

Article 43 Saviour or Nightmare?

Dr. Karin Lauber Senior Regulatory Specialist Agrochemicals and Biopesticides SCC Scientific Consulting Company

CEUREG 2018, Wien

Article 43 **Overview**





Article 43 – Regulatory points **Timelines (without Category 4 studies)**





- Two parallel processes (PPP-re-auth. & DM) with mostly similar deadlines
- For Art. 43 statement confirming access to a.s. data necessary
- Differences
 - Data matching: <u>RMS issue</u>
 - Product renewal: <u>zRMS issue</u>



1st challenge: Double evaluation work

- Art.43 : 3 zRMS do the same work at the same time
- > Data matching and Art. 43: 2 processes in parallel (up to 4 MSs to evaluate data)

Further challenge: How to find a zRMS?

> Theory: zSCs (or MSs): to ask APPs about desired zRMS (Excel lists) plus final decision

- Excel lists too early (AIR IV.2 in SEZ; spring 2018 vs. end of Nov. 2023)
 Not applied yet, on-going evaluation, defence unclear
- Theory: Multiple applicants to find a common zRMS
 - No harmonisation between the applicants

> Theory: a.s. (Co)RMS to act as PPP zRMS in its zone (even if PPP not registered in its country)

- National law against non binding SANCO

=> Problem for Art. 43: e.g. BE, DE, HU, IE, PL

=> Problem for data matching: e.g. DK

Article 43 – Regulatory points Evaluation work and allocation of the zRMS



SANCO/2010/13170, point 3.7.5 (rev 15) / point 3.7.4 (rev 14):

"Where the renewal of the same product is sought in different zones, zonal RMSs are encouraged to reach an <u>interzonal</u> <u>decision</u> regarding the use of Art. 43(6)."

• Proposal:

- Interzonal approach as a pre-requisite
 - One dRR for all zones
 - => PhysChem, Analytic, Tox: One data package in all zones
 - => Residues: 2 data packages to be evaluated
 - => Fate / Etox: Some updates for national addenda needed
 - => Efficacy: Not necessary for Article 43
- Consolidation of Article 43 with data matching process
 - One MS to evaluate data matching plus the Art. 43 evaluation with amended timelines:
 > izRMS: 8 months evaluation time (1 month for data matching plus 7 months for Article 43)
 => cMSs: max of 2 months for Article 43 (only natl. addenda plus administrative process)
- One izRMS (ideally the a.s. RMS)
- > Special cases
 - In case of a.s. with many products (e.g. Glyphosate, Mancozeb): Work distribution by izSC
 - Products with > 1 a.s.: Also only one evaluator or change to second RMS with 2nd submission?

Article 43 – Regulatory points Official/ legal basis and data to be submitted







This document has been conceived as a guidance document of the Commission Services. It does not represent the official position of the Commission. It does not intend to produce legally binding effects. Only the European Court of Justice has jurisdiction to give preliminary rulings concerning the validity and interpretation of acts of the institutions of the EU pursuant to Article 267 of the Treaty.

Article 43 – Regulatory points **Official/ legal basis and data to be submitted**



Reg (EC) 1107/2009 (Art. 43)

- 43.2: Necessary information to be submitted within 3 months of the DoA:
 - (a) Copy of PPP authorisation
 - (b) + (c) New information (new data requirements/ guidances/ criteria/ endpoints) plus justification
 - (d) Information that PPP complies with the requirements (conditions and restrictions)
 - Monitoring report (where the authorisation was subject to monitoring) (e)

SANCO/2010/131370

Not any more in Not any more in revision 15 Necessary information to be submitted within 2 months following the EFSA-conclusion:

- Template to notify intended zonal applications [SANCO/12544/2014]
- Indication which parts of the risk assessment need updating
- An indicative "data matching list" and "data matching program" (if necessary)
- Indication of agreement on needed studies (plus expected timeframe)

Necessary information to be submitted within 3 months of the DoA:

- Art. 43.2 requirements [see above]
- Comparative assessment (where necessary) [Art.43.1 -> Art. 29 -> Art. 50 requirement]
- List of intended uses plus statement "no significant changes to previous authorisations"
- A product-specific dossier clearly indicating where there is new information





Problem:

- > In principle **<u>no (legal) requirement</u>** to
 - Submit a dossier
 - => Only stated in a Guidance document => No regulation available!

• But:

Complete dossier needed for RR preparation

• Proposal:

Maybe a legally binding regulation for Article 43 would be better!

Article 43 – Regulatory points Brexit and consequences



- Consequences after Brexit
 - > Prolongation of Mutual Recognitions (acc. to Dir. 91/414) with UK as country of origin
 - Some MSs not sure to follow the UK extension after the Brexit
- Proposal
 - Acceptance of MR-prolongations (also 91/414)
 - To be included in an Article 43 regulation

Article 43 – Regulatory points Brexit and consequences



Consequences after Brexit

- Higher workload for the CEZ-MSs
 - Industry to deal on PPP level of AIR 2 and AIR 3 batches 1-6 (no-re-allocation)



Re-allocation of AIR 3 batches 7-10

- Proposal:
 - Re-allocation of the outstanding groups AIR 2 and AIR 3 batches 1-6
 - Interzonal approach to distribute the workload to all zones

Article 43 – Regulatory points Low risk products (LRP)



- Having more Low risk products is a desired direction in the EU!
- But for Low risk products
 - Same Art. 43 deadlines as for non-LRPs
 - Same evaluation time under Article 43 as for non-LRPs
 - Same authorisation period will be granted as for non-LRPs

• Proposal:

- > After a.s. is approved as LRAI:
 - => Modified re-authorisation procedure (instead of Article 43), e.g.
 - (1) Check if product is also low risk
 - (2) Fast-track evaluation for LRP (120 days)
 - (3) Granting authorisation without expiry date
- Start of pilot data-call-in system only for LRP

Article 43 – Specific points Category 4 studies



SANCO/2010/13170 - point 3.5:

Cat. 4 = Data which are directly related to new guidance in place at the time of submission or to a new/revised endpoint <u>decided at the time of the renewal of the approval of the a.s.</u> (endpoints as listed in the supporting information to the EFSA conclusions) and for which the time is too short <u>from the publication of the EFSA conclusion</u> to produce the requested study.

Difficulties and question:

- Study preparation at time of EFSA conclusion?
 - But no legal endpoints and no final decision available
 - What about changes of endpoints afterwards (DoA time) => Again new study requested?

• Proposal:

Study preparation start at time of DoA

Article 43 – Specific points Category 4 studies



SANCO/2010/13170 - point 3.5:

The renewal dRR and the Cat. 4 studies should be submitted within 3 months of the final Cat. 4 study being finalised

• Difficulties and question:

dRR to be submitted 3 months after Cat. 4 studies available => too short!

• Proposal:

> Longer period for dRR preparation after Cat. 4 studies available (e.g. 6 months)

Article 43 – Specific points Category 4 studies





• Difficulties and question:

- Decision on Cat. 4 studies
 - Will be done in the 1st month after application deadline of Art. 43
 - In case of negative decision => No time for negotiations with competitors
- Proposal:
 - Negative decision on Cat. 4 studies: Time for negotiations needed (clock-stop)





- 5-Batch study needed for all non-Notifier [Data matching & Article 43]
 - All new impurities must be analysed

Citation Draft Minutes czSC meeting (06.06.18):

"Art. 43 GD is clear on it as a missing 5 batch analysis is not to be considered as Cat.4"

Problem - Timelines

- Study preparation time = 6 months (at least)
- Possible study start = as soon as new endpoints valid (= DoA; <u>not</u> EFSA conclusion)
- Submission deadline = 3 months after DoA
- <u>Main question:</u> When to prepare the study?
- Proposal:
 - 5-Batch Study as Cat. 4 study
 - > To start study preparation after DoA deadline

Article 43 – Specific points Delays



• Problems

- Blocking innovation
 - Use extensions (e.g. GAP changes, new major uses, minor uses)
 - Mutual recognitions

• Proposal:

- Combination of ...
 - Art. 33 and Art. 43 applications (re-evaluation plus use extension)
 - Art. 40 and Art.43 applications (re-evaluation plus MR to new MSs)
 - ... at the same time and in one process

Article 43 – Harmonisation GAP harmonisation





Northern zone

 GAP harmonisation encouraged (with supporting data)

Central zone

No harmonisation possible "due to tight deadlines"

Southern zone

- Harmonisation desired
- To add the same uses in MSs where those are not authorised (Art. 43 plus Art 33)

Article 43 – Harmonisation Efficacy requirement – major uses



SANCO/2010/13170, point 3.7.5 : "Where a GAP change is necessary, efficacy data addressing the revised GAP should be assessed. If not, only information about resistance should be assessed in the efficacy section."



Northern zone

Full efficacy evaluation necessary

Central zone

Either only resistance or full data set to be submitted

Southern zone

- If no GAP change either ... or:
 - Efficacy needed if data not evaluated acc. to Uniform Principles
 - Only resistance needed
 - Summary of study results needed

Article 43 – Harmonisation Minor uses, GAP and Efficacy



Further challenges Minor uses:

Different approaches for the re-authorisation of minor uses (Art. 51 and Art. 43)

- Article 51 application (e.g. DK)
- Article 43 application (e.g. LT)
- Sometimes full Efficacy data set necessary (e.g. MT)

Proposal:

- Clear harmonised rules needed (e.g. legally binding Regulation)
 - For GAP harmonisation
 - Efficacy requirements of major uses

Harmonisation for Minor use re-authorisations needed

- Combination of Art. 43 and Art. 51 helpful

Article 43 Conclusion



Main problems:

- In many cases Guidance documents not clear enough
 - Room for interpretation => Harmonisation difficult
- Guidance documents are not binding

• Need of:

- Implementation of interzonal approach
 - Introduction of an izRMS-system and and an izdRR
- Combination of Art. 43 and
 - Data matching
 - Art. 51
 - Art. 33
 - Art. 40
- > Adapted deadlines for LRP (also in the re-authorisation procedure)
- Harmonisation of
 - GAP between the MSs
 - Efficacy requirements for major uses: Only resistance necessary!
- Regulation for Art. 43 needed

Article 43 Conclusion



Article 43 Saviour or Nightmare?

It is somewhere in-between!





Thank you for your kind attention

Questions? ... Ideas ? ... Points for discussion? ...

... Please do not hesitate to contact me: Karin.Lauber@scc-gmbh.de