Contribution ID: c862e1e0-387f-43a1-8f14-06ca60becdae

Date: 15/12/2021 16:33:27

Open Public Consultation on the revision of the general pharmaceutical legislation

Fields marke	ed with * are	mandatory.
--------------	---------------	------------

Introduction

On 25 November 2020, the Commission published a Communication on a Pharmaceutical Strategy for Europe.

The Pharmaceutical Strategy identifies flagship initiatives and other actions to ensure the delivery of tangible results. As part of the implementation of the strategy, the Commission is evaluating the general pharmaceutical legislation¹ and assessing the impacts of possible changes in the legislation as described in the relevant inception impact assessment.

This public consultation aims to collect views of stakeholders and the general public in order to support the evaluation of the existing general pharmaceutical legislation and the impact assessment of its revision. It builds further on the public consultation² conducted for the preparation of the pharmaceutical strategy for Europe. The replies to that consultation will be taken into account for the revision of the general pharmaceutical legislation. The present questionnaire should be seen as a continuation of that process.

In parallel, the legislation for medicines for rare diseases and children is being <u>revised</u> as well. Separate consultation activities have been carried out for that <u>revision</u>.

This questionnaire is available in all EU languages and you can reply in any EU language. You can pause any time and continue later. You can download your contribution once you have submitted your answers.

A summary on the outcome of the public consultation will be published by the Commission services on the <u>'</u> Have your say' portal.

We thank you for your participation.

[1] Directive 2001/83/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 6 November 2001 on the Community code relating to medicinal products for human use (OJ L 311, 28.11.2001, p. 67)

Regulation (EC) No 726/2004 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 31 March 2004 laying down Community procedures for the authorisation and supervision of medicinal products for human and veterinary use and establishing a European Medicines Agency (OJ L 136, 30.4.2004, p. 1)

[2] A report analysing the results of the pharmaceutical strategy consultation was published in November 2020.

About you

0	Czech
0	Danish
	Dutch
	English
	Estonian
	Finnish
	French
	German
	Greek
	Hungarian
	Irish
	Italian
	Latvian
	Lithuanian
	Maltese
	Polish
	Portuguese
	Romanian
0	Slovak
0	Slovenian
0	Spanish
0	Swedish
*I am	giving my contribution as
	Academic/research institution
0	Business association
	Company/business organisation
	Consumer organisation
	EU citizen
0	Environmental organisation
0	Non-EU citizen

*Language of my contribution

Bulgarian

Croatian

Non-governmental organisation (NGO)
Public authority
Trade union
Other
*Which stakeholder group do you represent?
Individual member of the public
Patient or consumer organisation
Healthcare professional
Healthcare provider organisation (incl. hospitals, pharmacies)
Healthcare payer
Centralised health goods procurement body
Health technology assessment body
Academic researcher
Research funder
Learned society
European research infrastructure
Other scientific organisation
Environmental organisation
Pharmaceuticals industry
Chemicals industry
Pharmaceuticals traders/wholesalers
Medical devices industry
Public authority (e.g. national ministries of health, medicines agencies, pricing
and reimbursement authorities)
EU regulatory partner / EU institution
Non-EU regulator / non-EU body
Other (Please specify)
*First name
Jolanta
*Surname
Kunikowska

*Email (this won't be pu	ıblis	shed)				
s.niederkofler@eanm.org	l					
*Organisation name						
255 character(s) maximum						
European Association of	Nucle	ear Medicine				
*Organisation size						
Micro (1 to 9 em	ploy	rees)				
Small (10 to 49 e	emp	loyees)				
Medium (50 to 2	•	• ,				
Large (250 or mo		,				
Transparency register 255 character(s) maximum Check if your organisation is of influence EU decision-making	on the		t's a	voluntary database fo	or orga	nisations seeking to
348978437245-85						
*Country of origin						
Please add your country of or Afghanistan	_	Djibouti	-	Libya	0	Saint Martin
Aland Islands	0	Dominica	0	Liechtenstein	0	Saint Pierre and
7 Harra Totaliae		2011111100		Licontonicioni		Miquelon
Albania	0	Dominican	0	Lithuania		Saint Vincent
		Republic				and the
		·				Grenadines
Algeria	0	Ecuador		Luxembourg	0	Samoa
American Samoa	a 🔘	Egypt		Macau	0	San Marino
Andorra		El Salvador		Madagascar		São Tomé and
						Príncipe
Angola	0	Equatorial Guinea	a [©]	Malawi	0	Saudi Arabia
Anguilla	0	Eritrea		Malaysia		Senegal
Antarctica	0	Estonia	0	Maldives		Serbia
Antigua and Barbuda	0	Eswatini	0	Mali	0	Seychelles

Argentina	Ethiopia	Malta	Sierra Leone
Armenia	Falkland Islands	Marshall Islands	Singapore
Aruba	Faroe Islands	Martinique	Sint Maarten
Australia	Fiji	Mauritania	Slovakia
Austria	Finland	Mauritius	Slovenia
Azerbaijan	France	Mayotte	Solomon Islands
Bahamas	French Guiana	Mexico	Somalia
Bahrain	French Polynesia	a [©] Micronesia	South Africa
Bangladesh	French Southern	n [©] Moldova	South Georgia
	and Antarctic		and the South
	Lands		Sandwich
			Islands
Barbados	Gabon	Monaco	South Korea
Belarus	Georgia	Mongolia	South Sudan
Belgium	Germany	Montenegro	Spain
Belize	Ghana	Montserrat	Sri Lanka
Benin	Gibraltar	Morocco	Sudan
Bermuda	Greece	Mozambique	Suriname
Bhutan	Greenland	Myanmar/Burma	ı [©] Svalbard and
			Jan Mayen
Bolivia	Grenada	Namibia	Sweden
Bonaire Saint	Guadeloupe	Nauru	Switzerland
Eustatius and			
Saba			
Bosnia and	Guam	Nepal	Syria
Herzegovina			
Botswana	Guatemala	Netherlands	Taiwan
Bouvet Island	Guernsey	New Caledonia	Tajikistan
Brazil	Guinea	New Zealand	Tanzania
British Indian	Guinea-Bissau	Nicaragua	Thailand
Ocean Territory			
British Virgin	Guyana	Niger	The Gambia
Islands			
Brunei	Haiti	Nigeria	Timor-Leste

	Bulgaria	0	Heard Island and		Niue	0	Togo
			McDonald Islands	3			
0	Burkina Faso	0	Honduras		Norfolk Island	0	Tokelau
	Burundi		Hong Kong		Northern		Tonga
					Mariana Islands		
0	Cambodia	0	Hungary		North Korea	0	Trinidad and
							Tobago
	Cameroon		Iceland		North Macedonia		Tunisia
	Canada		India		Norway		Turkey
	Cape Verde		Indonesia		Oman		Turkmenistan
	Cayman Islands		Iran		Pakistan	0	Turks and
							Caicos Islands
0	Central African	0	Iraq		Palau	0	Tuvalu
	Republic						
	Chad		Ireland		Palestine		Uganda
0	Chile	0	Isle of Man		Panama	0	Ukraine
0	China	0	Israel		Papua New	0	United Arab
					Guinea		Emirates
0	Christmas Island	0	Italy		Paraguay	0	United Kingdom
0	Clipperton	0	Jamaica		Peru	0	United States
	Cocos (Keeling)		Japan		Philippines	0	United States
	Islands						Minor Outlying
							Islands
	Colombia	0	Jersey		Pitcairn Islands	0	Uruguay
	Comoros	0	Jordan		Poland	0	US Virgin Islands
	Congo		Kazakhstan		Portugal		Uzbekistan
	Cook Islands		Kenya		Puerto Rico	0	Vanuatu
0	Costa Rica	0	Kiribati		Qatar	0	Vatican City
0	Côte d'Ivoire	0	Kosovo		Réunion	0	Venezuela
	Croatia		Kuwait		Romania		Vietnam
	Cuba		Kyrgyzstan		Russia	0	Wallis and
							Futuna
	Curaçao		Laos		Rwanda	0	Western Sahara
0	Cyprus	0	Latvia		Saint Barthélemy	0	Yemen

Czechia	Lebanon	Saint Helena Zambia
		Ascension and
		Tristan da Cunha
Democratic	Lesotho	Saint Kitts and Zimbabwe
Republic of the		Nevis
Congo		
Denmark	Liberia	Saint Lucia

The Commission will publish all contributions to this public consultation. You can choose whether you would prefer to have your details published or to remain anonymous when your contribution is published. Fo r the purpose of transparency, the type of respondent (for example, 'business association, 'consumer association', 'EU citizen') country of origin, organisation name and size, and its transparency register number, are always published. Your e-mail address will never be published. Opt in to select the privacy option that best suits you. Privacy options default based on the type of respondent selected

*Contribution publication privacy settings

The Commission will publish the responses to this public consultation. You can choose whether you would like your details to be made public or to remain anonymous.

Anonymous

Only organisation details are published: The type of respondent that you responded to this consultation as, the name of the organisation on whose behalf you reply as well as its transparency number, its size, its country of origin and your contribution will be published as received. Your name will not be published. Please do not include any personal data in the contribution itself if you want to remain anonymous.

Public

Organisation details and respondent details are published: The type of respondent that you responded to this consultation as, the name of the organisation on whose behalf you reply as well as its transparency number, its size, its country of origin and your contribution will be published. Your name will also be published.

I agree with the personal data protection provisions

Looking back

As mentioned in the Inception Impact assessment, the revision aims to tackle the following problems:

- Unmet medical needs and market failures for medicines other than medicines for rare diseases and children;
- Unequal access to available and affordable medicines for patients across the EU;
- The current legislative framework may not be fully equipped to respond quickly to innovation;
- Inefficiency and administrative burden of regulatory procedures;
- Vulnerability of supply of medicines, shortages of medicines;
- Environmental challenges and sustainability;
- Any other issues, which might emerge from the evaluation.

Q1 In your opinion, are there any other issues that should be addressed in this revision?

800 character(s) maximum

A major aspect to be addressed is bedside/in-house preparation of medicinal products, especially radiopharmaceuticals (RP). The pharma acquis mainly focuses on industrial/large scale manufacturing intended to be distributed commercially, leaving behind an important part of the pharmaceutical innovation, especially in the field of nuclear medicine.

The procedure and the implementation rules by EMA for granting a marketing authorization (MA) for RPs should be reconsidered.

- Therapeutic RP: the MA holder has to define a posology based on body weight, contradicting the Directive 2013/59/Euratom requiring an individual customized dosing.
- Diagnostic RP: the MA holder has to define a fixed activity concentration at a defined time point which is inappropriate for half-lives of few hours

Q2 How has the legislation performed in terms of the following elements?

	Very well	Well	Moderately	Poorly	Very poorly	Don' t know
Fulfilling its public health protection mission for patients and society.	©	•	0	0	0	0
Promoting the development of new medicines, especially for unmet medical needs.	0	0	•	0	0	0
3. Enabling timely development of medicines at all times, including during crises.	0	0	•	0	0	0
4. Enabling timely authorisation, including scientific evaluation, of medicines in normal times.	0	0	•	0	0	0
5. Enabling timely authorisation, including scientific evaluation during crises.	0	0	•	0	0	0
6. Adapting efficiently and effectively to technological and scientific advancements and innovation.	0	0	•	0	0	0

7. Ensuring medicines are of high quality, safe and effective.	0	0	•	0	0	0
8. Addressing the competitive functioning of the market to support affordability.	0	0	0	•	0	0
9. Ensuring the availability of generic ³ and biosimilar ⁴ medicines.						
[3] "Generic" is a copy of a medicine based on simple or chemical molecules. [4] "Biosimilar" is a copy of a medicine based on biological molecules.	•	0	©	•	0	0
10. Ensuring that new medicines are timely available to patients in all EU countries.	0	0	0	•	0	0
11. Ensuring that medicines stay on the market at all times and that there are no shortages.	0	•	0	0	0	0
12. Ensuring that authorised medicines are manufactured, used and disposed of in an environmentally friendly manner.	0	0	0	•	0	0
13. Ensuring that the EU system for development, authorisation and monitoring of medicines, including its rules and procedures, is understandable and easy to navigate.	0	0	•	•	0	0
14. Attracting global investment for medicine innovation in the EU.	0	0	0	0	0	•

Is there any other aspect you would like to mention, including positive or unintended effects of the legislation, or would you like to justify your replies?

800 character(s) maximum

Article 6 Nr. 2 of Dir 2001/83 imposes the need for a MA on "radionuclide precursor radiopharmaceuticals". In Article 1 instead of a definition for "radionuclide precursor radiopharmaceutical" a definition is given for the term radionuclide precursor. This led to the unintended effect that all radionuclides regardless of the type of preparation they are used in (kit-type procedure or complex preparation) need a MA to be distributed from a site that has the technical provisions for radionuclide production (accelerator, nuclear reactor etc.) to another site that is equipped for the radiosynthesis of the final radiopharmaceutical. Strict interpretation of the directive therefore leads to the non-availability of radionuclides that are prepared by technically demanding infrastructure.

Looking forward

This section reflects on possible solutions to address the problems identified in the inception impact assessment mentioned in the previous section.

Your contribution will help us in defining the way forward.

UNMET MEDICAL NEEDS

One of the aims of the strategy is to stimulate innovation and breakthrough therapies, especially in areas of 'unmet medical need'.

Regulators, health technology assessment experts and representatives of bodies responsible for reimbursing or paying for medicines ('payers') are discussing a definition or a set of principles for 'unmet medical needs' in order to achieve the objectives of the general pharmaceutical legislation. The discussions reveal different perceptions of what is an 'unmet medical need'. Convergence on this key concept should facilitate the design of clinical trials, generation of evidence and its assessment, and the quick availability on the market of these products and ensuring that innovation matches the needs of patients and of the national health systems.

The purpose of this question is to identify elements that are important in defining what is unmet medical need and in which areas of unmet medical need innovation should be stimulated.

[5] Please note that a similar discussion is taking place in the context of medicines for rare diseases and for children. The concept of 'unmet needs' in the context of rare diseases and children might be slightly differentiated compared to 'unmet needs' in the context of the general pharmaceutical legislation.

Q3 How important are the following elements for defining 'unmet medical needs'?

	Very important	Important	Fairly important	Slightly important	Not important	Don' t know
1. Seriousness of a disease.	0	•	0	0	0	0
Absence of satisfactory treatment authorised in the EU.	•	0	0	0	0	0
3. A new medicine has major therapeutic advantage over existing treatment(s).	•	0	0	0	0	0
Lack of access for patients across the EU to an authorised treatment.	0	•	0	0	0	0
5. Other (please specify).	0	0	0	0	0	0

800 character(s) maximum

This is key to get a multi-stakeholder endorsed definition to avoid a too strict interpretation. A legally binding definition raises more problems than it would solve, leading potentially to long discussions to the detriment of the populations intended to be served.

Unmet medical needs are implicit in the 'significant benefit' criteria. A commonly understood definition by all stakeholders (in particular regulators, HTA bodies, payers, medicine developers & patients) is expected. Quality-of-Life and patient-reported outcomes must be part of the criteria for 'significant benefit'. The definition should also take into account the burden of disease, prevalence, quality of life and societal needs. In addition, it should not only consider medicines, but all treatment modalities, like radiation

INCENTIVES FOR INNOVATION

The general pharmaceutical legislation guarantees the pharmaceutical innovator, typically a company, regulatory data and market protection for its new medicinal product. This data protection makes sure that another pharmaceutical company cannot re-use the proprietary data of the innovator for 8 years. Market protection makes sure that a generic or biosimilar medicine cannot be marketed until 10 years after authorisation. This dual protection shields a pharmaceutical innovator from generics or biosimilars on the market for 10 years. This protection is part of the EU system of incentives for innovation. The EU regime of intellectual property protection provides an additional protection coverage but is beyond the scope of this questionnaire and the revision of the general pharmaceutical legislation.

Q4 What do you think of the following measures to support innovation, including for 'unmet medical needs'?

	Very important	Important	Fairly important	Slightly important	Not important	Don' t know
The current data and market protection periods for innovative medicines: 10 years of market protection, and 8 years of data protection.	0	0	0	0	0	•
2. Provide different data and market protection periods depending on the purpose of the medicine (i.e. longer period of protection in areas of unmet medical need).	0	0	0	0	0	•
3. Reduce the data and market protection periods to allow earlier access for generic and biosimilar medicines to the market.	0	0	0	0	0	•
4. Introduce new types of incentives ⁶ on top of the existing data and market protection for medicines addressing an 'unmet medical need'. [6] Examples of new incentives are a transferable exclusivity voucher or a priority review voucher. A						
transferable exclusivity voucher would give the legal right to extend the protection time period of any other patented medicinal product, in exchange for the successful regulatory approval of a specified medicine for unmet medical need (e.g. an antibiotic). The voucher would be transferable or saleable, and may impact the turnover and profitability levels of other products in a developer's portfolio. A priority review voucher gives priority to the assessment of the application of the medicine in question or another medicine in the applicant's portfolio.	•	•	•	•	•	•
5. Early scientific support and faster review/authorisation of a new promising medicine for an unmet medical need.	0	0	0	0	0	•
6. Public listing of priority therapeutic areas of high unmet medical need to support product development by providing incentives.	0	0	0	0	0	•
7. Require transparent reporting from companies about their research and development costs and public funding as a condition to obtain certain incentives.	0	0	0	0	0	•
8. Other (please specify)	0	0	0	0	0	0

800 character(s) maximum

The system of orphan drugs and market protection is not suitable for many RPs, as the market potential for many RPs is limited. Measures such as strengthening the in-house individual preparations outside the marketing authorization track would be more effective.

Development of innovative RPs often takes place in radiopharmacies or research centers: all recent major breakthroughs were based on the use of in-house preparations of innovative RPs. In case a new RP has potential to be produced and distributed commercially, it then makes its way to pharmaceutical companies, taking over from academia and providing funding for further clinical trials. It is of the outmost importance that the revision includes specific provisions and incentives for academic research and hospital preparations.

ANTIMICROBIAL RESISTANCE⁷

Antimicrobial resistance (AMR) is the ability of microorganisms (such as bacteria, viruses, fungi or parasites) to survive and grow over time and no longer respond to medicines making infections harder to treat and increasing the risk of infections, severe illness and death. Antimicrobials include antibiotics, which are substances that fight bacterial infections. Overprescribing, overuse and inappropriate use of antibiotics are key drivers of AMR, leading to harmful health outcomes. The question below is intended to collect opinions on both the incentives for the development of new antimicrobials as well as possible option on their prudent use.

[7] amr_2017_action-plan.pdf (europa.eu).

Q5 Should there be specific regulatory incentives for the development of new antimicrobials while taking into account the need for more prudent use and if so what should they be?

100	10 character(s) maximum

FUTURE PROOFING: ADAPTED, AGILE AND PREDICTABLE REGULATORY FRAMEWORK FOR NOVEL PRODUCTS

Novel products and innovative solutions continue to challenge the understanding of a "medicinal product" with low volume, and cutting-edge products (e.g. medicines combined with self-learning artificial intelligence) becoming a new reality. 'Bedside' manufacture of more individualised medicines changes the way medicines are produced. There are classification and interplay challenges with other medical products, such as medical devices and substances of human origin, or related to the combination of clinical trials with in vitro diagnostics/medical devices and medicines. In addition, certain cell-based advanced therapy medicines⁸ are offered in hospital settings and are exempted from aspects of the pharmaceutical legislation. These developments offer possibilities for novel promising treatments and new ways of authorising and monitoring medicines but they are also testing the limits of the current regulatory system.

They need to be addressed to unfold their potential while safeguarding the principles of high quality, safety and efficacy of medicines.

Digital transformation is affecting the discovery, development, manufacture, evidence generation, assessment, supply and use of medicines. Medicines, medical technologies and digital health are becoming increasingly integral to overarching therapeutic options. These include systems based on artificial intelligence for prevention, diagnosis, better treatment, therapeutic monitoring and data for personalised medicines and other healthcare applications.

[8] Advanced therapy medicinal products (ATMPs) are medicines for human use that are based on genes, tissues or cells. They offer ground-breaking new opportunities for the treatment of disease and injury.

Q6 How would you assess the following measures to create an adapted, agile and predictable regulatory framework for novel products?

	Very important	Important	Fairly important	Slightly	Not important	Don' t know
1. Maintain the current rules.	0	0	0	0	•	0
2. Create a central mechanism in close coordination with other concerned authorities (e.g. those responsible for medical devices, substances of human origins) to provide non-binding scientific advice on whether a treatment/product should be classified as a medicine or not.	0	0	0	•	0	0
3. Make use of the possibility for 'regulatory sandboxes' in legislation to pilot certain categories of novel products/technologies.						
[9] Some very innovative solutions fail to see the light of day because of regulations which might be outdated or poorly adapted for fast evolving technologies. One way to address this is through regulatory sandboxes. This enables innovative solutions not already foreseen in regulations or guidelines to be live-tested with supervisors and regulators, provided that the appropriate conditions are in place, for example to ensure equal treatment. Regulatory sandboxes provide up-to-date information to regulators and supervisors on, and experience with, new technology, while enabling policy experimentation. See COM(2020) 103 final.	•	•	•	•	•	•
4. Create adaptive regulatory frameworks (e.g. adapted requirements for authorisation and monitoring with possibility to adjust easily to scientific progress) for certain novel types of medicines or low volume products (hospital preparations) in coherence with other legal frameworks (e.g. medical devices and substances of human origin ¹⁰) and respecting the principles of quality, safety and efficacy.	•	•	•	•	•	•
[10] Substances that are donated by humans such as blood, plasma, cells, gametes, tissues and organs and are applied as therapy. Some substances of human origin can also become starting materials to manufacture medicines.						

5. Introduce an EU-wide centrally coordinated process for early dialogue and more coordination among clinical trial, marketing authorisation, health technology assessment bodies, pricing and reimbursement authorities and payers for integrated medicines development and post-authorisation monitoring.	0	•	0	0	©	0
6. Other (please specify)	0	0	0	0	0	0

800 character(s) maximum

The EANM welcomes the acknowledgement of the current shift towards bedside/hospitals and more individualized preparations in the pharmaceutical ecosystem and is pleased to see that the European Commission understands that innovative solutions challenging the definition of medicinal product are testing the limit of the current regulatory system.

In this regard, the review of the pharmaceutical legislation should consider adaptations to the current system of authorizations and new regulatory pathways to accommodate to new products, such as innovative RPs.

Q7. Do you think that certain definitions and the scope of the legislation need to be updated to reflect scientific and technological developments in the sector (e.g. personalised medicines, bedside manufacturing, artificial intelligence) and if so what would you propose to change?

1000 character(s) maximum

Since 2001, the technological advances in R&D of new RPs have changed most of practices of preparations and delivery, justifying some adaptations within regulatory framework:

- RP require preparation in dedicated facilities not in standard hospital pharmacies. Therefore, the exemptions for pharmacies that have reasonably been established in the existing legislation for magistral and officinal preparations are not generally applicable to RP preparations and the regulatory practice thus varies considerably throughout Europe.
- A new definition of kit preparation is needed, especially defining what is out of the scope of a kit and therefore not in need for a marketing authorization.
- A definition of "radionuclide precursor radiopharmaceutical" (Art. 6 N. 2) is lacking and should be added instead of "radionuclide precursor" (Art. 1 N. 9), as suggested: a radionuclide produced and ready to use for the preparation of a radiopharmaceutical by combination with a kit.

REWARDS AND OBLIGATIONS RELATED TO IMPROVED ACCESS TO MEDICINES

Some medicines and therapies do not always reach patients in all EU countries, so patients in the EU still have different levels of access to medicines, depending on where they live. Even if a medicine received an EU-wide authorisation, companies are currently not obliged to market it in all EU countries. A company may decide not to market its medicines in, or decide to withdraw them from, one or more countries. This can be due to various factors, such as national pricing and reimbursement policies, size of the population and level of wealth, the organisation of health systems and national administrative procedures. Smaller markets in particular face challenges for availability and supplies of medicines.

Q8 How would you assess the following measures to improve patient access to medicines across the EU?

	Very important	Important	Fairly important	Slightly important	Not important	Don' t know
Maintain the current rules which provide no obligation to market medicines in all EU countries.	0	0	0	0	•	0
2. Require companies to notify their market launch intentions to regulators at the time of the authorisation of the medicine.	0	0	•	0	0	•
Introduce incentives for swift market launch across the EU.	0	0	•	0	©	0
4. Allow early introduction of generics in case of delayed market launch of medicines across the EU, while respecting intellectual property rights.	0	0	•	0	©	•
5. Require companies to place – within a certain period after authorisation – a medicine on the market of the majority of Member States, that includes small markets.	©	•	•	©	©	•
6. Require companies withdrawing a medicine from the market to offer another company to taker over the medicine.	•	•	•	•	•	•
7. Introduce rules on electronic product information to replace the paper package leaflet.	•	0	•	•	•	0
8. Introduce harmonised rules for multi-country packages of medicines.	0	0	0	•	0	0
9. Other (please specify).	0	0	0	0	0	©

800 character(s) maximum

Patient access to novel diagnostic and therapeutic radiopharmaceuticals is limited because of a lack of commercial interest for some types of RPs. Therefore, the availability of RP needs to be improved by enabling different types of marketing schemes. In addition, recent years have seen withdrawal of marketing authorization of well established RP with limited market value, there should be incentives to simplify retaining or re-gaining market authorisations, e.g. by accepting single English SPCs, easier access to nationally registered products in other member states, introducing waivers for retaining marketing authorization, if sales are limited etc.

ENHANCE THE COMPETITIVE FUNCTIONING OF THE MARKET TO ENSURE AFFORDABLE MEDICINES

The affordability of medicines has implications for both public and household finances. It poses a growing challenge to pay for medicines in the majority of Member States. Often, innovative medicines have higher prices, while there are growing concerns among stakeholders about the real-life effectiveness of some medicines and related overall costs. This puts the budgetary sustainability of health systems at risk, and reduces the possibilities for patients to have access to these medicines. Generics and biosimilars ¹¹ of medicines which no longer benefit from intellectual property protection (off-patent medicines) may provide accessible and affordable treatments. They also increase the availability of alternative treatment options for patients. They may also increase competition between available medicines. However, experience shows that there are still barriers for medicines entering the EU market, including for generics or biosimilars.

[11] "Generics" are copies of medicines based on simple or chemical molecules; "biosimilars" are copies of medicines based on biological molecules.

Q9 In your view, to what extent would the following measures support access to affordable medicines?

	To a great extent	To a certain extent	No change	Very little	Not at all	Don' t know
Maintain the current rules.	0	0	0	0	•	0
2. Stimulate earlier market entry through a broader possibility to authorise generics /biosimilars despite ongoing patent protection ('Bolar exemption') ¹² .	•	•	•	0	0	0
[12] The Bolar exemption allows companies to conduct research on patent protected medicines under the condition that it is with a view to apply for a marketing authorisation for a generic.						

3. Create a specific (regulatory) incentive for a limited number of biosimilars that come to the market first.	0	©	•	0	©	0
4. Introduce an EU-wide scientific recommendation on interchangeability for specific biosimilars.	0	•	0	0	0	•
5. Introduce other, non-legislative measures, such as joint procurement to reinforce competition while addressing security of supply and environmental challenges.	•	•	•	0	0	•
6. Other (please specify).	0	0	0	0	0	0

800 character(s) maximum

Biosimilar and generics are not the only tools to foster access to affordable medicines. Reimbursement and pricing strategies of radiopharmaceuticals in Europe vary significantly between member states. The variation seen is a consequence of reimbursement and pricing being decided at a national level. This means that access to radionuclide therapy is not uniform across the Union. The EANM would therefore welcome further studies to be conducted on appropriate reimbursement through Health Technology Assessment for RP, as well as European guidelines on reimbursement schemes for RP.

REPURPOSING OF MEDICINES

Repurposing is the process of identifying a new use for an established medicine in a disease or condition other than that it is currently authorised for. Repurposing of older (off-patent) medicines constitutes an emerging and dynamic field of medicines development, often led by academic units and medical research charities, with the potential for faster development times and reduced costs as well as lower risks for companies. This is because repurposing commonly starts with substances that have already been tested and many have demonstrated an acceptable level of safety and tolerability. The objective is to identify the opportunities and address any regulatory burdens to facilitate repurposing of off-patent, affordable medicines.

Q10 What measures could stimulate the repurposing of off-patent medicines and provide additional uses of the medicine against new diseases and medical conditions? Please justify your answers.

1	000 character(s) maximum

SECURITY OF SUPPLY OF MEDICINES

Shortages of medicines and the vulnerabilities in the pharmaceutical supply chain continue to be concerns in the EU. Shortages of medicines can have serious impacts on patient care. Under the current pharmaceutical legislation, pharmaceutical companies and wholesalers must, within the limits of their responsibilities, ensure a continued supply of medicines once they are placed on the market in the EU. Companies must also notify national authorities at least two months before an expected shortage or planned market withdrawal.

Q11 What is your view on the following measures to ensure security of supply of medicines in the EU?

	Very important	Important	Fairly important	Slightly important	Not important	Don' t know
1. Maintain the current rules.	0	0	0	0	•	0
2. Earlier reporting of shortages and market withdrawals to national authorities in a common format.	•	0	0	0	0	0
3. Companies to have shortage prevention plans.	•	0	0	0	0	0
4. Companies to have safety stocks.	0	0	0	0	•	0
5. Monitoring of supply and demand at national level.	0	0	•	0	0	0
6. Introduce a shortage monitoring system at EU level.	0	•	0	0	0	0
7. Require companies to diversify their supply chains, in particular the number of key suppliers of medicines and components.	0	0	0	0	0	•
8. Companies to provide more information to regulators on their supply chain.	0	0	0	0	0	•
9. Introduce penalties for non-compliance by companies with proposed new obligations.	0	0	0	0	0	•
10. EU coordination to help identify areas where consolidation in the supply chain has reduced the number of suppliers.	•	0	0	0	0	0
11. Other (please specify)	0	0	0	0	0	0

800 character(s) maximum

Due to the short life of RP, time management & having access to transportation hubs that understand the need for quick & swift processing is key. The transport of radioactive material is regulated by 2 dedicated laws on the transport of dangerous goods, on the road (ADR) or by aviation (IATA), being major hurdles for an efficient and unbureaucratic supply of RPs.

The EANM is concerned with the Europe-wide issue of ageing research reactors. While the number of accelerators is increasing, the supply of medical radioisotopes relies on a limited number of research reactors.

This review should include the necessary measures to support a robust supply chain for radioisotopes which goes beyond irradiation of targets and includes the supply of target material and processing capabilities.

QUALITY AND MANUFACTURING

Medicines manufactured for the EU market must comply with the principles and guidelines of good manufacturing practice (GMP). GMP describes the minimum standard that a medicines manufacturer must meet in their production processes. GMP requires that medicines are of consistent high quality, are appropriate for their intended use and meet the requirements of the marketing authorisation or clinical trial authorisation.

Q12 What is your opinion of the following measures to ensure manufacturing and distribution of high quality products?

	Very adequate	Adequate	Neutral	Less adequate	Not adequate	Don' t know
Maintain the current rules.	0	0	0	0	•	0
Strengthen manufacturing and oversight rules.	0	0	0	0	•	0
Adapt manufacturing rules to reflect new manufacturing methods.	•	0	0	0	0	0
4. Include selected environmental requirements for manufacturing of medicines in line with the one health approach on antimicrobial resistance ¹³ .	•	©	©	©	•	•
[13] The one-health approach is a holistic and multi-sectorial approach						

to addressing antimicrobial resistance since antimicrobials used to treat infectious diseases in animals may be the same or be similar to those used in humans.						
5. Increase Member State cooperation and surveillance of the supply chain in the EU and third countries.	0	•	•	0	0	0
6. Strengthen and clarify responsibilities of business operators over the entire supply chain on sharing information on quality, safety and efficacy.	0	©	©	©	©	•
7. Other (please specify).	0	0	0	0	0	0

800 character(s) maximum

Annex 3 to EU Guidelines to GMP defines specific requirements for industrially prepared RPs: in house manufactured RPs that are prepared from licensed starting materials (generator and kit) are exempted from the annex (all RPs prepared by a procedure other than a kit-type preparation are included).

GMP regulations should not apply to preparations using marketing authorised kits and generators as the authorisation is intended for the gained radionuclide to be combined with the kit. While partly recognized by legislation, this is not enforceable in all European countries. Since the safety of this procedure is proven by the marketing authorisation process and since such a compounding process is not prone to errors, GMP regulations only reiterate the marketing authorisation process.

ENVIRONMENTAL CHALLENGES

While access to pharmaceuticals is a priority, it is also important that the environmental impacts of those pharmaceuticals are as low as possible. The environmental risk assessments (ERAs) is currently not taken into account in the overall benefit/risk analysis which influences the delivery of a marketing authorisation (MA) of a medicine. ERA can influence risk management measures. Yet, ERA results are not decisive in the MA process.

Q13 How would you assess the following measures to ensure that the environmental challenges emerging from human medicines are addressed?

	Very important	Important	Fairly important	Slightly important	Not important	Don' t know
Maintain the current rules.	0	•	0	0	0	0
2. Strengthen the environmental risk assessment during authorisation of a medicine, including risk mitigation measures, where appropriate.	0	0	0	0	•	0
3. Harmonize environmental risk assessment by national regulators, including risk mitigation measures.	0	0	0	0	•	0
4. Increase information to the health care professionals and the general public about the assessment of environmental risks of medicines.	0	•	0	0	0	0
5. Allow companies to use existing data about environmental risks for authorisations of a new medicine to avoid duplicating tests.	0	0	0	0	0	•
6. Other (please specify).	0	0	0	0	0	0

800 character(s) maximum

Nuclear medicine physicians are well trained to the challenges of waste management and each nuclear medicine department across Europe follows national rules to ensure an efficient and safe radioactive waste management.

Hospitals using radioisotopes have sufficient infrastructural and manpower resources to keep its radiation levels towards the environment within specified safe limits.

The EANM recognises the huge amount of work achieved by healthcare professionals and regulatory authorities at the national level to ensure safe waste management and believes that no further measures are needed at the European level with regards to ERA for in-house production of RP.

Q14 Is there anything else you would like to add that has not been covered in this consultation?

900 character(s) maximum

The regulatory framework for in-house RP production is not harmonized throughout Europe and has resulted in unbalanced access to innovative RPs based on national particularities. Future revision of the pharma legislation should consider the importance of in-house production of RP, ensuring quality and safety with harmonized standards and dedicated rules considering the particular needs for this specialty. Ideally a dedicated legal text that covers the in-house production of RP should be established in a way that it does not cover additional requests raised by the radioactive nature but clearly states alleviations from general industrial regime, no longer referring to existing annexes to the EU GMP guideline but should clearly define the appropriate measures needed for the preparation of a safe patient dose.

Q15 In case you would like to share a document that substantiates your replies, please upload it below (optional).

Only files of the type pdf,txt,doc,docx,odt,rtf are allowed

b864c74d-64e7-4e9a-a5a7-dbbf66edd493/EANM_attachment_to_Pharma_Legislation_consultation.pdf

Contact

EU-PHARMACEUTICAL-STRATEGY@EC.EUROPA.EU