

### CMDh feedback on

- Informal WS procedure for follow up requests after a PSUSA for NAPs (PSUFU)
- CMDh project on ideas for WS of assessment of RMPs

12th industry stakeholder platform - operation of EU pharmaocvigilance - 24 November 2017

Kora Doorduyn-van der Stoep (NL-CMDh member)



CMDh created a new informal WS procedure for the submission and assessment of follow-up after a PSUSA for NAPs

PSUSA Follow-Up (PSUFU)



#### Rationale

- No official EU procedure exists for NAPs (equivalent to LEG-CAPs)
- Analysis of existing regulatory tools to handle the followup requests not always possible (have limitations)/may not be proportionate
  - Official worksharing variation
  - signal procedure at PRAC level (only if a new potentially causal association or a new aspect of a known association but not a safety issue that has been (partly) assessed in a PSUSA)
  - bringing the next PSUR submission forward
  - initiating an appropriate referral procedure



# PSUFU - why/when

- To avoid parallel national assessments & duplication of work
- Enhance the consistency of the assessment
- Exceptional Use: will not be used for issues that could/should have been dealt with and resolved within the PSUSA procedure



### Key elements defined for operational success

- Appointment of a Lead MS
- Assignment of a specific procedure number (to be published by CMDh in press release)
- Submission route and requirements
- AR template
- Timetable
- Publication & implementation of the outcome



### Outcome published

The outcome of the procedure will be published on the CMDh website (Summary, not full report)

- Changes to the RMP will be detailed (if app)
- Recommendation to update the product information, the SmPC wording and PL wording to be implemented will also be published, together with the timelines for implementations (Type IB var, C.I.3.z category) (if applicable)



#### **Current Status**

- Procedure guidance recently publicated on the CMDh website (CMDh/367/2017)
- 2 months of public consultation (Jan 19<sup>th</sup>, 2018)
- A pilot phase will run until sufficient experience is gained



CMDh/367/2017 - For public consultation CMDh Guidance on the Informal Work-Sharing procedure for follow-up for PSUSA for NAPs Table of contents 3. Rationale and prerequisites for Informal WS procedures for PSUSA 10 11 12 3.2. Prerequisites for successful informal WS procedures for PSUSA follow-up for NAPs.......3 13 4. Detailed outlines of an informal WS procedure for PSUSA follow-up for 14 NAPs.......4 15 4.1. Applying the informal WS procedure to all PSUSA follow-up for NAPs ......4 16 17 4.2. Appointment of a Lead MS.......4 19 4.10. Commitment of MAHs .......



# CMDh "Generic" RMP project (temporary name of the project)



### Problem statement

- Huge workload for the MSs to assess RMPs in similar generic applications
- Inconsistency in the List of Safety Concerns within generic products as well as with the reference product
- Incomplete overview in the Excel table published on the CMDh website



## Project proposal

### Two domains:

- 1. (*Prospective approach*) Developing up-to-date generic RMPs from the innovator document for active substances for which the data exclusivity of the reference product will expire soon
- 2. Clean-up of the current existing Excel list as published on the CMDh website



# Summary - Domain 1 - RMPs for which data exclusivity of reference product will expire

- Clean-up of reference product RMP <u>before</u> the first generic submission commences (up-to-date version)
  - Focus on the relevance of the safety concerns, studies and additional risk minimisation measures (GVP Module V Rev 2)
- Up-to-date version of RMP of reference product will serve as RMP to be used by other MAHs <u>after</u> <u>expiration of data exclusivity</u>



# Summary - Domain 2 - Clean-up of the current existing Excel list

- Active substance for which there is <u>no</u> innovator product or the innovator has <u>no</u> RMP
- The list as published by the CMDh will have to be reviewed and information captured there should be aligned (safety concerns, overview of studies [if applicable], and additional risk minimisation measures)
- This will subsequently be published on the website of the CMDh for the MAHs to use



### Challenges

- It is <u>important</u> for this project to be a success that <u>all</u>
   <u>the stakeholders commit</u> to align new generic RMPs
   with the agreed upon and published RMPs
- EMA/PRAC needs to be involved
- Time-lines and procedures (including assessment/approval/adoption/implementation) need to be developed
- Who does what? Need for Lead NCA and Lead MAH



# Brainstorming meeting with ad hoc CMDh small WP and Industry on 9 November 2017

- Problem statement as expressed by Industry <u>very</u> <u>similar to concerns presented by CMDh</u>
- Industry's first preliminary feedback on CMDh proposal positive
- Industry will provide "candidates" for both domains



### Next steps

- Comments received from members CMDh PhVig WSP WP will be included in draft proposal as prepared by NL
- New version/comments discussed by WP in December en presented in CMDh
- Further feedback from Industry based on new version document and parallel to pilot (see below)
- Proposal to start with an active substance with different lists of safety concerns in the published CMDh list: NL prepared to take on first procedure/substance
- Start with pilot for Domain 2 in Q1 2018?



# THANK YOU ANY QUESTIONS?