



- GUIDANCE DOCUMENT -

Final, January 2003
Rev.3, September 2006

Assessment Report Mutual Recognition Procedure

OVERVIEW

<Invented Name>
<(Active Substance)>

AB/H/ nnnn/

Applicant:

Date:

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. RECOMMENDATION

II. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

II.1 Problem statement

II.2 About the product

II.3 General comments on the submitted dossier

II.4 General comments on compliance with GMP, GLP, GCP and agreed ethical principles

III. SCIENTIFIC OVERVIEW

III.1 Quality aspects

III.2 Non clinical aspects

III.3 Clinical aspects

III.4 Risk Management Plan

IV BENEFIT RISK ASSESSMENT

V RECOMMENDED CONDITIONS FOR MARKETING AUTHORISATION AND PRODUCT INFORMATION

V.1 Conditions for the marketing authorisation

V.2 Summary of Product Characteristics

V.3 Package Leaflet and User Testing

V.4 Labelling

I. RECOMMENDATION

Based on the review of the data on quality, safety and efficacy, the RMS considered that the application for <product name>, in the treatment of <indication>, could be approved. The national marketing authorisation was granted on <date>.

II. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

II.1 Problem statement

Rationale for the product: epidemiology, main features of the disease and current therapy.

For generic applications this section is not applicable

II.2 About the product

Mode of action.

Pharmacological classification.

Claimed indication and recommendation for use and posology.

Special pharmaceutical aspects, if any, e.g. novel delivery system

II.3 General comments on the submitted dossier

State the type of marketing authorisation application incl. reference to the legal basis of the application. If appropriate, elaborate here on the key aspects of the dossier in relation with the legal basis.

For applications based on Art 10a (bibliographical applications): The document in Module 1.5.1 summarizing the grounds and evidence used for demonstrating that the constituents of the medicinal products have a well-established use with an acceptable level of safety and efficacy should be discussed here. It should be made clear as to why it is scientifically acceptable to waive certain studies that would normally be performed in-house.

For applications based on Art 10 (generics): The document in Module 1.5.2 summarizing the grounds and evidence used in demonstrating that the medicinal product is essentially similar to an authorised medicinal product should be discussed here.

For applications based on Art 10 (3) the differences between the medicinal product applied for and the reference product should be discussed.

Introduce and comments on the use of an European Reference Product, if applicable.

Introduce and comment the clinical development programme in view of the proposed indications and posologies (if applicable).

Indicate if, and when Scientific Advice was given and if this was followed by the applicant.

Indicate if CPMP guidance documents were followed.

Indicate availability and/or need for paediatric development and development in other special populations, such as elderly, male/female and ethnic subpopulations.

II.4 General comments on compliance with GMP, GLP, GCP and agreed ethical principles

The RMS has been assured that acceptable standards of GMP are in place for these product types at all sites responsible for the manufacture and assembly of this product prior to granting its National authorisation.

< For manufacturing sites within the Community, the RMS has accepted copies of current manufacturer authorisations issued by inspection services of the competent authorities as certification that acceptable standards of GMP are in place at those sites.>

< For manufacturing sites outside the Community, the RMS has accepted copies of current GMP Certificates or satisfactory inspection summary reports, 'close-out letters' or 'exchange of information' issued by the inspection services of the competent authorities (or those countries with which the EEA has a Mutual Recognition Agreement for their own territories) as certification that acceptable standards of GMP are in place at those non-Community sites.>

Elaborate as appropriate in concordance with points made in the critical assessment modules.

A specific comment should be made as to whether any inspections are needed and if so whether it is GMP, GLP and/or GCP.

In the MRFG meeting 15 December 2003 the Group adopted the above mentioned wording on GMP.

III. SCIENTIFIC OVERVIEW AND DISCUSSION

This section might be compiled from the paragraphs “assessor’s overall conclusions on...” in the critical reviews. The respective paragraphs appear at the end of the relevant parts of the detailed assessment reports. These paragraphs could be effectively copied and pasted to the corresponding headings below or written directly below at the discretion of the assessor. However, attempts should be made to have a similar structure for the different part of the assessment.

A general conclusion explaining why a marketing authorisation and each of the proposed indications have been approved or rejected and detailing the risk-benefit considerations for the product.

The structure is in accordance with the Public Assessment Report structure and thus can be updated at the different stages of the Mutual Recognition Procedure. The text in this chapter should be sufficiently detailed to be used for drafting the Public Assessment Report.

Furthermore, when applicable, a list of outstanding commitments after the granting of the national marketing authorisation should be given in this Section.

Requested Post-marketing studies should be discussed here.

For generic applications:

In case an European Reference Product is used, the RMS should make clear whether the justification to use this product is based on their own files or based on the files submitted upon request by another Member State.

If the SPC is different from that of the reference product, the assessment report should outline the data supporting the modifications. In particular, if the RMS granted more indications for the reference product than the CMS, information on the underlying documentation for this additional indication should be given

Where the SPC of the bandleader has been approved by a Commission Decision after a Referral based on Art 30 of Dir 2001/83 this SPC should be used for products with the same active substance and pharmaceutical form, unless specified.

III.1 Quality aspects (see Guidance document on Module 3)

Drug substance

<The control tests and specifications for the drug substance are adequately drawn up.>

< Stability studies have been performed with the drug substance. The proposed retest period of <...> is justified.>

Drug Product

<The development of the product has been described, the choice of excipients is justified and their functions explained.>

<The product specifications cover appropriate parameters for this dosage form. Validations of the analytical methods have been presented. Batch analysis has been performed on <number> batches. The batch analysis results show that the finished products meet the specifications proposed.>

<The conditions used in the stability studies are according to the ICH stability guideline. The control tests and specifications for drug product are adequately drawn up.>

<The proposed shelf-life of <number> years with <storage conditions to be specified> for the drug product is considered acceptable.>

<The Quality documentation in relation to <product name> is of sufficient quality in view of the present European regulatory requirements.>

Elaborate as appropriate in concordance with points made in the critical assessment module.

The following information might be added:

- General information on results of dissolution tests
- A statement whether the drug substance and excipients used are well known and of pharmacopoeial quality.
- If applicable, a statement on EDQM certificate of suitability is given for the drug substance.

III.2 Non clinical aspects (see Guidance document on module 4)

Generic applications in general deal with existing substances. A non-clinical assessment should be performed focused on the new information. A non-clinical assessment can only be waived in those cases where the product can be regarded as well known in both RMS and CMS and where no new preclinical data are available. However, as soon as new non-clinical data become available, e.g. regarding pregnancy and lactation, QT, etc, which may impact the SPC, a new non-clinical assessment has to be performed.

Bibliographic applications are ‘full dossier’ applications. Non-clinical data should be discussed here. In the AR it should be indicated whether the studies/literature submitted are relevant for the medicinal product. When certain studies are not performed it should be made clear why this is scientifically justified, based upon the criteria of ‘well established medicinal use’ as outlined in Annex 1 to Directive 2001/83/EC as amended.

If applicable, a waiver for an environmental risk assessment should be discussed here.

Pharmacology

Pharmacokinetics

Toxicology

III.3 Clinical aspects (see guidance documents on Module 5)

Generic applications:

For medicinal products with a systemic effect, the need of appropriate bioequivalence studies should be addressed here, or it should be justified when these studies were not considered relevant or necessary. The conclusions of the assessment of these studies should be summarized here.

A confidential attachment (not to be disclosed to the applicant) should state the full composition of and specification for the reference product used in the bioequivalence studies to enable the concerned Member States to compare it with that of the approved products marketed in their own countries.

The justification for using an European Reference Product should be described here.

If the SPC is different from that of the original product referred to, the AR should outline the data supporting the modifications.

Information on the underlying documentation for granting an additional indication should be given, if the RMS granted more indications for the reference product than the CMS.

Bibliographic applications are ‘full dossier’ applications. Clinical data should be discussed here.

Pharmacokinetics

Pharmacodynamics

Clinical efficacy

Clinical safety

III.4 Risk Management Plan

If applicable, the waiver for submission of a risk management plan should be discussed here

Non-clinical and clinical safety specifications

Pharmacovigilance Plan

Risk Minimisation Plan

IV. BENEFIT RISK ASSESSMENT

V RECOMMENDED CONDITIONS FOR MARKETING AUTHORISATION AND PRODUCT INFORMATION

V.1 Conditions for the marketing authorisation

Legal Status

Follow-up measures

Specific obligations

V.2 Summary of Product Characteristics (SPC)

The English version of SPC approved by the RMS should be included here.

V.3 Package Leaflet (PL) and User Testing

V.3.1 Package Leaflet

The English version of the PL approved by the RMS should be included here.

V.3.2 Assessment of User Testing

The RMS should include a brief assessment of user testing, if available. Otherwise, a comment on whether user testing is foreseen, or whether the justification for its absence is acceptable

V.4 Labelling

The English version of the Labelling (line listing) approved by the RMS should be included here.