

### **GVP V update**

4th industry stakeholder platform - operation of EU pharmacovigilance legislation

Risk Management Plan (RMP) activities updates session





### Disclaimer

GVP Module V is a work in progress.

The orientations presented in this presentation may change following consultation of EMA Committees and the public consultation.



# Guideline on good pharmacovigilance practices: Module V – Risk management systems

Published June 2012

Almost 3 years of PRAC experience for RMP assessment

New process for RMP assessment (CHMP & PRAC joint assessment)

#### Comments from:

- Assessors and rapporteurs
- Industry: on guidance (e.g. AESGP, EFPIA and EGA) and RMP template (pilot project)
- -> Need for 2.0 update





### Eight major areas of focus for the GVP V update

- Defined the purpose of the RMP (prospective planning, fit-for-purpose, reducing the size in the life cycle of the product)
- 2. Provided clarity on risk definitions, aligned with ICH E2E and E2C
- 3. Evidence based risk identification -> reshaped module SVII
- 4. Provided guidance on post-authorisation removal of safety concerns
- Provided detailed guidance on requirements for all types of initial MAAs (GVP V and RMP template)
- 6. Data driven RMP updates! RMP submission is required only at initial MAA and/or when SS, PhV or RM activities change
- 7. Provided further PASS guidance on imposed & required studies
- 8. Cleaned annexes; clarified role and content



## 1. Planning document - not a historical record

- ✓ Focus on prospective planning
- ✓ Discuss safety findings; do not duplicate data assessed elsewhere
- ✓ Focus on correct identification of risks and missing information with the view to minimising or further characterising them
- ✓ Delete data from old RMP template not relevant for post-marketing planning
- ✓ Limit duplication of data presented in other modules of eCTD
- ✓ Make use of electronic format -> include links to support discussion.

### 2. Risk definitions

- ✓ Keep aligned to ICH E2E and ICH E2C definitions
- ✓ Consider seriousness, frequency, patient and benefit/risk impact to define importance
- ✓ Provide clarity on what is an important risk and what is not
- ✓ Focus on strength of association between an event and the drug
- ✓ Present and discuss the scientific evidence of (causal) association
- ✓ Evidence based stepwise discussion of events observed in (pre-)clinical development -> risks -> important risks or missing information
- ✓ Support guidance with examples for specific circumstances



### 3. Risk presentation – Module SVII

- ✓ Bring together all elements to consider in one discussion (from scattered around the RMP): EU requirements, class effects, medication errors, off-label use, populations not studied, pre-clinical data, interactions, risks for biologicals and ATMPs)
- ✓ Structure guidance on stepwise discussion to identify the important risks and missing information
- ✓ Approach risks in consistent way, but allow flexibility for MAH proposals / assessment
- ✓ Keep scientific standards for identifying safety concerns, but encourage focus on further characterisation and minimisation activities when product gathers additional real-life, post-marketing data on safety (i.e. slimmer RMP in time, not heavier)
- ✓ Bring Missing Information to the table (as it will require activities in the PhV Plan)



### 4. Use data available, but plan for the future

#### Consider the life cycle of the product:

- ✓ Cast the net wide to capture potential safety concerns at approval
- ✓ Require only activities that can make a difference (minimise risks or further characterise them)
- ✓ Allow important risks or missing information to be changed once the scientific evidence changes (e.g. at first renewal, with first PSUR after renewal), for example:
  - Important potential risk -> important identified risk
  - Important potential risk -> removed (data does not confirm concern)
  - Important potential risk -> removed (data confirms concern but the now identified risk is not considered sufficiently important to remain in the list of safety concerns in the RMP)
  - Important identified risk -> removed (when risk is well characterised after sufficient use and risk minimisation activities are part of routine clinical practice)
- 1995 2015
  - Missing information -> removed (PASS results)

### 5. Requirements for initial MA applications

- ✓ Replaced table with detailed description
- ✓ Expanded guidance regarding modified requirements for generic medicines (considering data on CMDh website <a href="http://www.hma.eu/464.html">http://www.hma.eu/464.html</a>)
- ✓ Addressed all types if initial MAAs: informed consent, hybrids, fixed combinations, well established use, herbal products, new products with substances authorised for more than 10 years.
- ✓ Detailed guidance on requirements for parts and modules: what is needed when
  - ✓ Further guidance to be included in the RMP template for the MAHs. i.e. when a section is required and when there is a limited scope or can be omitted



### 6. RMP updates

- ✓ Data driven; not procedure type driven
- ✓ RMP submission only when there is an impact on the safety specifications, PhV or risk minimisation plans
- ✓ Reduce assessors' and MAHs' administrative burden by reducing the number of potentially unnecessary RMP submissions
- ✓ Make the MAHs responsible and empower them to consider prospectively the planning needs following the submission of new data
- ✓ Addressed the submission of the RMPs in parallel procedures by allowing flexibility for submission and proposals for deferred RMP submissions



### 7. PASS

- ✓ Keep in the PhV Plan only the studies required/requested by the PRAC/CHMP.
- ✓ Included further guidance on types of studies (Category 1, 2, and 3)
- ✓ Addressed the issue of PASS required by regulatory authorities outside EU
- ✓ Included in annexes an overview of all relevant ongoing and completed studies.
- ✓ Also included in annexes the protocols of all the studies in the PhV Plan:
  - a. Protocols of proposed studies, submitted for assessment with this RMP
  - b. Updates of previously approved protocols, submitted for assessment with this RMP
  - c. Protocols previously approved by the Competent Authority



#### 8. Refocus the annexes

- ✓ On what is needed for the RMP assessment
- ✓ Removed duplicates (e.g. SmPC); make use of electronic format (links when possible)
- ✓ Overview of on-going and completed pharmacoepidemiological study programme
- ✓ Overview of protocols for all studies in the PhV Plan (until study report is submitted and assessed – plan for the future)
- ✓ Clarified life cycle of risk minimisation key messages and examples of educational materials, and NCA role in assessing additional risk minimisation materials
- Strengthened the wording on sharing of materials across products with same substance



### Next steps

- DIA RMP Information Day 30 June
- Update in parallel: RMP template for industry
- PRAC, CHMP, CMDh endorsement
- Public consultation planned for autumn 2015: GVP V and RMP template (at the same time and in parallel)
- Receive Industry and other stakeholders' feedback

# Thank you for your attention



#### **Further information**

Emil.Cochino@ema.europa.eu

#### **European Medicines Agency**

30 Churchill Place • Canary Wharf • London E14 5EU • United Kingdom

**Telephone** +44 (0)20 3660 6000 **Facsimile** +44 (0)20 3660 5555

Send a question via our website www.ema.europa.eu/contact



