

Michael Kaeding
Julia Schmäler · Christoph Klika

Pharmacovigilance in the European Union

Practical Implementation
across Member States

OPEN

 Springer

Pharmacovigilance in the European Union

Michael Kaeding · Julia Schmälder
Christoph Klika

Pharmacovigilance in the European Union

Practical Implementation
across Member States

OPEN

 Springer

Prof. Dr. Michael Kaeding
Julia Schmälter
Christoph Klika

Universität Duisburg-Essen
Duisburg, Deutschland



ISBN 978-3-658-17275-6 ISBN 978-3-658-17276-3 (eBook)
DOI 10.1007/978-3-658-17276-3

Library of Congress Control Number: 2017932440

© The Editor(s) (if applicable) and The Author(s) 2017. This book is published open access.

Open Access This book is licensed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>), which permits use, sharing, adaptation, distribution and reproduction in any medium or format, as long as you give appropriate credit to the original author(s) and the source, provide a link to the Creative Commons license and indicate if changes were made.

The images or other third party material in this book are included in the book's Creative Commons license, unless indicated otherwise in a credit line to the material. If material is not included in the book's Creative Commons license and your intended use is not permitted by statutory regulation or exceeds the permitted use, you will need to obtain permission directly from the copyright holder.

The use of general descriptive names, registered names, trademarks, service marks, etc. in this publication does not imply, even in the absence of a specific statement, that such names are exempt from the relevant protective laws and regulations and therefore free for general use.

The publisher, the authors and the editors are safe to assume that the advice and information in this book are believed to be true and accurate at the date of publication. Neither the publisher nor the authors or the editors give a warranty, express or implied, with respect to the material contained herein or for any errors or omissions that may have been made. The publisher remains neutral with regard to jurisdictional claims in published maps and institutional affiliations.

Lektorat: Jan Treibel

Printed on acid-free paper

This Springer imprint is published by Springer Nature
The registered company is Springer Fachmedien Wiesbaden GmbH
The registered company address is: Abraham-Lincoln-Str. 46, 65189 Wiesbaden, Germany

Contents

Abbreviations	IX
List of Tables, Figures and Boxes	XI
Preface	XIII
1 Introduction	1
1.1 Background and Terms of Reference	1
1.2 Methodology: Selection of Countries	3
1.3 Methodology: Research Strategy	5
1.4 Summary of Evidence	8
1.5 Implementation Assessment Structure	8
References	9
2 Pharmacovigilance	11
2.1 Fundamentals of Pharmacovigilance	11
2.2 Importance of Pharmacovigilance for Biologicals	13
References	15
3 The EU Pharmacovigilance System	17
3.1 EU Institutions and Pharmacovigilance Actors	21
3.2 Legislative Developments	23
3.3 The Pharmacovigilance Reform: Directive 2010/84/EU and Article 102	25
References	33

4	Timely and Correct Transposition of Pharmacovigilance across Member States	35
4.1	Timely Transposition of Directive 2010/84/EU across Member States	35
4.2	Correct Transposition of Directive 2010/84/EU across Member States	37
4.2.1	Correct Transposition – Processes and Actors	37
4.2.2	Correct Transposition – Quality and Content	40
	References	42
5	Practical Implementation in Six Member States	45
5.1	ADR Reporting in the United Kingdom	45
5.1.1	The System	45
5.1.2	Perceived Challenges	49
5.1.3	Perceived Best Practices	53
5.2	ADR Reporting in Finland	57
5.2.1	The System	57
5.2.2	Perceived Challenges	62
5.2.3	Perceived Best Practices	64
5.3	ADR Reporting in Poland	65
5.3.1	The System	65
5.3.2	Perceived Challenges	67
5.3.3	Perceived Best Practices	71
5.4	ADR Reporting in France	73
5.4.1	The System	73
5.4.2	Perceived Challenges	76
5.4.3	Perceived Best Practices	79
5.5	ADR Reporting in Portugal	81
5.5.1	The System	81
5.5.2	Perceived Challenges	85
5.5.3	Perceived Best Practices	88
5.6	ADR Reporting in Germany	90
5.6.1	The System	90
5.6.2	Perceived Challenges	94
5.6.3	Perceived Best Practices	98
	References	100

6	Challenges and Best Practices in Perspective	103
6.1	Pharmacovigilance Systems	104
6.2	Major Challenges	107
6.3	Comparison of Factors Contributing to Underreporting	109
6.3.1	Lack of Awareness	109
6.3.2	Complexity of ADR Reporting	110
6.3.3	Lack of Cooperation	111
6.3.4	Interconnectivity Problems	112
	References	113
7	Conclusions and Recommendations	115
7.1	Specific Recommendations in Relation to Article 102	116
7.2	General Recommendations: National Healthcare Systems and Policy Options for Pharmacovigilance	120
	References	124

Abbreviations

ÄAAS	Ärzteausschuss Arzneimittelsicherheit (Germany)
ADR	Adverse Drug Reaction
AFSSAPS	Agence Française de Sécurité Sanitaire des Produits de Santé (France)
AGRIFISH	Agriculture and Fisheries (Council)
AkdÄ	Arzneimittelkommission der Deutschen Ärzteschaft (Germany)
AMK	Arzneimittelkommission der Deutschen Apotheker (Germany)
ANSM	Agence Nationale de Sécurité du Médicament et des Produits de Santé (France)
BfArM	Bundesinstitut für Arzneimittel und Medizinprodukte (Germany)
CHMP	Committee for Medicinal Products for Human Use
CMPH	Co-ordination Group for Mutual Recognition and Decentralised procedures – Human
CRPV	Centre Régionaux de Pharmacovigilance (France)
DG	Directorate General (European Commission)
EBGM	Empirical Bayes Geometric Mean (Method)
EMA	European Medicines Agency
ENVI	Environment, Public Health and Food Safety (European Parliament)
EP	European Parliament
EPSCO	Employment, Social Policy, Health and Consumer Affairs (Council)
EU	European Union
FPD	French Pharmacovigilance Database
Fimea	Lääkealan Turvallisuus- Ja Kehittämiskeskus (Finland)
GDP	Good Distribution Practice
GIS	Główny Inspektorat Sanitarny (Poland)
GMP	Good Manufacturing Practice
GROWTH	Directorate General Internal Market, Industry, Entrepreneurship and SMEs (European Commission)
GVP	Good Pharmacovigilance Practice

HCP	Healthcare Professional
ICSR	Individual Case Safety Report
IMCO	Internal market and Consumer Protection (European Parliament)
INFARMED	Autoridade Nacional do Medicamento e Produtos de Saúde (Portugal)
IT	Information Technology
ITRE	Industry, research and Energy (European Parliament)
MAH	Marketing Authorisation Holder
MDSO	Medical Device Safety Officer
MHRA	Medicines and Healthcare Products Regulatory Agency (United Kingdom)
MSO	Medical Safety Officer
NCA	National Competent Authority
NHS	National Health Service (United Kingdom)
NIM	National Implementing Measure
PASS	Post-Authorisation Safety Study
PEI	Paul-Ehrlich-Institut (Germany)
PHAGRO	Bundesverband des Pharmazeutischen Großhandels (Germany)
PRAC	Pharmacovigilance Risk Assessment Committee
SANTE	Directorate General Health and Food Safety (European Commission)
SCOPE	Strengthening Collaboration for Operating Pharmacovigilance in Europe
THL	Terveyden- ja Hyvinvoinnin Laitos (National Institute for Health and Welfare, Finland)
URF	Unidade Regional de Farmacovigilância (Portugal)
URPL	Urząd Rejestracji Produktów Leczniczych, Wyrobów Medycznych i Produktów Biobójczych (Poland)
WHO	World Health Organisation
WIS	Wojewodzki Inspektorat Sanitarny (Poland)
YCC	Yellow Card Centre (United Kingdom)

List of Tables, Figures and Boxes

3 The EU Pharmacovigilance System

Fig. 3.1	The pharmacovigilance network on the European level	18
Tab. 3.1	Development of Article 102 of Directive 2010/84/EU	29

4 Timely and Correct Transposition of Pharmacovigilance across Member States

Fig. 4.1	Timely transposition of Directive 2010/84/EU across EU Member States (provided by the European Commission)	36
Tab. 4.1	Correct transposition of Directive 2010/84/EU across EU Member States – processes and actors	38
Tab. 4.2	Correct transposition of Directive 2010/84/EU across EU Member States – quality and content	41

5 Practical Implementation in Six Member States

5.1 United Kingdom

Fig. 5.1	ADR reporting in the United Kingdom	46
Fig. 5.2	ADR reporting by actors (2005-2014)	48
Box 5.1	Best Practice: The Yellow Card App	54
Box 5.2	Best Practice: Yellow Card Hospital Champion Scheme Wales	55

5.2 Finland

Fig. 5.3	ADR reporting in Finland	58
Fig. 5.4	ADR reporting by actors in 2015	60
Tab. 5.1	How vaccines are identified	64

5.3 Poland

Fig. 5.5	ADR reporting in Poland	66
Fig. 5.6	Reporting of ADRs stemming from vaccines	72
Box 5.3	Best Practice: URPL on social media	71

5.4 France

Fig. 5.7	ADR reporting in France	74
Box 5.4	The 2009 Mediator scandal in France	77
Box 5.5	Best Practice: Master's Degree in Pharmacovigilance and Pharmacoepidemiology	81

5.5 Portugal

Fig. 5.8	ADR reporting in Portugal	82
Fig. 5.9	ADR reporting by actors	84

5.6 Germany

Fig. 5.10	ADR reporting in Germany for synthetic medicines	91
Fig. 5.11	ADR reporting in Germany for biological medicines	92
Box 5.6	Red- and blue-hand letters	99
Box 5.7	AMK/PHAGRO Schnellinformationssystem	100

6 Challenges and Best Practices in Perspective

Tab. 6.1	Comparison of the national pharmacovigilance systems	106
----------	--	-----

Preface

This implementation assessment, “Pharmacovigilance in the EU: Practical Implementation across Member States” is the result of intensive teamwork. The assessment was commissioned by AbbVie, directed by Dr Michael Kaeding and managed by Julia Schmälder. In addition, the group of collaborators included Christoph Klika, Roxana Dürsch, Annika Körner, Stella Malliara and Charline Ulrich.

“Pharmacovigilance in the EU: Practical Implementation across Member States” comes at a time when Europe faces rising populism and Euroscepticism, and a time when Europe needs to find effective responses to pressing European and global issues – in short, to develop a new narrative. Europe has to deliver by reaching out to its Member States and must prove more than ever its added value. Non-compliance with EU rules implies legal uncertainty and hampers the European regulatory framework in which citizens live and businesses operate. In addition, non-compliance frustrates further European integration, including the free movement of people, goods, services and capital, and potentially jeopardizes market competitiveness, social standards, national growth and employment performance across Europe.

Our implementation assessment studies the practical implementation of pharmacovigilance across Europe. European pharmacovigilance has been geared towards the detection of adverse reactions to medicinal products to ensure public health through product safety and to provide medicinal products with a high level of efficacy.

The research for this assessment would have been impossible without fruitful discussions and collaborations with colleagues and implementation scholars during the 10 months of investigation. Some of our thoughts that eventually turned into chapters were presented at conferences: the IRUN compliance workshop, “Non-compliance with EU Regulatory Norms, Rules and Values” at the University of Duisburg-Essen, the ECSA-C 11th Biennial Conference in Halifax, the ECPR Pan-European Conference on the European Union in Trento, the ECPR General Conference at the Charles University of Prague, and the GAfPA Patient Advocacy and Safety Conference in Brussels.

Furthermore, this assessment would have been impossible without the support of our interview partners. Many thanks to all those we met in Berlin, Bonn, Brussels, Helsinki, Lisbon, London, Liverpool, Paris, Reims and Warsaw, who contributed by kindly agreeing to give up their valuable time to participate in in-depth interviews conducted by the Duisburg-Essen pharmacovigilance research team. Moreover, the team is grateful to Monika Bähz and Peter Staniczek for their administrative support and to Elizabeth Meyer zu Heringdorf for her linguistic expertise.

Finally, the views expressed in this implementation assessment are those of its authors, and these views neither reflect those of their institution of employment nor its staff. The authors are solely responsible for any mistakes or inaccuracies.

Dr Michael Kaeding, Julia Schmälter and Christoph Klika
Brussels and Duisburg, December 2016

1.1 Background and Terms of Reference

Healthcare is a major component of the contemporary welfare state, and thus ensuring public health through product safety is a substantive public concern.

It is universally accepted that all medicines might produce adverse drug reactions (ADRs) during the course of their normal therapeutic use (Belton and the European Pharmacovigilance Research Group 1997). In order to ensure post-marketing authorisation safety, all suspected ADRs must be reported in an accurate and timely manner.

Due to the use of living cells, biological medicinal products (so-called biologics) pose a specific challenge for pharmacovigilance and the accurate reporting of ADRs for mainly four reasons: restrictions in clinical trials, sensitivity to changes in the manufacturing process, reporting of batch numbers and the establishment of valid causality assessments.

For these reasons, the timely and accurate reporting of ADRs is particularly important when it comes to the use of biological products. In order to ensure the correct and timely attribution of adverse events to the correct biological product and batch, the availability of information such as the international non-proprietary name, the brand name, the company's name and the batch number are extremely important.

The former European Union (EU) pharmaceuticals legislation (Directive 2001/83/EC) underwent an extensive reform process since 2006, which resulted in a new Directive (2010/84/EU) and Regulation (No 1235/2010) in 2010, bringing about significant changes to pharmacovigilance in general and ADR reporting in particular.

The new legislation, in force since July 2012, strengthens the monitoring of medicinal products in general and biologics in particular to ensure public health through product safety. The new legislation is geared towards the detection of adverse reactions to medicinal products that have been authorised for marketing,

and it consists of activities and methods for detecting, assessing, informing on and preventing ADRs.

In August 2016 the European Commission (Commission) published its assessment of the new EU pharmacovigilance legislation. The assessment consists of two documents, namely the Commission Report titled “Pharmacovigilance-related Activities of Member States and the EMA Concerning Medical Products for Human Use (2012-2014)” and the related Commission staff working document. The first document, an eight-page report, mainly explains the role of the relevant actors involved (Member States, EMA and the Commission) and the main activities related to pharmacovigilance. Further, the report provides statistics on the numbers of pharmacovigilance-related reports and activities between 2012 and 2014 (such as ADR reports), showing that the situation in Europe has been steadily improving since the adoption of the new pharmacovigilance legislation. The Commission staff working document is more elaborate (54 pages) and includes additional information on activities related to ADR reporting, such as improvements in strengthening patient involvement or awareness-raising campaigns (European Commission 2016, 10-12).

Both Commission documents, however, only scratch the surface and do not go into further detail about the overall day-to-day functioning of the pharmacovigilance systems in single Member States, the remaining challenges, or factors that might impede or incentivise ADR reporting. Most important, they lack country-specific and detailed information about the ADR reporting of biologicals.

This also holds for the work conducted by the three-year Joint Action, called the “Strengthening Collaboration for Operating Pharmacovigilance in Europe” (SCOPE, 2013-2016). Funded by the Consumers, Health and Food Executive Agency,¹ this collaborative joint action was created to support effective implementation of the pharmacovigilance reform. SCOPE aims at delivering practical tools to and guidance for national regulatory authorities to ensure the consistent development of pharmacovigilance systems across Europe, including training in key aspects of pharmacovigilance and tools and templates that aim to support best practices across Europe. SCOPE was divided into eight separate work packages, one of which focused on improvements in ADR reporting.

Overall, SCOPE offers a useful source of information for horizontal aspects of national pharmacovigilance systems in Europe. It provides a fuller general understanding of, and develops best practices in, reporting mechanisms for ADRs.

However, SCOPE pays little attention to biologicals. Moreover, its survey data does not allow tracing back country-specific information. Therefore, SCOPE does

1 Executive agencies in the EU are created by the Commission to support the implementation of specific programmes, inter alia, in the area of public health.

not contribute to a Member State-specific understanding of reporting mechanisms for ADRs regarding biologicals.

In summary, our study focuses on the ADR reporting of biologicals and on specific EU Member States representing various types of healthcare systems across Europe. Assessing the timely transposition and accurate implementation of the European pharmacovigilance framework as described in Directive 2010/84/EU, this report aims at identifying major drivers impeding and incentivising appropriate ADR reporting in Europe. Our assessment offers a rich and detailed account of ADR reporting systems across individual Member States, identifying perceived challenges and best practices in order to formulate recommendations on the necessary conditions for robust and effective systems ensuring accurate identification and rapid traceability of biological medicines.

1.2 Methodology: Selection of Countries

Assessing medical services has become a political issue throughout the industrialised world. The utilisation of health services is influenced by the activities of physicians, hospitals, professional associations, interest groups, legislative chambers and administrators. Furthermore, it is influenced by the competition of rival ideologies. Thus, systems can be centralised or decentralised, or possibly fragmented in a recentralised state.

Therefore, our research strategy for the EU pharmacovigilance implementation project goes beyond single-country studies. Its geographic scope covers six areas, distinguishing between ideal systems – namely, state healthcare systems and societal healthcare systems (as well as various permutations of mixed systems thereof):

- United Kingdom (ideal-type state healthcare system)
- Finland (state-based mixed type)
- Poland (state-based mixed type)
- France (state-based mixed type)
- Portugal (societal-based mixed type)
- Germany (societal-based mixed type)

Essentially, there are three responsibilities in healthcare: first, the financing of health services through taxation, social insurance contributions or private means; second, the provision of healthcare which can be carried out in state-run facilities by state-based actors, in societal-based facilities, or in private for-profit facilities

by private actors; and third, the regulation by these actors of the various aspects of financing and provision (Moran 1999; Burau and Blank 2004). Taken together, the financing, service provision and regulation of healthcare are three key dimensions along which different groups of actors may take on numerous roles and exhibit varying levels of engagement. However, in “real” medical care systems, the “state”, “societal” and “private” elements tend to coexist alongside each other in all three dimensions. Therefore, when analysing changes over time, the mix within categories is taken into consideration.

Based on uniform features across all dimensions of healthcare, we identified three instances of ideal types. These types comprise state healthcare systems, in which financing, service provision and regulation are carried out by state actors and institutions; societal healthcare systems, in which societal actors take on the responsibility of healthcare financing, provision and regulation; and finally private healthcare systems, in which all three dimensions fall under the auspices of market actors.

In total, six empirical cases illustrate different arrangements for governing the medical care sector and their associated political problems. The United Kingdom, Finland, Poland, France, Portugal and Germany have different public traditions concerning the ratio of individual versus collective responsibility for social welfare in general and medical care in particular.

Given their respective histories and patterns of development, Finland and the United Kingdom have well-developed prototypes of organisational and political arrangements. The United Kingdom is highly centralised and its National Health Service (NHS) is directly financed by the central government out of general tax revenues. Significant changes have taken place intra-dimensionally such that there has been an internal shift of levels. The introduction of an internal market in the United Kingdom has not led to a replacement of the state as the main regulator; however, the United Kingdom has created some space for self-regulation through NHS trusts. Finland, although a unitary state, has granted important financial and organisational roles to local authorities, and it has decentralised many health-related functions to regional levels.

Germany can be characterised by predominantly social-insurance-based regulation and financing combined with a high and increasing share of private healthcare provision. In addition, the current growth of state intervention in Germany even enlarges the distance to the societal-based ideal type.

Poland is exemplary for Central and Eastern Europe which has changed from socialist healthcare systems to social health insurance systems (Dubois and McKee 2004) and is currently characterised by comparatively weak social insurance systems actors and a high proportion of healthcare being provided in public hospitals.

Despite the low level of tax funding, Poland can still be classified as the state-based mixed type, and only a strengthening of corporate social insurance actors would lead to a real system change.

Southern European countries changed from a social insurance type to a national-health-service type in the late 1970s and early 1980s (Guillén and Matsaganis 2000). In contrast to France, however, Portugal maintained elements of the former social health insurance scheme and is characterised by weak public authorities (Cabiedes and Guillén 2001).² Despite the weakness of state authorities, the changes of the 1970s and 1980s seem to represent a system shift from a societal-based mixed type towards a state-based mixed type (Wendt et al. 2009).

1.3 Methodology: Research Strategy

The primary assessment program involves a range of research methodologies that are both quantitative and qualitative. Based on a mainly threefold methodological approach, including qualitative, quantitative and benchmarking methods, the findings and recommendations have emerged from a most appropriate, sequential desk and field research process, benchmarking, and interviews across the six selected Member States, national (hospital) pharmacist associations, national regulatory agencies, and those administering systems for post-marketing safety surveillance of biologicals, including spontaneous reporting systems and external stakeholders.

The research strategy for the EU pharmacovigilance implementation project comprises five key stages, as outlined below and detailed in the following paragraphs:

- Desk-based analysis
- Document research
- Key informant interviews
- In-depth field research
- Benchmarking

Desk-based analysis. There is a vast literature on pharmacovigilance dealing with incentives of healthcare professionals to report ADRs. This literature was crucial for developing analytical categories for both desk-based and field-based research. However, given that this literature is part of the health sciences, it is concerned

2 Spain, in contrast, has experienced reforms of the medical care sector which means that it no longer has a societal-type system.

primarily with individual factors of ADR reporting, and it necessarily neglects political implications at the systems level. Furthermore, research designs are mostly based on surveys conducted in single case studies, and thus deal with countries in isolation. Extending on this literature, the six empirical case studies, based on varying organisational and political arrangements, allow for a better contextualisation of ADR reporting.

A comparative case study, with cases selected on an ideal-type health system, provides for added benefit to the existing literature.

Document research. Assessing the transposition of the European pharmacovigilance framework involved conducting a documentation review. This first phase helped collect useful information on the timely and correct transposition, management and governance of compliance with Directive 2010/84/EU across all EU-28 Member States. Information on the EU pharmacovigilance Directive was taken from the official legal database of the EU, which covers all Member State legislation and provides publication references regarding Member States' national provisions to enact EU legislation. Because Member States often transpose EU legislation by using more than one national transposing instrument, we recorded all transposing instruments that were indicated to the Commission until March 2016. Because the recorded measures do not indicate whether the national implementation process is complete, a second step was put in place.

Key informant interviews. It is essential that practitioners, industry and regulators participate in the reporting of suspected ADRs in order to ensure accurate traceability back to the manufacturer. Consequently, formal schemes were established in every country to enable healthcare professionals and the public to report ADRs.

This step involved a series of in-depth interviews which were carried out, either face-to-face or by telephone, with different stakeholder groups to map the national pharmacovigilance systems. We developed a list of potential interview partners who would be relevant for the study, and from this list of stakeholders, we conducted 33 key informant interviews with executives, healthcare professionals, the industry and patient organisations between April and September 2016.

On the basis of these interviews, the country chapters mapping the respective national pharmacovigilance systems were finalised and a first set of perceived best practices and challenges was drafted.

In-depth field research. The third step in assessing the European pharmacovigilance framework as described in Directive 2010/84/EU involved in-depth study and visits

to the six selected countries. This step also helped us compare the different national systems and develop recommendations.

Simultaneously, monitoring data provided in documents, websites and reports reflecting the current state of play of academic literature was performed. This has included collecting details on the number and features of adverse drug reporting, incurred by the following studies:

- Andrews, E., Moore, N. (eds) (2014). *Mann's Pharmacovigilance*. Wiley-Blackwell Oxford.
- Drozd et al. (2014). *Biosimilar Drugs – Automatic Substitution Regulations Review. Polish ISPOR Chapter's Therapeutic Programmes and Pharmaceutical Care (TPPC) Task Force Report*. Journal of Health Policy 1: 52-57.
- European Commission (2016). *Pharmacovigilance Related Activities of Member States and the European Medicines Agency Concerning Medicinal Products for Human Use (2012-2014)*, COM(2016) 498 final, Brussels, 08.08.2016.
- SCOPE (2016). *Work Package 4 – ADR Collection*.
- Vermeer et al. (2015). *Traceability of Biologicals: Present Challenges in Pharmacovigilance*. Expert Opinion on Drug Safety 14 (1).

Benchmarking. Benchmarking analysis included a comparative assessment of cases highlighting perceived best practices versus perceived challenges in developing national systems, allowing for the identification of biologicals by brand name and batch number.

By utilising these comparative materials, we were able to see the relative strengths as well as the chronic problems of the EU pharmacovigilance system. Drawing on desk- and field-based research, these findings complement and add significantly to primarily theoretical discussions about the system (see Borg et al. 2015; Calvo and Zuñiga 2014). The research distinguishes the malleable from the inevitable in health-related decision-making across Europe and thereby suggests the constrained nature of policy options in Western democratic societies.