M23-A4

What is different vs. M23-A3

Current status and next steps

Approach to 2015 version

- New order of the chapters
- Follows the order that usually applies when developing a new antibacterial agent; each chapter also considers revisions

Essentially:

- Identify the reference method
- Establish QC ranges
- Identify MIC susceptibility criteria
- Derive disk diffusion criteria

Table of contents

Table of contents

Major revisions since M23-A3

- New arrangement for setting MIC interpretive criteria for new agents depending on time since FDA approval
  - If agreement with FDA then publish
  - If disagreement then delay publication

- New set up for the Working Groups
  - Implications for handling of requests from sponsors for new or revised interpretive criteria
  - New guidance on submitting requests and details of handling, including appointment of ad hoc working groups

Major revisions since M23-A3

- New section on PK-PD covering nonclinical cutoffs and clinical exposure-response cutoffs
  - ➢ Drafted by PK-PD Working Group
- Integrated into a single chapter that also considers epidemiologic, clinical exposure-response and clinical cutoffs
  - ➢ Drafted by both groups
- New section that considers how interpretive criteria are then arrived at taking into account all available cutoffs
  - ➢ This section does not attempt to be definitive but describes the scenarios that may occur in terms of what is available and the relative strength of evidence that may apply

Topics for discussion at plenary

There were no issues on the Chapters (i.e. the main text) identified during the WG meeting that seem to require specific discussion at plenary

There is a need to do some tidying up in several places but there were no major changes identified

Once these are accomplished the WG considers we could move to the final review and sign off process

Topics for discussion at plenary

There is one issue regarding **Appendix A**: Statement of Policy of the AST Standing Subcommittees of the CLSI

Resolution of discrepancies: CLSI will establish a Microbiology Area Committee Working Group to explore a process, with both a U.S. and global perspective, to manage and resolve discrepancies in breakpoints. This process will include drug sponsors, regulatory agencies, device manufacturers, generic drug sponsors, professions, and other interested parties.

Since this has never actually occurred should we delete this item from the policy statement?

Timeframe for completion

Start Consensus Voting **21. Draft 1 Vote – 60 days** • **Review/comment by Microbiology Consensus Committee, BOD, and public review** • **Review/comment/vote by SC and CLSI delegates**	**January/February 2015**
22. Comments received collated by CLSI staff **Comments addressed by WG (schedule conference call or webinar if needed)** **Document revised and responses drafted for comments** **Approval of resolutions by WG and SC**	March/April 2015
23. CLSI Staff prepare document for final vote of the Microbiology Consensus Committee (CC)	May 2015
24. WG develop a checklist that sponsors can use to ensure that they have everything that is required and possibly a PPT template for breakpoint presentations **Circulate to SC for approval when completed**	May/June 2015
25. Final draft vote of Micro CC – 15 days • **Final review and vote to publish by CC** • **If no susbstantive technical comments, draft is submitted for publication** • **Substantive technical comments require revision and a second 60-day vote**	June 2015
26. Preparation for publication by CLSI Staff	July 2015