

- 1 11 April 2013
- 2 EMA/CVMP/ERA/718229/2012
- 3 Committee for Medicinal Products for Veterinary Use (CVMP)

# 4 Concept paper on assessing the toxicological risk to

# 5 humans and the environment of veterinary

# 6 pharmaceuticals in groundwater

7

| Agreed by ERAWP and SWP                      | January 2013  |
|--|---------------|
| Adopted by CVMP for release for consultation | 11 April 2013 |
| Start of public consultation                 | 19 April 2013 |
| End of consultation (deadline for comments)  | 30 June 2013  |

#### 8 9

Comments should be provided using this <u>template</u>. The completed comments form should be sent to <u>vet-guidelines@ema.europa.eu</u>

10



An agency of the European Union

## 11 **1. Introduction**

- 12 Residues of veterinary medicinal products may gain access to groundwater systems. The CVMP
- 13 guideline on Environmental Impact Assessment for Veterinary Medicinal Products in support of the
- 14 VICH guidelines GL6 and GL38 (EMEA/CVMP/418282/2005-Rev.1) indicates that if the predicted
- 15 concentration of residues of a veterinary medicinal product in groundwater exceeds a trigger value, the 16 applicant should provide a risk assessment to demonstrate that this concentration does not represent
- 17 an unacceptable risk. However, existing guidance provides no further information on how this risk
- 18 assessment should be performed.
- 19 This intended guideline should provide further technical support to the implementation of the VICH
- 20 guidelines GL6 and GL38 on the environmental risk assessment (ERA) of veterinary medicinal products21 (VMPs).

## 22 **2. Problem statement**

23 The CVMP guideline on Environmental Impact Assessment for Veterinary Medicinal Products in support 24 of the VICH guidelines GL6 and GL38 (EMEA/CVMP/418282/2005-Rev.1) outlines a two step process 25 for the risk assessment of residues of veterinary medicinal products in groundwater. In the first step, 26 the predicted concentration in groundwater is compared to a trigger value of  $0.1 \mu g/l$ . If the predicted 27 concentration in groundwater is below this value, the risk is considered negligible and no further 28 assessment is needed. If the predicted concentration in groundwater exceeds 0.1  $\mu$ g/l, the applicant 29 should provide a risk assessment to demonstrate that exceeding the trigger value for groundwater is 30 not indicative of an unacceptable risk. The current absence of guidance on how such a risk assessment

31 should be performed represents a difficulty for both applicants and assessors.

# 32 **3. Discussion**

- 33 There is a need for guidance on the methodology to use when performing the groundwater risk
- assessment. The methodology should consider both the risk for human health resulting from residues
   of veterinary medicinal products in groundwater, and the risk to the environment.
- 36 In its groundwater risk assessment the CVMP should follow Directives 80/86/EEC on the protection of
- 37 groundwater against pollution caused by certain dangerous substances, Directive 2006/118/EC on the
- 38 protection of groundwater against pollution and deterioration, Directive 2000/60/EC establishing a
- 39 framework for Community action in the field of water policy (WFD) and the Directive 98/83/EC on the
- 40 quality of water intended for human consumption.

## 41 **4. Recommendation**

- 42 The Committee recommends the development of a guideline outlining the methodology to perform a
- 43 risk assessment for both human health and the environment in cases where the concentration of
- residues of veterinary medicinal products in groundwater is estimated to be above the trigger value of
- 45 0.1 μg/l.
- 46 This guidance should be applied to new substances to be used in veterinary medicine for food
- 47 producing species and for existing products in cases where the presence of residues in groundwater
- 48 has been found or calculated to exceed the trigger value.

#### 49 **5. Proposed timetable**

- 50 To be released for consultation during Q1 2013.
- 51 April 2013 release of concept paper for consultation
- 52 June 2013 deadline for receipt of comments
- 53 March 2014 SWP and ERAWP to endorse draft guideline for publication
- 54 July 2014 CVMP to adopt draft guideline for publication
- 55 January 2015 deadline for receipt of comments
- 56 July 2015 SWP and ERAWP endorse final guideline for publication
- 57 September 2015 CVMP adopts final guideline for publication

#### **6. Resource requirements for preparation**

- 59 The ERAWP and the SWP would jointly develop the guideline. A Rapporteur from each working party
- 60 will be nominated. Adequate time for discussions at both working parties will be required. The EMA

61 secretariat will coordinate the consultation and communication between the working parties as well as

- 62 the public consultation. Time at plenary CVMP will be required to discuss and adopt the various drafts
- 63 of the guideline.

## 64 **7. Impact assessment (anticipated)**

- The guideline would be beneficial for both industry and regulators as it would promote the use of a consistent and scientifically justifiable approach.
- 67 The number of substances for which residues above the trigger value can be expected is minimal. In
- 68 those cases where a risk for man is identified a portion of the ADI might need to be reserved to take
- 69 into account consumer exposure to residues in the ground water.

#### 70 8. Interested parties

71 Pharmaceutical industry, environmentalists and regulatory bodies, environmental agencies.

#### 72 9. References to literature, guidelines, etc.

- Danielopol DL, Griebler C. 2008. Changing Paradigms in Groundwater Ecology from the 'Living
   Fossils' Tradition to the 'New Groundwater Ecology'. Internat. Rev. Hydrobiol. 93:565-577.
- 75 Dole-Olivier, M.-J., P. Marmonier, Creuzé Des Châtelliers and D. Martin, 1994: Interstitial fauna
- 76 associated with the alluvial floodplains of the Rhône River (France). In: Gibert, J., D. L. Danielopol.
- J. A. Stanford (eds.), Groundwater ecology. Academic Press, San Diego, pp. 313–346.
- Longley, G., 1981: The Edwards aquifer: earth's most diverse groundwater ecosystem? Int. J.
  Speleol. 11: 105–122.
- 80 Rouch, R. and D. L. Danielopol, 1997: Species richness of microcrustacea in subterranean freshwater
- 81 habitats. Comparative analysis and approximate evaluation. Internat. Rev. ges. Hydrobiol. 82: 121–
- 82 145.

- Steube, C., S. Richter and C. Griebler, 2008: First attempts towards an integrative concept for the
  ecological assessment of groundwater ecosystems. Hydrogeol. J. 17: 23-25.
- 85 Council Directive 80/68/EEC of 17 December 1979 on the protection of groundwater against pollution
- 86 caused by certain dangerous substances
- 87 Directive 2006/118/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 12 December 2006 on the
- 88 protection of groundwater against pollution and deterioration
- 89 Directive 2000/60/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council establishing a framework for the
- 90 Community action in the field of water policy (the EU Water Framework Directive)
- 91 Council Directive 98/83/EC of 3 November 1998 on the quality of water intended for human
- 92 consumption