.C.: November 16, 2006.

Internet Pharmacies: Some Pose Safety Risks for Consumers and Are Unreliable in Their Business Practices. [GAO-04-888T](#). Washington, D.C.: June 17, 2004.

Internet Pharmacies: Some Pose Safety Risks for Consumers. [GAO-04-820](#). Washington, D.C.: June 17, 2004.

Antibiotic Resistance: Federal Agencies Need to Better Focus Efforts to Address Risk to Humans from Antibiotic Use in Animals. [GAO-04-490](#). Washington, D.C.: April 22, 2004.

Pediatric Drug Research: Food and Drug Administration Should More Efficiently Monitor Inclusion of Minority Children. [GAO-03-950](#). Washington, D.C.: September 26, 2003.

Women's Health: Women Sufficiently Represented in New Drug Testing, but FDA Oversight Needs Improvement. [GAO-01-754](#). Washington, D.C.: July 6, 2001.

This is a work of the U.S. government and is not subject to copyright protection in the United States. It may be reproduced and distributed in its entirety without further permission from GAO. However, because this work may contain copyrighted images or other material, permission from the copyright holder may be necessary if you wish to reproduce this material separately.

GAO's Mission

The Government Accountability Office, the audit, evaluation and investigative arm of Congress, exists to support Congress in meeting its constitutional responsibilities and to help improve the performance and accountability of the federal government for the American people. GAO examines the use of public funds; evaluates federal programs and policies; and provides analyses, recommendations, and other assistance to help Congress make informed oversight, policy, and funding decisions. GAO's commitment to good government is reflected in its core values of accountability, integrity, and reliability.

Obtaining Copies of GAO Reports and Testimony

The fastest and easiest way to obtain copies of GAO documents at no cost is through GAO's Web site (www.gao.gov). Each weekday, GAO posts newly released reports, testimony, and correspondence on its Web site. To have GAO e-mail you a list of newly posted products every afternoon, go to www.gao.gov and select "Subscribe to Updates."

Order by Mail or Phone

The first copy of each printed report is free. Additional copies are \$2 each. A check or money order should be made out to the Superintendent of Documents. GAO also accepts VISA and Mastercard. Orders for 100 or more copies mailed to a single address are discounted 25 percent. Orders should be sent to:

U.S. Government Accountability Office
441 G Street NW, Room LM
Washington, D.C. 20548

To order by Phone: Voice: (202) 512-6000
TDD: (202) 512-2537
Fax: (202) 512-6061

To Report Fraud, Waste, and Abuse in Federal Programs

Contact:

Web site: www.gao.gov/fraudnet/fraudnet.htm

E-mail: fraudnet@gao.gov

Automated answering system: (800) 424-5454 or (202) 512-7470

Congressional Relations

Gloria Jarmon, Managing Director, JarmonG@gao.gov (202) 512-4400
U.S. Government Accountability Office, 441 G Street NW, Room 7125
Washington, D.C. 20548

Public Affairs

Paul Anderson, Managing Director, AndersonP1@gao.gov (202) 512-4800
U.S. Government Accountability Office, 441 G Street NW, Room 7149
Washington, D.C. 20548