



1 4 June 2015
2 EMA/CVMP/ERA/698394/2014
3 Committee for Medicinal Products for Veterinary Use

4 **Concept paper on the testing strategy and risk**
5 **assessment for plants in the Phase II of the**
6 **environmental risk assessment for veterinary medicinal**
7 **products**

8

Agreed by the ERAWP	April 2015
Adopted by the CVMP for release for consultation	4 June 2015
Start of public consultation	18 June 2015
End of consultation (deadline for comments)	30 September 2015

9

Comments should be provided using this [template](#). The completed comments form should be sent to vet-guidelines@ema.europa.eu

10



11 **1. Introduction**

12 Plant toxicity tests are used in the terrestrial environmental risk assessment of veterinary medicinal
13 products, as described in the VICH guideline on environmental impact assessment for veterinary
14 medicinal products Phase II (CVMP/VICH/790/2003)[1].

15 In 2012 the CVMP published a reflection paper on the testing strategy and risk assessment for plants
16 (EMA/CVMP/ERA/147844/2011)[2], in which the plant test requirements in Phase II Tier A and Tier B
17 are explained. The reflection paper was developed to recommend a plant testing strategy for
18 veterinary medicinal products, given that since the publication of the VICH Phase II guideline [1], the
19 guideline recommended for plant testing, the "OECD guideline 208: seedling emergence and seedling
20 growth test" [3] was updated, and guidance on how many plant species are needed for testing of
21 veterinary pharmaceuticals is no longer available. Although the existing reflection paper provides
22 recommendations on how to conduct the testing for plants in the Phase II assessment, there are a
23 limited number of cases where the testing strategy may not be adequate to assess the toxicity of all
24 types of substances.

25 This is the case for active ingredients of veterinary medicines that show a high formation of non-
26 extractable residues or transformation products (e.g., the latter can be identified when the applicant
27 has conducted tests on determining the fate of veterinary medicines in manure
28 (EMA/CVMP/ERA/430327/2009)[4]). For example, experience with studies on the determination of the
29 fate of veterinary medicinal products in manure, performed according to EMA guideline [4], has shown
30 that some antibiotics form a high percentage of non-extractable residues. However, it is not known
31 whether or not these are bioavailable to plants and consequently could pose a risk, as the manure
32 matrix consists of a high percentage of organic matter and will undergo decomposition after spreading.
33 Therefore non-extractable residues might be released and become bioavailable. In the event of
34 assessing a substance that shows a high formation of non-extractable residues or transformation
35 products, alternative ecotoxicity studies other than those recommended in the existing reflection paper
36 may need to be considered for the refinement of the risk assessment following Tier B, to ensure that
37 the toxicity of non-extractable residues is assessed.

38 At the time of the publication of the CVMP reflection paper [2], the reason for not including the
39 considerations mentioned above for substances that show a high formation of non-extractable residues
40 or transformation products, was due to fact that a standard operating procedure for this scenario was
41 not yet developed. However, based on the recommendations on determining the fate of veterinary
42 medicines in manure [4], applicants have already been submitting this study and developing protocols
43 themselves as no harmonised guidelines or protocols on how to design, conduct and assess the data of
44 such a modified test are yet available.

45 This concept paper has been prepared to address the need to develop a guideline on the testing
46 strategy and risk assessment for plants in the Phase II assessment, as explained in the existing
47 reflection paper, as well as including how to conduct a tier based assessment for plants for those
48 substances that form high amounts of non-extractable residues or transformation products in manure.

49 **2. Problem statement**

50 For a plant risk assessment, the initial predicted environmental concentrations (PEC) in soil, calculated
51 according to the CVMP guideline on Environmental impact assessment for Veterinary Medicinal
52 Products in support of the VICH guidelines GL6 and GL38 (EMA/CVMP/ERA/418282/2005-Rev.1) [5],
53 is compared to the predicted no effect concentration (PNEC) obtained from the seedling emergence

54 and seedling growth test according to OECD guideline 208 [3]. If a risk for plants is still identified in
55 Tier B, the reflection paper [2] recommends conducting a higher tier assessment for the risk
56 assessment by applying a statistical extrapolation technique, the so-called species sensitivity
57 distribution (SSD). However, in some cases an alternative methodology may be preferable to the SSD
58 approach (e.g., perform the plant test under a modified exposure scenario). There is currently no
59 alternative approach described in any guideline.

60 The fact that currently there is only one option for applicants to conduct higher tier assessments when
61 a risk is identified in Tier B, has led to discussions among scientists, regulators and applicants on the
62 possibility of conducting a modified plant toxicity test (so called 'extended plant test') with a modified
63 exposure for specific scenarios. The workshop: 'A new concept for a plant test with a more realistic
64 exposure scenario via manure' [6] was held in 2013 with the aim to address the issues identified to
65 date with the extended plant test, and to provide suggestions for improvement to applicants and
66 assessors. The workshop was attended by industry, contract laboratories, scientists and regulators.

67 The 'extended plant test' is an option in case a risk for plants has been identified and the substance
68 has been shown to form non-extractable residues in manure or transformation products $\geq 10\%$ of the
69 applied amount but would not be a required test from the outset.

70 In view of the usefulness of this 'extended plant test' for refining the risk assessment for plants when a
71 risk is identified in Tier B, several applicants have already decided to submit this test. Although this
72 test is considered valuable, there are no harmonised guidelines or protocols on how to design, conduct
73 and assess the data of such modified test design.

74 Consequently, the CVMP considers it necessary to develop a guideline that will include the information
75 that is already explained in the existing reflection paper, and will also include the conditions and
76 technical specifications for those scenarios when an extended plant test should be considered by
77 applicants and how to facilitate the assessment by assessors.

78 **3. Discussion (on the problem statement)**

79 The reflection paper on the testing strategy and risk assessment for plants, published by the CVMP in
80 2012, only presents one option for refining the risk assessment for plants in scenarios when a risk is
81 identified in Phase II Tier B of the environmental risk assessment. However, in certain situations it has
82 been acknowledged by applicants, assessors and the scientific community that additional tests should
83 be considered for specific scenarios. Modified plant tests have already been submitted in dossiers for
84 marketing authorisations, for the reasons explained above. However, a number of technical issues
85 have been identified in the tests performed that call for the development of a guideline with the aim to
86 harmonise the approach.

87 In view of the above, it is considered necessary to develop a guideline to enable a harmonised
88 approach for applicants and assessors.

89 **4. Recommendation**

90 The CVMP acknowledges the need to develop a guideline that will include the information currently
91 available in the existing reflection paper, in addition to address when and how to perform a modified
92 plant toxicity test. This would include a detailed explanation on when the extended plant test should be
93 conducted and the technical specifications on the test as no guideline is yet available.

94 The new technical aspects of the test design and data evaluation of the extended plant test should take
95 into consideration the outcome of the research project and workshop that took place in 2013, which

96 addressed the issues identified to date with the extended plant test and of their results to provide
97 suggestions for improvement. The workshop had input and participation from industry, contract
98 laboratories, researchers and regulators.

99 The new guideline can be used in the preparation of the environmental risk assessment by the
100 applicant for a marketing authorisation and in the evaluation of the studies by the competent
101 authorities. It does not introduce new requirements to applicants.

102 **5. Proposed timetable**

103 June 2015 – adoption of concept paper for release for consultation by the CVMP

104 September 2015 – end of consultation period

105 Timelines for development of the guideline will be determined following review of comments received
106 on the concept paper.

107 **6. Resource requirements for preparation**

108 The new guideline will involve the CVMP ERAWP, ERAWP secretariat and the CVMP. The ERAWP should
109 appoint a rapporteur from amongst its members.

110 It is anticipated that development of a draft guideline may require physical drafting group meetings as
111 well as 1-2 additional virtual meetings and discussion time during scheduled ERAWP meetings.

112 **7. Impact assessment (anticipated)**

113 It is anticipated that this guideline will lead to an improved and more realistic risk assessment.

114 No adverse impact on industry or regulators with respect to either resources or costs is foreseen. The
115 number of products that would still indicate a risk in Tier B of the environmental risk assessment can
116 be expected to be low. For those substances that may require additional studies when a risk for the
117 terrestrial compartment has been identified, developing this specific guidance is viewed beneficial as
118 applicants and laboratories will then be able to have a clear direction on the experimental design and
119 technical aspects of the test.

120 **8. Interested parties**

121 Pharmaceutical industry, EU national competent authorities, consultants, contract laboratories

122 **9. References**

123 [1] VICH (2004). Guideline on Environmental Impact Assessment for Veterinary Medicinal Products
124 Phase II (CVMP/VICH/790/2003).

125 [2] European Medicines Agency (2011). Reflection paper on testing strategy and risk assessment for
126 plants (EMA/CVMP/ERA/147844/2011).

127 [3] OECD (2006). OECD guidelines for the testing of chemicals – Terrestrial Plants Test: Seedling
128 Emergence and Seedling Growth Test (OECD 208).

129 [4] European Medicines Agency (2011). Guideline on determining the fate of veterinary medicinal
130 products in manure (EMA/CVMP/ERA/430327/2009).

131 [5] European Medicines Agency (2008). Guideline on Environmental Impact Assessment for Veterinary
132 Medicinal Products in support of the VICH guidelines GL6 and GL38 (EMA/CVMP/ERA/418282/2005-
133 Rev.1).

134 [6] German Federal Environmental Agency (UBA) (2013). Workshop on pharmaceuticals in soil, sludge
135 and slurry. Environmental risk assessment of veterinary medicinal products – a new concept for a plant
136 test with more realistic exposure scenario. 18-19 June 2013, Dessau, Germany.