

26 October 2015 EMA/710507/2015

# Comments received from public consultation on good pharmacovigilance practices (GVP)

GVP Module VIII Addendum I – Requirements for transmission of information on non-interventional post-authorisation safety studies (Rev 2) (EMA/395730/2012)

The draft of this module was released for public consultation between 11 August and 9 October 2015. The module has been revised, taking the comments received into account.

Those who participated in the public consultation were asked to submit comments using a specific template.

The comments received are published, identifying the sender's organisation (but not name). Where a sender has submitted comments as an individual, the sender's name is published.

The European Medicines Agency thanks all those who participated in the public consultation for their contributions.





8 October 2015

Submission of comments on GVP Module VIII Addendum I – Requirements for transmission of information on non-interventional post-authorisation safety studies (Rev 2) (EMA/395730/2012)

#### Comments from:

Name of organisation or individual

### **ACRO (Association of Clinical Research Organizations)**

Please note that these comments and the identity of the sender will be published unless a specific justified objection is received (please see privacy statements:

http://www.ema.europa.eu/ema/index.jsp?curl=pages/home/general\_general\_content\_000516.jsp&mid and http://www.ema.europa.eu/docs/en\_GB/document\_library/Other/2012/02/WC500123144.pdf).

When completed, this form should be sent to the European Medicines Agency electronically, in Word format (not PDF) (see Introductory cover note for the public consultation of GVP under Practical advice for the public consultation:

http://www.ema.europa.eu/docs/en\_GB/document\_library/Other/2012/02/WC500123145.pdf).



Stakeholder number	General comment	Outcome
(To be completed by the Agency)		(To be completed by the Agency)
	The Association of Clinical Research Organizations (ACRO) represents the world's leading, global clinical research organizations (CROs). Our member companies provide a wide range of specialized services across the entire spectrum of development for new drugs, biologics and medical devices – from discovery, pre-clinical, proof of concept and first-in-man studies through post-approval and pharmacovigilance research. With more than 110,000 employees engaged in research activities around the world (including 30,000 in Europe), ACRO advances clinical outsourcing to improve the quality, efficiency and safety of biomedical research. Each year, ACRO member companies conduct more than 9,000 clinical trials involving nearly two million research participants in 142 countries. On average, each of our member companies works with more than 500 research sponsors annually.  ACRO welcomes this opportunity to comment on the draft Addendum to the Module VIII pharmacovigilance guidance and appreciates that the Addendum clearly summarises the current requirements of the competent authorities in the EU for transmission of information on non-interventional post-authorisation safety studies (PASS). ACRO is concerned, however, that there is an	

Stakeholder number	General comment	Outcome
(To be completed by the Agency)		(To be completed by the Agency)
	unnecessary level of complexity in these requirements.  ACRO therefore recommends and encourages the EU regulatory network to simplify and harmonise the transmission requirements.	

Line number(s) of	Stakeholder number	Comment and rationale; proposed changes	Outcome
the relevant text (e.g. Lines 20-23)	(To be completed by the Agency)	(If changes to the wording are suggested, they should be highlighted using 'track changes')	(To be completed by the Agency)
Table VIII Add I.1. Studies imposed as an obligation by a competent authority		Comment: ACRO welcomes the clarity on current requirements shown by the table. However, ACRO encourages the competent authorities of the EU regulatory network to simplify requirements by moving to a position where the same requirements apply in all Member States. If this is not possible at this time, ACRO further encourages the EU regulatory network to work towards achieving this position and further revising the guideline in the near future. For instance, ACRO questions why it is considered necessary by all Member States except Denmark that information must be submitted directly to the competent authority as well as via the PRAC. In the interests of simplification of requirements and reducing the administrative burden on organisations conducting PASS imposed by a competent authority, ACRO recommends that all competent authorities accept transmission of information via the PRAC without the need for additional direct submissions.  Proposed change (if any): Modify the table to indicate that all competent authorities accept transmission of information via the PRAC without the need for additional direct submissions.	
Table VIII Add I.2. Studies initiated, managed or		Comment: Again, ACRO welcomes the clarity on current requirements shown by the table. However, ACRO encourages the competent authorities of the EU regulatory network to simplify requirements by moving to a position where the same	

Line number(s) of	Stakeholder number	Comment and rationale; proposed changes	Outcome
the relevant text (e.g. Lines 20-23)	(To be completed by the Agency)	(If changes to the wording are suggested, they should be highlighted using 'track changes')	(To be completed by the Agency)
financed		requirements apply in all Member States. If this is not possible	
voluntarily by		at this time, ACRO further encourages the EU regulatory	
marketing		network to work towards achieving this position and further	
authorisation holder		revising the guideline in the near future.	
		Additionally, ACRO notes that the proposed revision of the	
		main Annex VIII guideline on PASS seeks to make a	
		distinction in the text of the guideline between legal	
		requirements and recommendations. ACRO recommends that	
		this should be done also for the Addendum. For instance,	
		while there are benefits to including non-imposed PASS	
		conducted voluntarily by the marketing authorisation holder in	
		the EU PAS Registry (transmission to some Member States via	
		the registry, and the desire to apply the same level of	
		transparency, scientific and quality standards to all PASS), the	
		proposed revisions to the Addendum do not make clear that	
		there is no legal requirement to include voluntary, non-	
		imposed studies in the registry.	
		However, given that all EU competent authorities have access	
		to the EU PAS Registry, ACRO questions why it is also	
		considered necessary to submit the required information	
		directly to the competent authorities of several Member States	
		when information is included in the registry. In the interests of	
		simplification of requirements, reducing the administrative	
		burden on organisations conducting voluntary PASS, and	
		encouraging the inclusion of voluntary PASS in the registry,	

Line number(s) of	Stakeholder number	Comment and rationale; proposed changes	Outcome
the relevant text (e.g. Lines 20-23)	(To be completed by the Agency)	(If changes to the wording are suggested, they should be highlighted using 'track changes')	(To be completed by the Agency)
		ACRO recommends that all competent authorities accept transmission of information via the registry without the need for additional direct submissions.	
		Proposed change (if any): Modify the table to indicate that use of the EU PAS Registry is recommended but not a legal requirement for voluntary PASS and that, if the registry is used, all competent authorities will accept transmission of information via the registry without the need for additional direct submissions	
		ACRO thanks the EMA for the opportunity to submit comments on this consultation. Please do not hesitate to contact us if we can provide additional information	

Please add more rows if needed.



9 Oct 2015

Submission of comments on Guideline on good pharmacovigilance practices (GVP) – Module VIII Addendum I – Requirements for transmission of information on non-interventional post-authorisation safety studies (Rev. 2) – EMA/395730/2012 Rev. 2

### Comments from:

Name of organisation or individual

EFPIA

Please note that these comments and the identity of the sender will be published unless a specific justified objection is received.

When completed, this form should be sent to the European Medicines Agency electronically, in Word format (not PDF).



Stakeholder number	General comment (if any)	Outcome (if applicable)
(To be completed by the Agency)		(To be completed by the Agency)
	The format of this addendum could be further improved to clarify the MAH requirements, i.e. to whom and how to send what, as it is currently very difficult to follow, which has a potential to create a risk of misunderstanding requirements and even worse regulators may not be receiving the right documents.  EFPIA's current understanding is that the addendum seems to require that the same document is sent via different routes to the same recipients.  EFPIA strongly recommends that efforts are made to reduce this redundancy.	
	To provide comprehensive information on requirements for the transmission of information, it would be welcomed if expected timelines for transmission of information could be specified in this addendum in line with recommendation provided in the Module VIII revision 2, lines 218-220.	

Line number(s) of	Stakeholder	Comment and rationale; proposed changes	Outcome
the relevant text (e.g. Lines 20-	number (To be	(If changes to the wording are suggested, they should be highlighted using 'track changes')	(To be completed by the Agency)
(e.g. Lines 20- 23)	completed by the Agency)	using track changes )	
Addendum I (1st paragraph) – Statistical analytical plan		Where the full statistical analytical plan is not included in the protocol, it should be reported following the same requirements as for the study protocol.  Comment:  The use of the word "reported" is unclear: it could be interpreted as "transmitted" (as in "sent" or "communicated") rather than "reported" since the term "reported" is not consistently used elsewhere.  It should also be clarified whether amended statistical analytical plans following substantial amendments need to be transmitted as per the protocol. Especially how much detail is required in the SAP beyond what is currently already provided as part of the protocol itself.  Proposed change:  This Addendum specifies requirements for the transmission of study protocols, updated protocols following substantial amendments, statistical analysis plans, updated statistical analysis plans following substantial statistical analysis plan amendments, final study reports and progress reports if requested on post authorisation safety studies initiated, managed or financed by marketing authorisation holders voluntarily or pursuant to an obligation. Where the full statistical plan is not included in the protocol, it should be reported transmitted following the same requirements as for the study protocol."	
First paragraph		Comment: It is recommended to mention the scope of this addendum in order to clarify that it applies to non-interventional studies.	
		<ul><li>Proposed change:</li><li>This Addendum specifies requirements for the transmission of study</li></ul>	

Line number(s) of	Stakeholder	Comment and rationale; p	roposed o	changes			(	Dutcome
the relevant text	number	(If changes to the word	ing are s	suggested	, they sho	uld be highlighted	d (	(To be completed by the Agency)
(e.g. Lines 20-	(To be	using 'track changes')						
23)	completed by							
	the Agency)							
	the Agency)							
		protocols, updated pro reports and progress r authorisation safety st voluntary or pursuant • Table VIII Add I.1. No by a competent author • Table VIII Add I.2. No	eports if i udies init to an obla <u>n Interve</u> rity	requested of iated, mandigation.  Intional PAS	on <u>non-inte</u> aged or fina <u>'S</u> Studies i	rventional post- anced by marketing mposed as an oblig	gation	
		financed voluntarily by	marketii	ng authoris	ation holde	rs		
		Comment: It should be clarified, and addendum apply to PASS scompetent authorities only imposed or required by EU aligned with guidance prov. In addition, as for GVP VII the use of a table listing the for each type of PASS by claw for each category, vs. level.  Proposed change: Insert table	studies, was and non wided in Manager 1, the claractual attegory.	which have applies to P -EU compe lodule VIII rity of this provisions of this should this should be the provisions of the provisions of this should be the provisions of the provisions	been impos ASS studie tent author revision 2. document v of the legis I make clea	ed or required by Es which have been ities. This should be would be enhanced ation in a tabular for what is imposed by	e with orm by	
			Catagony 2	Catagon 3	Catagony 4			
		Provisions of Art 107m	Category 2	Category 3	Category 4			
		Provisions of Art 107n						
		Provisions of Art 107o						
		Provisions of Art 107p Provisions of Art 107q						
14-17		Comment:						
		For centrally authorised protocols and reports show VIII Add I.1. or Table VIII	ıld be rep	orted to Me	ember Stat	es according to Tab		

Line number(s) of	Stakeholder	Comment and rationale; proposed changes	Outcome
the relevant text number  (e.g. Lines 20- (To be completed by the Agency)		(If changes to the wording are suggested, they should be highlighted using 'track changes')	(To be completed by the Agency)
		<ul> <li>study. For centrally authorised products, study protocols and reports should always also be sent to the Agency.</li> <li>This sentence would benefit from further clarity; It could be interpreted as if an additional submission to the EMA is requested whilst this would lead into duplication: <ul> <li>EMA would receive protocols/results of imposed NI-PASS as the MAH submits them to the PRAC following the Dossier requirements for Centrally Authorised Products (CAPs) (EMA/497021/2012).</li> <li>For voluntary NI-PASS, the EMA would receive them via the EU PAS register. In addition, the pharmacovigilance legislation does not foresee that applicants should send all non-interventional PASS protocol/report to the EMA/PRAC, only for the imposed NI-PASS. The wording should therefore be changed as follows.</li> </ul> </li> <li>Proposed change (if any):  <ul> <li>"As a reminder, for centrally authorised products, study protocols and reports should always also be sent to the Agency will be received by the EMA:  <ul> <li>for Studies initiated, managed or financed voluntarily by marketing authorisation holders: automatically following their submission on the EU PAS register by the MAH.</li> <li>For Studies imposed as an obligation: as part of the submission of the protocol/results to the PRAC following the Dossier requirements for Centrally Authorised Products (CAPs) (EMA/497021/2012)."</li> </ul> </li> </ul></li></ul>	
Footnote 4 of Table VIII Add I.2		Comment: This footnote states that a message is sent at the end of registration in the EU PAS register by the Agency to all EU MSs with a link to the study record.  EFPIA requests the EMA to clarify this process, as it is not described in the ENCePP register or on the EMA website.	

Line number(s) of the relevant text	Stakeholder number	Comment and rationale; proposed changes  (If changes to the wording are suggested, they should be highlighted	Outcome  (To be completed by the Agency)	
(e.g. Lines 20- 23)	(To be completed by the Agency)	using 'track changes')	t inchigency)	
		Comment: Table VIII Add I.2. indicate that next to the provision via EU PAS register, reports/protocols should also be provided to member states, according to national procedures, in case the study is conducted in that member state (applicable to AT, BG, CZ, DE, ES, IT, NL, PT, RO, SI, HR, LT, SK, FR).  EFPIA interprets this to imply that the provision to EU PAS register of protocols and reports for voluntary studies is not enough, but local submissions also need to be done.		
		<b>Proposed change:</b> Additional clarification should be added to the Guideline highlighting whether all protocols and reports for voluntary studies need to be submitted to EU PAS register as well as submitted directly to NCAs.		



<Date of submission>

Submission of comments on GVP Module VIII Addendum I - Requirements for transmission of information on noninterventional post-authorisation safety studies (Rev 2) (EMA/395730/2012)

#### **Comments from:**

Name of organisation or individual

EGA - European Generic and Biosimilar medicines Association

Please note that these comments and the identity of the sender will be published unless a specific justified objection is received (please see privacy statements:

http://www.ema.europa.eu/ema/index.jsp?curl=pages/home/general/general content 000516.jsp&mid and http://www.ema.europa.eu/docs/en\_GB/document\_library/Other/2012/02/WC500123144.pdf).

When completed, this form should be sent to the European Medicines Agency electronically, in Word format (not PDF) (see Introductory cover note for the public consultation of GVP under Practical advice for the public consultation:

http://www.ema.europa.eu/docs/en\_GB/document\_library/Other/2012/02/WC500123145.pdf).



Stakeholder number	General comment	Outcome
(To be completed by the Agency)		(To be completed by the Agency)
	The EGA welcomes this opportunity to comment the new revision of the <i>GVP Module VIII – Post-authorisation safety studies – Addendum I.</i> We don't have any specific comment, just one general comment regarding study information:  Study information must be submitted to the EU PAS Registry but also to the Member State (MS) where the study is to be conducted and all PRAC members. We believe that the EU PAS Registry should be used as a single submission portal which allows the study documents to then be disseminated to the relevant MS and PRAC members.	

Line number(s) of	Stakeholder number	Comment and rationale; proposed changes	Outcome
the relevant text (e.g. Lines 20-23)	(To be completed by the Agency)	(If changes to the wording are suggested, they should be highlighted using 'track changes')	(To be completed by the Agency)
		No further comments.	

Please add more rows if needed.



5<sup>th</sup> October 2015

Submission of comments on GVP Module VIII Addendum I – Requirements for transmission of information on non-interventional post-authorisation safety studies (Rev 2) (EMA/395730/2012)

#### Comments from:

Name of organisation or individual

Gilead Sciences International Ltd.

Please note that these comments and the identity of the sender will be published unless a specific justified objection is received (please see privacy statements:

http://www.ema.europa.eu/ema/index.jsp?curl=pages/home/general\_content\_000516.jsp&mid and http://www.ema.europa.eu/docs/en\_GB/document\_library/Other/2012/02/WC500123144.pdf).

When completed, this form should be sent to the European Medicines Agency electronically, in Word format (not PDF) (see Introductory cover note for the public consultation of GVP under Practical advice for the public consultation:

http://www.ema.europa.eu/docs/en\_GB/document\_library/Other/2012/02/WC500123145.pdf).



Stakeholder number	General comment	Outcome
(To be completed by the		(To be completed by the Agency)
Agency)		

Line number(s) of	Stakeholder number	Comment and rationale; proposed changes	Outcome
the relevant text (e.g. Lines 20-23)	(To be completed by the Agency)	(If changes to the wording are suggested, they should be highlighted using 'track changes')	(To be completed by the Agency)
Page 3, Line 4-5		Comment: text 'Where the full statistical analytical plan is not included in the protocol, it should be reported following the same requirements as for the study protocol' Most SAPs are operational and detailed documents expanding on the detailed analytical approaches of those statistical analyses described in the study protocol. Making the full SAP subject to the same submission and review requirements as the protocol may significantly impact study timelines and is considered redundant effort. The planned statistical analyses should be reviewed as part of the protocol, where they have to have sufficient detail to judge the appropriateness for the study protocol objectives, aims and design.  Proposed change (if any): remove the reference to the SAP as a separate document and rather make it clear in Module VIII that the protocol needs to have sufficient detail to judge the appropriateness of the statistical analyses planned.	
		Comment:  Proposed change (if any):	
		Comment:	

Line number(s) of	Stakeholder number	Comment and rationale; proposed changes	Outcome
the relevant text (e.g. Lines 20-23)	(To be completed by the Agency)	(If changes to the wording are suggested, they should be highlighted using 'track changes')	(To be completed by the Agency)
		Proposed change (if any):	

Please add more rows if needed.



<Date of submission>

Submission of comments on 'GVP Module VIII Addendum I – Requirements for transmission of information on non-interventional post-authorisation safety studies (Rev 2)'

#### Comments from:

Name of organisation or individual

Pfizer

Please note that these comments and the identity of the sender will be published unless a specific justified objection is received.

When completed, this form should be sent to the European Medicines Agency electronically, in Word format (not PDF).



Stakeholder number	General comment (if any)	Outcome (if applicable)
(To be completed by the Agency)		(To be completed by the Agency)
	This Addendum I (rev 2) to GVP Module VIII (rev 2) provides additional guidance on the requirements for transmission of information on non-interventional post-authorisation safety studies. We thank the Agency for efforts to provide clear and comprehensive guidance. Further, we appreciate the opportunity to review this document and provide the following comments with the goal of improving, and thereby strengthening the guidance provided. We provide separate comments on GVP Module VIII (rev 2).	
	The expectations and rationale regarding the proposed requirement in draft GVP Module VIII (rev 2) to register certain ex-EU PASS in the EU PAS Register are not clear. The proposed requirement would require registration of non-interventional studies requested by non-EU regulatory authorities and conducted outside the EU. Clarification is needed on whether the requirements in Addendum I (rev 2) for EU non-interventional studies would also apply to non-EU studies.	

Line number(s) of the relevant text (e.g. Lines 20- 23) Page 3, 1st paragraph	Stakeholder number (To be completed by the Agency)	Comment and rationale; proposed changes (If changes to the wording are suggested, they should be highlighted using 'track changes')  Comment: We assume that the reference to "if requested" refers to progress reports, and not the other documents (e.g., protocols, amendments) as these other documents must be transmitted; if correct, this should be clarified.  Proposed change: " updated protocols following substantial	Outcome (To be completed by the Agency)
		amendments, final study reports and, if requested, progress reports if requested on post-authorisation safety studies"	
Page 3, 1 <sup>st</sup> paragraph		Comment: The new text states that separate statistical analysis plans should be submitted. Is this a new requirement? If so, is PRAC endorsement required and before what milestone (for obligated PASS)?  Proposed change: Clarify the requirements for statistical analysis plans. If there are any new requirements for statistical analysis plans, this should also be clearly described in GVP Module VIII (rev 2). Please note that in most cases, PRAC endorsement of separate SAPs will most likely delay study start.	

Line number(s) of the relevant text (e.g. Lines 20- 23)	Stakeholder number (To be completed by the Agency)	Comment and rationale; proposed changes (If changes to the wording are suggested, they should be highlighted using 'track changes')	Outcome (To be completed by the Agency)
Tables VIII Add I.1 and I.2		Comment: We suggest providing definitions of country abbreviations.  Proposed change: Add a list of country codes and decodes or refer the reader to the appropriate ISO code sets, e.g., those used for ICSRs per GVP Module VI.	
Table VIII Add I.1		Comment: The clarity and utility of Table VIII could be improved with minor adjustments.  Proposed change: We suggest that for progress reports, a column referring to "Transmission to by MAH to MS via PRAC" be added so that it is parallel to the study protocols, etc. column. Additionally, in the "Transmission to by MAH to MS via PRAC" column, should "DK" instead of "All" be listed for Member States where the study is conducted? Thus, the MAH should directly transmit the study protocol, etc., to the participating MS except DK, which will receive these documents by PRAC. Finally, it should be noted whether there are any differences in requirements between centrally and nationally	

Line number(s) of the relevant text (e.g. Lines 20-23)	Stakeholder number (To be completed by the Agency)	Comment and rationale; proposed changes (If changes to the wording are suggested, they should be highlighted using 'track changes')	Outcome (To be completed by the Agency)
		authorized products.	



8 Oct 2015

Submission of comments on GVP Module VIII Addendum I – Requirements for transmission of information on non-interventional post-authorisation safety studies (Rev 2) (EMA/395730/2012)

#### Comments from:

Name of organisation or individual

SEC Associates, Inc.

Please note that these comments and the identity of the sender will be published unless a specific justified objection is received (please see privacy statements:

http://www.ema.europa.eu/ema/index.jsp?curl=pages/home/general\_general\_content\_000516.jsp&mid and http://www.ema.europa.eu/docs/en\_GB/document\_library/Other/2012/02/WC500123144.pdf).

When completed, this form should be sent to the European Medicines Agency electronically, in Word format (not PDF) (see Introductory cover note for the public consultation of GVP under Practical advice for the public consultation:

http://www.ema.europa.eu/docs/en\_GB/document\_library/Other/2012/02/WC500123145.pdf).



Stakeholder number	General comment	Outcome
(To be completed by t Agency)	the	(To be completed by the Agency)
	Thank you for the opportunity to address these changes.  Please read these comments in conjunction with GVP	
	VIII comments.	

Line number(s) of	Stakeholder number	Comment and rationale; proposed changes	Outcome
the relevant text	(To be completed by	(If changes to the wording are suggested, they should be	(To be completed by the Agency)
(e.g. Lines 20-23)	the Agency)	highlighted using 'track changes')	
This Addendum		Comment: This is inaccurate in combination with the	
specifies		statement "These requirements are based on Directive	
requirements for		2001/83/EC Art 107 m-q". Registration and public posting of	
the transmission		information in the EU PAS Register by the MAH is not	
of study protocols,		mandated, although the EMA will publish the protocol and	
updated protocols		public results abstract of PASS imposed as an obligation in the	
following		EU PAS Register if not posted by the MAH. The draft GVP VIII	
substantial		does state that MAHs should register (as opposed to legally	
amendments, final		required to do so), but then it says the "requirements" for	
study reports and		submission are in this Annex.	
progress reports if			
requested on		In line with the "should register, not required" aspect, in	
post-authorisation		correspondence with the EMA several years ago, we were	
safety studies		told "registration of PASS information in the EU PAS register	
initiated,		is not a legal obligation", "As a matter of principle, for all	
managed or		PASS, registration will facilitate the implementation of the new	
financed by		pharmacovigilance legislation and is also recommended for	
marketing		PASS voluntarily conducted by marketing authorisation	
authorisation		holders.", and the EMA will publish the protocols and public	
holders voluntarily		abstracts of results of PASS imposed as an obligation in the	
or pursuant to an		EU PAS register, unless this has already been done by the	
obligation.		MAH.	
		Proposed change (if any): This Addendum specifies	
		requirements for the transmission of study protocols, updated	

omment and rationale; proposed changes	Outcome
f changes to the wording are suggested, they should be ighlighted using 'track changes')	(To be completed by the Agency)
rotocols following substantial amendments, final study sports and progress reports if requested on post-athorisation safety studies initiated, managed or financed by marketing authorisation holders voluntarily or pursuant to an oligation <insert>, and recommendations on transmission of me same, if requested, on post-authorisation safety studies itiated, managed or financed by marketing authorisation olders voluntarily. (or similar; I realize final study reports are equired to be submitted directly to NCA for voluntary PASS)</insert>	
coording to the legislation:  The Agency shall, in collaboration with the Member States and the Commission, set up and maintain a European medicines reb-portal for the dissemination of information on medicinal roducts authorised in the Union. By means of that portal, the Agency shall make public at least the following:  (a) protocols and public abstracts of results of the post-uthorisation safety studies referred to in Articles 107n and 107p of Directive 2001/83/EC;  (b) (c) (c) (c) (d) (d) (d) (d) (d) (e) (e) (e) (e) (e) (e) (e) (e) (e) (e	
op Op	m (voluntary studies) is not addressed as required for ag made public via the portal – only the obligatory studies.

Line number(s) of	Stakeholder number	Comment and rationale; proposed changes	Outcome
the relevant text	(To be completed by	(If changes to the wording are suggested, they should be	(To be completed by the Agency)
(e.g. Lines 20-23)	the Agency)	highlighted using 'track changes')	
Table VIII Add		Comment:	
I.2. Studies		First, GVP VIII as amended in draft already states that	
initiated,		registration via the EU PAS Register is "should", not required,	
managed or		so the table should reflect the voluntary nature of submission	
financed		to the EU PAS Register.	
voluntarily by			
marketing		Second, the table makes no mention of "if requested". In	
authorisation		context with everything else, it implies submission of all these	
holders: specific		documents is a legal requirement for any voluntary study,	
text: Transmission		whether or not requested by the NCA.	
by MAH via			
registration in the		Third, since the Directive says "if requested", then Member	
EU PAS Register -		States would have to legislate, apart from the Directive, that it	
All Member States		wasn't an "if requested" but always required condition,	
under several		wouldn't they?	
situations			
		Proposed change (if any): column header to read as follows:	
		<b>Voluntary</b> Transmission by MAH via registration in the EU	
		PAS Register	
		Comment:	
		Proposed change (if any):	

Please add more rows if needed.