

SPECIAL 510(k): Device Modification OIVD Review Memorandum

To: THE FILE

RE: DOCUMENT NUMBER k110413

This 510(k) submission contains information/data on modifications made to the SUBMITTER'S own Class II, Class III or Reserved Class I devices requiring 510(k). The following items are present and acceptable (delete/add items as necessary) for the Power Processor Sample Processing System with Generic Connections:

1. The name and 510(k) number of Beckman Coulter, Inc.'s previously cleared device, Power Processor Sample Processing System with Generic Connection Module, Model: 4210, cleared under k090588. (For a preamendments device, a statement to this effect has been provided.)
2. Submitter's statement that the **INDICATION/INTENDED USE** of the modified device as described in its labeling **HAS NOT CHANGED** along with the proposed labeling which includes instructions for use, package labeling, and, if available, advertisements or promotional materials.
3. A description of the device **MODIFICATION (S)**, including clearly labeled diagrams, engineering drawings, photographs, user's and/or service manuals in sufficient detail to demonstrate that the **FUNDAMENTAL SCIENTIFIC TECHNOLOGY** of the modified device **has not changed**.
This change was to connect up to 12 generic connections (increase from current 4), plus options to increase the primary sample ID to 13 characters, plus 2 characters for the secondary sample ID, connect up to three 3K or three 5K tube stockyards, load balancing number of tubes per rack, Data Migration Utility (DMU) for V3.5/V3.6 to V5.0, route a primary tube with no assigned tests in its test order to the stockyard and the use of USB drives for data storage and retrieval.
4. **Comparison Information** (similarities and differences) to applicant's legally marketed predicate device including, labeling, intended use, and physical characteristics.
5. A **Design Control Activities Summary** which includes:
 - a) Identification of Risk Analysis method(s) used to assess the impact of the modification on the device and its components, and the results of the analysis
 - b) Based on the Risk Analysis, an identification of the verification and/or validation activities required, including methods or tests used and acceptance criteria to be applied
 - c) A declaration of conformity with design controls. The declaration of conformity should include:
 - i) A statement signed by the individual responsible, that, as required by the risk analysis, all verification and validation activities were performed by the designated individual(s) and the results demonstrated that the predetermined acceptance criteria were met, and
 - ii) A statement signed by the individual responsible, that the manufacturing facility is in conformance with design control procedure requirements as specified in 21 CFR 820.30 and the records are available for review.
6. A **Truthful and Accurate Statement, a 510(k) Summary or Statement and the Indications for Use Enclosure (and Class III Summary for Class III devices).**

The labeling for this modified subject device has been reviewed to verify that the indication/intended use for the device is unaffected by the modification. In addition, the submitter's description of the particular modification(s) and the comparative information between the modified and unmodified devices demonstrate that the fundamental scientific technology has not changed. The submitter has provided the design control information as specified in The New 510(k) Paradigm and on this basis, I recommend the device be determined substantially equivalent to the previously cleared (or their preamendment) device.

Comments – Software Validation Protocols were adequate to address the identified causes of hazards identified in the Risk analysis (FMEA)