N° d'enregistrement :
Ares(2013)3449923

Subject: Annex sixteen (draft)

Dear Mister, Dear Madam,

First of all I would like to apologizes for the delay in answering to that public consultation of the revision of the Annex 16 to the European good manufacturing guide.

Because of a really busy schedule these last months I only realized yesterday that the deadline was on November 5th, 2013. However, because Ms Tosetti invited me to send you my comments, I am delighted to do so.

I would like to say now that that new proposed text is easier to read than the current version of the Annex 16. However, resulting from my reading, I would like to deliver you some comments about that Annex sixteen draft.

Number one I would like to remind the authors that , in 2001, when the current annex has been issued there were actually not so many other annexes. Especially **annex 19** did not exist at the time. Now it could be interesting to mention it in Annex 16.

Also in 2001, the "Parallel import" trade was just as an embryo and therefore, was not covered then. What is proposed is interesting because it addresses the situation of the repackaged batches. I would suggest here not to limit the repackaging example to parallel imports because it is not so uncommon that the MAH laboratories proceed to the repackaging (sometime from the labelling) when some liveries are redirected for another country or another model. In that case I guess that the inspectors would expect a new certification (limited to the repackaging operations). A specific paragraph on the topipc would be welcome, I guess, by the QPs, that would could be re-issued from the previous paragraph 4.7.

Always not existing in 2001, is the "Product Quality Review" which only arised in 2005 with the revision of the chapter 1. Such document is now a wonderful tool and for the QPs and for the inspectors. However it is even no cited in that new proposed Annex 16. I really do believe that it should be introduced somewhere in the proposal together with a sentence that could be placed in a new paragraph 3.5.23 :*"The information contained in the assessed batch record or file of records is consistent with the information collected in the current Product Quality Review"*.

I would also like to alert the community oo inspectors on the proposed wording in chapter 5 : "Handling of *unplanned* deviations". To my opinion this is a very dangerous wording because it implicitely put on the table that a deviation can be planned, which is a terrible non-sense : accepting or tolerating that a deviation is decided meaning deliberately developed ! So, where is the difference in between an acceptable planned deviation and an unacceptable planned deviation ? Again, I am

afraid this is at risk of exageration. My recommendation would be to rease "unplanned" and to use only "unexpected" in *unexpected deviations*.

Last are some additional reflections from the proposal :

Chapter 4, paragraph 4.1 could be completed with the following sentence "*the professional profile of the auditor(s) should be comparable, in terms of education and experience, to the one of a QP*".

Chapter 4, paragraph 4.2.6 could also be completed with the following sentence "*and their schedule be approved by the QP in charge of the corresponding release operation*".

Chapter 5, paragraph 5.2 to add the word "*only*" between the words "of the marketing authorization and GMP" and the words "when the details described control methods"

Chapter 5, title and paragraphs 5.1 to 5.2.1 replace "unplanned deviations" with "*unexpected deviations*" (or even "deviation")

Chapter 5, paragraph 5.2.2 replace the last word of the paragraph "product" with the words "*concerned batch(es)*"

Chapter 6, paragraph 6.2. It is well accepted that there are three different categories of quarantine : 1. physical 2. by labelling 3. computerized. It should be not reduced here to only two possibilities. Therefore I would suggest to replace part of the text after "physical" and before "or electronic" and to put the following : "*(via the use of locked storage areas), administrative (via the use of clear and colored status labels)*". And to add the following after the words "computerised systems" *coupled with a systematic reading of optic codes or radiofrequency tags).*:

Then the sentence in 6.2 will be :

[...] and may be physical (via the use of locked storage areas), administrative (via the use of clear and colored status labels or electronic (via the used of validated computerised systems coupled with a systematic reading of optic codes or radiofrequency tags).

Chapter 7, to add the words "parallel import" and to give a clear definition with the reference to the legal basis of the profession.

Again, I deeply apologize for having been late !

With my best regards,