HAMILTON QUALITY LLC

# U.S. Quality Intelligence Brief

**Week Ended October 31, 2026 | Published November 02, 2026**

This week's brief examines four FDA warning letters newly posted on October 27, revised draft guidance on drug-delivery performance, and two medical-device safety communications. Newly posted warning letters and device safety communications illustrate why procedures, passing tests, and completed records must be supported by evidence that the controls work.

**Reading note:** The four warning letters discussed below were posted by FDA on October 27, although their issue dates are earlier. The PF4 recall communication was published October 30; the Medline early alert was published October 29. Findings and company responses are summarized from the cited FDA records and reflect the agency's assessments at the time of those documents. Subsequent correspondence or corrective actions may change the regulatory status of the matters described. "Why It Matters" and "Carry Forward" provide Hamilton Quality's analysis, not additional FDA findings.

## 1. Northland Nuclear Medicine: FDA Questions Environmental Monitoring and CAPA Effectiveness

*Warning letter issued October 22, 2026*

FDA's letter concerns Northland's positron emission tomography (PET) drug facility in Bismarck, North Dakota. The agency reported more than 100 ISO 5 microbial recoveries from March 2024 through April 2026, with extensive gaps in formal identification. Of approximately 75 recoveries since December 2024, only two were sent for formal identification. FDA separately discussed fungi and spore-forming bacteria in the facility's classified environments.

The agency also reported that:

- Environmental-monitoring plates were exposed to a solution with sporicidal activity, potentially suppressing recovery and producing false-negative results.
- Low-yield corrective and preventive actions (CAPAs) were closed without the firm's required effectiveness checks. Yields subsequently fell below a lowered limit.

- Airflow visualization studies lacked adequate evaluation under dynamic operating conditions.

The letter acknowledges commitments to identify future recoveries, change plate-handling practices, revise procedures, and retrain staff. FDA found the responses inadequate, including their failure to assess historical monitoring reliability and prior batch-release decisions. It emphasized that PET drugs' short expiry periods mean administration can precede completion of sterility testing and environmental-monitoring results.

Read the Northland Warning Letter

**Why It Matters**

An investigation depends on the quality of the evidence used to reach its conclusions. When the monitoring method itself is questionable, historical acceptable results may not support the same level of assurance previously assigned to them. That uncertainty warrants assessment; it does not establish that every affected batch was contaminated.

**Carry Forward**

Before revising a limit, document the scientific rationale, applicable requirements, and product-risk assessment. A change in limits should not substitute for investigating recurring failures. When monitoring reliability is compromised, reassess affected data, trends, disposition decisions, and the evidence supporting CAPA effectiveness.

## 2. FDA Revises Draft Guidance on Drug Delivery Performance

*Revised draft issued October 29, 2026; comments requested by January 28, 2027*

FDA's revised draft, *Essential Drug Delivery Performance Characteristics for Devices Intended to Deliver Drugs and Biological Products*, replaces its 2024 draft on essential drug delivery outputs and aligns the discussion with the Quality Management System Regulation (QMSR).

The document uses **essential drug delivery device performance characteristics (EDDCs)** for system-level characteristics supporting delivery of the intended dose to the intended site. Examples within scope include syringes, autoinjectors, infusion pumps, inhalers, nebulizers, nasal sprays, and vaginal systems.

The draft recommends:

- Clinically meaningful performance specifications.
- Verification after relevant storage, shipping, and use-related stresses, including sequential preconditioning where warranted by risk.
- Scientifically justified control strategies using upstream controls, finished-product testing, or both.
- Assessment of product and process changes for their effects on delivery performance and associated verification, validation, and control strategies.

**This remains draft guidance, distributed for comment and not for implementation.** It does not itself create new binding obligations; applicable statutes and regulations remain controlling. FDA requests comments by January 28, 2027, for consideration before work begins on the final guidance.

Read the FDA Guidance Page | Download the Revised Draft

**Why It Matters**

Combination-product change control needs a defensible connection between a component or process change and finished-system performance. Compliance with an individual drawing or incoming specification may support that assessment, but its sufficiency depends on how the attribute influences delivery and whether subsequent operations can change it.

**Carry Forward**

Consider an EDDC traceability matrix linking intended delivery, patient consequences, device characteristics, component and material attributes, process controls, verification and validation, and change assessment. Treat the matrix as a practical quality tool, not a newly mandated document format.

### 3. PF4 Assay Recall Highlights a Failure Mode That Routine QC May Miss

*FDA recall communication published October 30, 2026*

FDA identified the recall of four HemosIL AcuStar HIT-IgG(PF4-H) assay lots as its most serious recall type. Affected lots are **B40005, B40006, B38062, and B38063**.

According to FDA, complaints included invalid calibration and one report of a 47% mean negative bias in patient samples. Werfen's investigation confirmed negative bias of approximately 20–35%, which routine calibration and quality-control testing might not reliably detect. The root-cause investigation remained ongoing.

FDA warned that false-negative results could delay recognition of heparin-induced thrombocytopenia (HIT); continued heparin exposure in affected patients could increase thrombotic risk. The notice states that, as of September 3, Werfen had reported no associated serious injuries or deaths.

The communication directs users to destroy affected inventory and identify an alternative testing method. Decisions about prior patient results, follow-up, or repeat testing belong to the laboratory and/or treating clinician under applicable procedures, clinical judgment, and regulatory requirements.

Read the FDA PF4 Assay Recall Notice

**Why It Matters**

A passing control result supports a decision only to the extent that the control can detect the relevant failure mode. An investigation should distinguish evidence that a test ran as expected from evidence that the system can recognize the particular defect under investigation.

**Carry Forward**

Ask explicitly: *Would the existing calibration, control material, sampling plan, or release test reliably detect this failure?* Document the basis for the answer. Where routine controls may miss a defect, evaluate whether containment and retrospective assessment should extend beyond remaining inventory.

### 4. Sanrace and TSP: Records Reviews Support FDA Enforcement Findings

*Warning letters issued October 22, 2026*

FDA's letters to Sanrace Biotechnology and TSP Solutions describe reviews of records submitted under section 704(a)(4) of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act.

**Sanrace:** FDA cited inadequate incoming-component identity testing, including testing relevant to high-risk components; absent process-validation procedures and studies; and deficiencies in laboratory controls, stability, and quality-unit oversight. Several component

and system identities are redacted in the public letter. FDA stated that the firm's drugs were placed on Import Alert 66-40 on September 21, 2026.

Read the Sanrace Warning Letter

**TSP:** FDA stated that submitted sunscreen records did not demonstrate adequate active-ingredient assay, impurity testing, or microbiological testing. The agency requested a plan to test retain samples from all U.S.-distributed batches within expiry as of the letter date, with prompt corrective action, potentially including recalls, if testing identified substandard product. The letter also cited incoming-component testing, supplier verification, production controls, laboratory controls, stability, and quality-unit deficiencies. FDA stated that the firm's drugs were placed on Import Alert 66-40 on August 14, 2026.

Read the TSP Warning Letter

**Why It Matters**

These letters demonstrate that FDA can identify CGMP deficiencies through submitted records. A records request deserves inspection-level preparation, even though a records review is distinct from an on-site inspection. An unsupported assertion does not become persuasive simply because it appears in a formal response.

**Carry Forward**

Trace each assertion to objective evidence, reconcile missing records, assess adverse trends, and identify unresolved gaps. Clearly distinguish existing controls from proposed remediation. If the evidence does not support continued distribution, escalate the product-risk and disposition assessment rather than relying on a narrative assurance.

**5. Chirp Innovations: FDA Seeks Evidence Supporting QMS Implementation**

*Warning letter issued October 2, 2026*

FDA's letter concerning the Chirp Halo Wireless Muscle Stimulator cited missing procedures for management review, quality audits, design controls, purchasing controls, CAPA, complaint handling, and medical-device reporting (MDR).

The letter acknowledges the firm's reported implementation of ISO 13485-based documents and evidence of personnel training. FDA stated that it could not determine the adequacy of the overall QMS response because several underlying procedures were not

provided. It separately found the MDR response inadequate, including the absence of an indication that a retrospective complaint review for reportability would occur.

FDA also concluded that promotion for menstrual pain exceeded the device's cleared indications and required a new premarket notification.

The underlying November 2025 inspection occurred under the former Quality System Regulation. FDA emphasized that corrective actions proposed or implemented now must meet the QMSR requirements effective February 2, 2026.

Read the Chirp Innovations Warning Letter

**Why It Matters**

Procedure approval and training are steps toward implementation. Evaluating whether a system works also requires records showing how personnel apply it. Similarly, a statement that remediation is complete should be supported by the documents and operational evidence needed to assess that claim.

**Carry Forward**

Sample actual complaints, supplier decisions, design changes, CAPAs, management reviews, and MDR assessments. Verify that procedures produce appropriate decisions and records, and that marketing claims remain within the applicable authorization. Remediation plans should account for the requirements in force when the corrective actions are implemented.

**6. Medline Field Action Covers All Medline Brand Beds and Associated Components**

*FDA early alert published October 29, 2026*

FDA's early alert covers all Medline Brand beds and associated components, including pendants, accessories, replacement parts, and bed-containing order packages. It describes potential electrical overheating and fire hazards, as well as entrapment and asphyxiation risks.

According to FDA, Medline reported two deaths and 16 serious injuries associated with these issues as of October 20. The alert reports an association; it does not establish causation for each event.

The notice describes Medline's market exit and an October 24 update allowing continued use under specified precautions pending repair or replacement. Those precautions include unplugging beds when not making necessary adjustments and avoiding extension cords. Repair, replacement, or refund eligibility varies; products purchased more than five years earlier remain subject to the field action even where remedies differ.

Affected users should follow the complete current FDA and manufacturer instructions. The early alert states that FDA is continuing to review information about the issue.

Read the FDA Medline Early Alert

**Why It Matters**

The breadth of a field action warrants evaluation of shared features and exposure across a product family. It does not establish that every model has the same defect or that every reported event has the same cause.

**Carry Forward**

Before limiting an action to the model that generated the initial complaint, assess common components, accessories, suppliers, service practices, and use conditions. Document both the basis for the affected-product boundary and the evidence that would trigger its reassessment.

**The Week in Context**

These developments raise practical questions for quality leaders:

- Can the monitoring and testing systems detect the failure modes used to justify product disposition?
- Do revised limits reflect scientific understanding and acceptable risk?
- Is CAPA effectiveness demonstrated through appropriate evidence?
- Do change controls connect component and process changes to finished-product performance?
- Are responses to regulators supported by complete records and evidence of implementation?
- Does field-action scope reflect relevant commonality across products and accessories?

The common lesson is to make the strength and limitations of the evidence explicit before relying on it for a quality decision.

**Worth Reading**

1. **Northland Nuclear Medicine Warning Letter** — Environmental-monitoring reliability, investigations, CAPA effectiveness, and batch disposition.
2. **Revised EDDC Draft Guidance** — Drug-delivery performance, lifecycle testing, and control strategies.
3. **PF4 Assay Recall Notice** — Failure-mode detectability and limitations of routine QC.
4. **Sanrace Warning Letter** and **TSP Warning Letter** — Records-based CGMP assessments and the evidence supporting release and distribution.
5. **Chirp Innovations Warning Letter** — QMS implementation evidence, complaint review, and QMSR remediation.
6. **Medline Early Alert** — Field-action scope, interim precautions, and product-family assessment.

---

# HAMILTON QUALITY LLC

**A weekly publication of Hamilton Quality LLC**
**Editor: Robert Holley**

*Independent analysis of selected U.S. pharmaceutical and medical-device quality developments, with practical implications for investigations, CAPA, validation, remediation, and product disposition.*

**Disclaimer**

*This publication provides general quality and regulatory information and professional commentary. It does not constitute legal advice or replace a product- or facility-specific assessment. Consult the linked source documents for complete findings, affected-product details, and applicable instructions.*

*This briefing presents selected developments, not an exhaustive inventory of enforcement actions, recalls, or guidance. Company-specific findings are attributed to the cited FDA records. "Why It Matters" and "Carry Forward" provide Hamilton Quality's professional interpretation. Warning letters reflect FDA's findings at issuance; subsequent responses or remediation may change a firm's status.*

**Hamilton Quality LLC**
*Experience. Judgment. Practical Results.*
hamiltonquality.com