



1 13 March 2014
2 EMA/CVMP/SWP/92311/2014
3 Committee for Medicinal Products for Veterinary Use (CVMP)

4 **Concept paper for a guideline on user safety of topically**
5 **administered products**

Agreed by Safety Working Party	February 2014
Adopted by CVMP for release for consultation	13 March 2014
Start of public consultation	24 March 2014
End of consultation (deadline for comments)	30 June 2014

6 The proposed guideline will supplement the existing "User Safety Guideline" (EMA/CVMP/543/03-
7 Rev.1).

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

8



9 **1. Introduction**

10 This concept paper addresses the need for a specific user safety guideline for topically administered
11 products. The CVMP adopted the revised general User Safety Guideline for pharmaceutical veterinary
12 medicinal products (EMA/CVMP/543/03-Rev.1) in March 2010. This document provides general
13 guidance on how user risk assessment should be conducted and reported. It does not provide specific
14 guidance on how exposure from topically administered products should be assessed.

15 The increase in the number of applications for topically administered products in recent years
16 highlighted the need for a coherent and common approach on how exposure from such products
17 should be assessed. Both industry and regulatory agencies have developed their own approaches for
18 addressing the issue and this has resulted in divergent conclusions. This concept paper describes and
19 discusses the basis for the need for a new guideline to supplement the existing user safety guideline.

20 **2. Problem statement**

21 The current User Safety Guideline for pharmaceutical veterinary medicinal products does not include
22 guidance on the approach or methodology to be applied when conducting a user risk assessment for
23 topically administered products. There are no agreed EU guidelines on this topic but some member
24 state agencies and the US Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) have published methodologies to be
25 used. Furthermore, there does not appear to be a standardised test system for estimating the amount
26 of residues dislodged onto the hands following stroking of an animal after it has been administered a
27 topical product. This has created a situation where studies are conducted differently and regulatory
28 authorities use different methodologies for evaluating the risk to the user, resulting in divergent
29 conclusions.

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

31 There has been an increase in the number of topically administered products to pet animals for the
32 treatment of flea and other infestations. The existing user safety guideline provides guidance on how
33 user risk assessments should be conducted and reported but does not address specific aspects relevant
34 for topically administered products (e.g. collar, spot-on, pour-on). As a result, different companies and
35 regulatory authorities apply different approaches in assessing the risk to the user from such products.

36 When conducting user risk assessments for topically administered products, other than direct exposure
37 to the product from the container (accidental spillage), additional exposure is also possible when
38 owners or other household members including children come into contact with the animals after
39 administration of a topical product. The resulting exposure depends on the physico-chemical
40 properties of the product as well as the nature and state of the fur and the vigorousness of the contact.
41 In many cases worst case exposure can be estimated based on conservative default assumptions.
42 Exposure can be divided into acute/sub-chronic exposure covering short term and long term scenarios.
43 Agreeing the exposure scenarios and the assumptions would be an aim of the proposed guideline.

44 More accurate estimations of exposure can be achieved through the generation of experimental data.
45 In particular, the amount of residue dislodged from a treated animal onto the user is often investigated
46 by means of the so called 'wipe test'. However, there is no standardised 'wipe test' and as a result,
47 the values obtained can vary significantly depending on the way it was conducted and evaluated.
48 Providing recommendations for the conduct of wipe tests would be a further aim of the proposed
49 guideline.

50 Existing guidance on user risk assessments for topically applied products is available in the form of a
51 US EPA guideline (2012) as well as in guidance developed by some individual EU member states but a
52 harmonised approach acceptable across Europe has not been agreed. A number of national agencies
53 have now acquired valuable experience by assessing the risk to users from topically administered
54 products. Based on the experience gained and on the available guidance on the matter, a commonly
55 agreed approach can now be developed that will allow applicants and regulatory agencies to assess the
56 risk to users in a coherent, consistent and transparent manner.

57 **4. Recommendation**

58 The Safety Working Party recommends that a new guideline be prepared to address the problems
59 identified above. The new guideline should provide formulas and assumptions/default values for use in
60 estimating exposure and the margin of exposure, and provide recommendations on the conduct of
61 'wipe tests'.

62 This additional guideline is not intended to introduce new requirements.

63 **5. Proposed timetable**

64 February 2014 – Concept paper endorsed by SWP.

65 March 2014 – adoption of concept paper for release for consultation by CVMP.

66 June 2014 – end of consultation period.

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

69 **6. Resource requirements for preparation**

70 The new guideline will involve the SWP, SWP secretariat and the CVMP. The SWP should appoint a
71 group of at least 3 rapporteurs from amongst its members and/or national experts.

72 It is anticipated that development of a draft guideline would require two physical drafting group
73 meetings as well as 3 additional virtual meetings and discussion time during scheduled SWP meetings.

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

75 The guidance will clarify requirements for regulators and industry with respect to methodologies and
76 data to be used in estimating exposure and so will encourage consistent and predictable decisions.

77 No adverse impact on industry or regulators with respect to either resources or costs is foreseen.

78 **8. Interested parties**

79 Pharmaceutical Industry, EU Competent Authorities, Consultants

80

81 9. References to literature, guidelines, etc.

- 82 1. CVMP guideline on user safety for pharmaceutical veterinary medicinal products
83 (EMA/CVMP/543/03-Rev.1), available
84 at [http://www.ema.europa.eu/docs/en_GB/document_library/Scientific_guideline/2010/03/WC
500077971.pdf](http://www.ema.europa.eu/docs/en_GB/document_library/Scientific_guideline/2010/03/WC
85 500077971.pdf)
- 86 2. Opinion of the French Agency for Food, Environmental and Occupational Health & Safety on
87 the results of the user safety assessment of antiparasiticides collars for companion animals
88 concerned by a withdrawal of marketing authorization (2012)
- 89 3. RIVM (2007) - Oral exposure of children to chemicals via hand-to-mouth contact (RIVM report
90 320005004/2007), available at <http://www.rivm.nl/bibliotheek/rapporten/320005004.pdf>
- 91 4. US EPA (1997) - Standard Operating Procedures (SOPs) for Residential Exposure Assessments,
92 available at <http://www.epa.gov/oppfead1/trac/science/trac6a05.pdf>
- 93 5. US EPA (2012) - Standard Operating Procedures for Residential Pesticide Exposure
94 Assessment, available at [http://www.epa.gov/pesticides/science/USEPA-OPP-
HED_Residential%20SOPs_Oct2012.pdf](http://www.epa.gov/pesticides/science/USEPA-OPP-
95 HED_Residential%20SOPs_Oct2012.pdf)
- 96 6. OECD (2004) - Guidance Document for the conduct of skin absorption studies. OECD series on
97 testing and assessment Number 28. ENV/JM/MONO(2004)2, available
98 at [http://search.oecd.org/officialdocuments/displaydocumentpdf/?cote=env/jm/mono\(2004\)2&
doclanguage=en](http://search.oecd.org/officialdocuments/displaydocumentpdf/?cote=env/jm/mono(2004)2&
99 doclanguage=en)
- 100 7. EC (2004) - Guidance Document on Dermal Absorption. Sanco/222/2000 rev. 7. 19 March
101 2004, available
102 at http://ec.europa.eu/food/plant/protection/evaluation/guidance/wrkd0c20_rev_en.pdf
- 103 8. EFSA Scientific Opinion (2012) Guidance on dermal absorption, EFSA Panel on Plant Protection
104 Products and their Residues (PPR). EFSA Journal 10(4): 2665, available
105 at <http://www.efsa.europa.eu/en/efsajournal/doc/2665.pdf>