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Rationale for reliance and harmonization

Main objective

The public health objective is to facilitate access of medicinal products including vaccines of assured quality, safety and efficacy available to the populations of the world that need it most in timely manner and at affordable prices.
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Regulatory Strategies

• Leverage on WHO prequalification system
• Harmonization of registration across countries
  – Harmonized application forms
  – Harmonized dossier in format and contents
  – Harmonized procedures
The United Nations System for vaccine procurement is mostly served by UNICEF and the PAHO RF. It relies on the WHO prequalification system for eligibility/acceptability of vaccines for purchase as well as for the monitoring of field performance.

Such vaccines undergo three levels of authorization:

- NRA in the producing country
- WHO prequalification
- MA in the user countries
Although these three levels of authorization are required, ideally, a vaccine that is well regulated in the producing country and is WHO prequalified, should be subject to an accelerated and facilitated review process in the receiving countries based on reliance on the two levels of evaluation performed.

WHO promotes a collaborative procedure between the NRAs and WHO for the registration in user countries, which is based on reliance on the PQ work and information sharing of the PQ reports. However, the implementation of this approach remains low.
Harmonization is critical

• There are vaccines that are not WHO prequalified. These products are targeted either at private markets or may be purchased directly by countries that do not require prequalification.

• Such vaccines are still subject to two levels of review for marketing authorization; in the producing and the importing countries.

• This should be multiplied by the number of countries where the vaccine needs to be registered.
In practice, manufacturers applying for registration of these products are required to go through a similar process three times and subject to different requirements in different countries.

The concern from manufacturers regarding the divergence in requirements in different countries has been highlighted many times in different international fora with poor results.

In spite of numerous alignment efforts by regulatory agencies, economic blocks, regulatory networks and others; the problem remains unsolved.
Main ICH objectives and activities

Main ICH objectives as stated in the Network mission.

– To make recommendations towards harmonisation in the interpretation and application of technical guidelines and requirements for pharmaceutical product registration and the maintenance of such registrations;
– To monitor and update harmonised technical requirements
– To avoid divergent future requirements through harmonisation of selected topics
– To encourage the implementation and integration of common standards
Main ICH objectives and activities (2)

- Development of the Common Technical Document (CTD) as a harmonized and unifying dossier with common structure (format) and suggested contents
- Introduction of the CTD as the common technical document in all ICH member countries starting with EU, USA and Japan and later expanding to additional member countries
ICH membership

More and more countries are becoming members of ICH
Others have observers status before becoming official members

– Regulatory agencies from countries applying to ICH membership commit to implementation of certain key set of ICH guidelines
– Industry Members are required to support and encourage compliance with ICH guidelines.
– All Members shall also support the aims of the ICH Association and take part in ICH meetings and ICH working groups.

Hence, members, observers and yet other non-ICH countries are adopting the CTD as the required registration dossier format
Increasing number of countries or regions adopting CTD format with adaptations

This trend expected to lead to convergence

However, because of the adaptations introduced, the degree of convergence does not seem to increase significantly

Vaccine manufacturers have engaged in assessing the degree of similarity/differences between CTDs used in different countries around the world
CTD adoption (2)

WHO-PQ used the Product Summary File as their dossier format.

WHO-PQ is adopting the CTD format for alignment purposes.

WHO-PQ is requesting the UN related information in a WHO specific module 1, the contents of which is currently in draft.

Vaccine manufacturers have engaged in assessing the degree of similarity/differences between WHO proposed module 1 and that required by countries/regions.
ICH developed the Common Technical Document as a harmonized dossier both in format and contents.

- Module I is not aligned. Contains region specific information that is not common between the ICH parties.
- Modules 2-5 are harmonized.
- **Module 2: Common Technical Document Summaries**
ASEAN CTD architecture

Part II - A: ToC
  B Quality Summary
  C Body of Data

Part III – A) ToC
  B ) N-Cl overview
  C ) N-C written and tabulated summaries
  D) N-C study reports

Part IV – A) ToC  B ) Clinical overview  C ) Clinical summary  D) Tabular listing of all Clinical studies  E) Clinical study reports  F) List of key literature references

ToC : Table of contents. N-C: Non clinical
Structure and contents of CTDs

• ASEAN CTD does not contain module 2. Information from this module is integrated into the specific technical sections II) III) and IV)
• This radical structural difference creates difficulties in dossier preparation and comparison of information
• ICH CTD is applicable to both medicines and biological products while the PAHO CTD is specific for vaccines and biological products only.
PAHO COUNTRIES ADOPTING CTD FORMAT ARE FEW, HOWEVER WORLDWIDE THE NUMBER IS INCREASING
Situation in Africa

• The African continent is divided in several economic blocks.

• Some of these blocks are engaged in regulatory harmonization efforts which are expected to lead to a convergence in dossier format and requirements.

• AVAREF is a WHO Network of regulators and Ethics Committees from all African countries engaged in harmonization of requirements within and between blocks.

• This continent offers opportunities towards a harmonized CTD adoption since the harmonization efforts are currently ongoing.
Rationale for comparing CTDs

• Based on the experience from manufacturers in the complexities to build CTD for submission to different countries due to differences in requirements and,

• On a recommendation from the regulatory experts panel held at the 2016 DCVMN annual meeting,
  – It was decided to make a comparison of CTDs from different countries in order to quantify similarities and differences
  – CTDs were compared between each other for module 1 (non-harmonized) and against the ICH CTD for modules 2-5 (harmonized modules).
CTDs from different countries were considered “different” from the ICH CTD if one of the following situations applied:

• Country X did not require a specific item required in the ICH CTD.
• Country X required data/information not required in the ICH CTD (other information).
• Country X contained in its requirements the same heading (or similar) as contained in the ICH CTD but the data/information expected to be provided under such heading was not specified, while being specified in the ICH CTD.
• Country X contained in its requirements the same heading (or similar) as contained in the ICH CTD but the data/information expected to be provided under such heading was specified, while not being specified in the ICH CTD.
• Country X requires different information from ICH under the same heading.
Some examples of differences found

• \Basis for differences btwn CTDs\Examples of differences observed in CTDs.docx
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