







Effect of a single market availability of veterinary medicines

Perspective of IFAH-Europe, representing the animal health industry

Erik De Ridder, IFAH-Europe/Elanco Animal Health (Eli Lilly) Belgrade, 29 November 2010



Contents

- ■Regulators & Industry: common goals
- Learning from previous EU enlargements
- Looking ahead



Directive 2004/28/EC

The main purpose of any regulation on the manufacture and distribution of veterinary medicinal products should be to *safeguard animal health and welfare as well as public health*. The legislation on marketing authorizations for VMP's, and the criteria governing the granting of authorizations, are such as to *strengthen the protection of public health*.

That aim should, however, be achieved by means that do not hinder the development of the pharmaceutical industry or trade in VMP's within the community".



Regulators & Industry

- All need to achieve high standards for the quality, safety and efficacy of VMP's
- ➤ If VMP's are not of high standard compared with competition
 - no advantage
 - only damage
- Any one poor product will reflect badly on total product range (brand image)



- Any review (= upgrading) of national registrations to EU level preferably to be performed before entrance date, or
 - at least started before EU entrance
 - with a clear deadline



- New MS should realize that registrations in EU are based on (mutual) trust and experience
- For "old" nationally registered products harmonized SPC's do not exist but these MA's do comply with the requirements of Directive 2001/82/EC

SPC = summary of product characteristics MA = marketing authorisation



- Industry can not update all dossiers every time a new MS joins EU, therefore reference to other MAs must be possible
- Most new Member States have done so successfully
 - Also old MS have done it



- •Authorities should be practical, do not lose sight of the aim i.e. only products that comply with Directive 2001/82/EC should be allowed to stay on the market
- Compliance can be proven/demonstrated in various ways, preferably in a practical way!
- •N.B. Pharmacovigilance ('in-use') data: safety record



- Literal interpretation of Dir. 2001/82/EC creates medicines availability problems, e.g.
 - Request for country specific packaging materials
 - Lack of bi-lingual application forms
 - European MAH should be acceptable
 - API-GMP certification by QP suffices
 - Re-analysis of API/FP products should not be required within EU
 - Inclusion of EAN code in Serbian MA huge impact on packaging
- Good examples: Finland, Slovenia, Slovakia and Baltic States



Looking ahead

- Allow new MS to participate from sideline in MRP / DCP prior to EU entrance
- Of course
 - 1. not officially, as new MS is not EU member yet
 - 2. national requirements will be fulfilled (but there should not be any additional "national" requirements)



Observe MRP/DCP on 'sideline'

Advantage for authorities:

- practice MRP/DCP procedure (training of staff)
- after EU entrance no need for review.

Advantage industry:

- train their local registration people
- register new product simultaneously in EU and new MS.



National renewals

- Pharmacovigilance reports have replaced renewal procedures within the EU since November 2010 (Directive 2004/28/EC) (N.B. Poland 2013)
- Therefore we assume and recommend that any new MS will automatically implement this rule
 - Example : Bulgaria



Looking ahead

- For a smooth transition into EU:
 - Authorities new MS: please discuss EU entrance
 - with other new MS
 - with industry (IFAH-Europe).
- They have the experience
 - so valuable lessons can be learned
 - practical issues can be tackled before they become problems