
THE
LIFE SCIENCES
LAW REVIEW

THIRD EDITION

EDITOR
RICHARD KINGHAM

LAW BUSINESS RESEARCH

THE LIFE SCIENCES LAW REVIEW

The Life Sciences Law Review
Reproduced with permission from Law Business Research Ltd.

This article was first published in The Life Sciences Law Review - Edition 3
(published in March 2015 – editor Richard Kingham).

For further information please email
Nick.Barette@lbresearch.com

THE LIFE SCIENCES LAW REVIEW

Third Edition

Editor
RICHARD KINGHAM

LAW BUSINESS RESEARCH LTD

THE LAW REVIEWS

THE MERGERS AND ACQUISITIONS REVIEW

THE RESTRUCTURING REVIEW

THE PRIVATE COMPETITION ENFORCEMENT REVIEW

THE DISPUTE RESOLUTION REVIEW

THE EMPLOYMENT LAW REVIEW

THE PUBLIC COMPETITION ENFORCEMENT REVIEW

THE BANKING REGULATION REVIEW

THE INTERNATIONAL ARBITRATION REVIEW

THE MERGER CONTROL REVIEW

THE TECHNOLOGY, MEDIA AND
TELECOMMUNICATIONS REVIEW

THE INWARD INVESTMENT AND
INTERNATIONAL TAXATION REVIEW

THE CORPORATE GOVERNANCE REVIEW

THE CORPORATE IMMIGRATION REVIEW

THE INTERNATIONAL INVESTIGATIONS REVIEW

THE PROJECTS AND CONSTRUCTION REVIEW

THE INTERNATIONAL CAPITAL MARKETS REVIEW

THE REAL ESTATE LAW REVIEW

THE PRIVATE EQUITY REVIEW

THE ENERGY REGULATION AND MARKETS REVIEW

THE INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY REVIEW

THE ASSET MANAGEMENT REVIEW

THE PRIVATE WEALTH AND PRIVATE CLIENT REVIEW

THE MINING LAW REVIEW

THE EXECUTIVE REMUNERATION REVIEW

THE ANTI-BRIBERY AND ANTI-CORRUPTION REVIEW

THE CARTELS AND LENIENCY REVIEW

THE TAX DISPUTES AND LITIGATION REVIEW

THE LIFE SCIENCES LAW REVIEW

THE INSURANCE AND REINSURANCE LAW REVIEW

THE GOVERNMENT PROCUREMENT REVIEW

THE DOMINANCE AND MONOPOLIES REVIEW

THE AVIATION LAW REVIEW

THE FOREIGN INVESTMENT REGULATION REVIEW

THE ASSET TRACING AND RECOVERY REVIEW

THE INTERNATIONAL INSOLVENCY REVIEW

THE OIL AND GAS LAW REVIEW

THE FRANCHISE LAW REVIEW

THE PRODUCT REGULATION AND LIABILITY REVIEW

THE SHIPPING LAW REVIEW

THE ACQUISITION AND LEVERAGED FINANCE REVIEW

THE PRIVACY, DATA PROTECTION AND CYBERSECURITY LAW REVIEW

PUBLISHER
Gideon Robertson

BUSINESS DEVELOPMENT MANAGER
Nick Barette

SENIOR ACCOUNT MANAGERS
Katherine Jablonowska, Thomas Lee

ACCOUNT MANAGER
Felicity Bown

PUBLISHING COORDINATOR
Lucy Brewer

MARKETING ASSISTANT
Dominique Destrée

EDITORIAL COORDINATOR
Shani Bans

HEAD OF PRODUCTION
Adam Myers

PRODUCTION EDITORS
Tim Beaver, Robbie Kelly, Joanne Morley

SUBEDITOR
Janina Godowska

MANAGING DIRECTOR
Richard Davey

Published in the United Kingdom
by Law Business Research Ltd, London
87 Lancaster Road, London, W11 1QQ, UK
© 2015 Law Business Research Ltd
www.TheLawReviews.co.uk

No photocopying: copyright licences do not apply.

The information provided in this publication is general and may not apply in a specific situation, nor does it necessarily represent the views of authors' firms or their clients.

Legal advice should always be sought before taking any legal action based on the information provided. The publishers accept no responsibility for any acts or omissions contained herein. Although the information provided is accurate as of March 2015, be advised that this is a developing area.

Enquiries concerning reproduction should be sent to Law Business Research, at the address above. Enquiries concerning editorial content should be directed to the Publisher – gideon.roberton@lbresearch.com

ISBN 978-1-909830-40-0

Printed in Great Britain by
Encompass Print Solutions, Derbyshire
Tel: 0844 2480 112

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The publisher acknowledges and thanks the following law firms for their learned assistance throughout the preparation of this book:

ADVOKATFIRMAET BA-HR DA

ANAND AND ANAND

AXON LAWYERS

BAE, KIM & LEE LLC

BÄR & KARRER AG

BDK ADVOKATI/ATTORNEYS AT LAW

CASTRÉN & SNELLMAN ATTORNEYS LTD

COVINGTON & BURLING LLP

DIERKS + BOHLE

FAUS & MOLINER

FIEBINGER POLAK LEON & PARTNER RECHTSANWÄLTE GMBH

GORODISSKY & PARTNERS LAW FIRM

LEE AND LI, ATTORNEYS-AT-LAW

MAPLES AND CALDER

MATTOS MURIEL KESTENER ABOGADOS

NAGASHIMA OHNO & TSUNEMATSU

NORTON ROSE FULBRIGHT

NSN LAW FIRM

PLESNER LAW FIRM
SÁNCHEZ DEVANNY
S. HOROWITZ & CO
SOŁTYSIŃSKI KAWECKI & SZLĘZAK
STUDIO LEGALE BIRD & BIRD
TAY & PARTNERS
TOBAR & BUSTAMANTE
TOMPKINS WAKE LAWYERS
VIEIRA DE ALMEIDA & ASSOCIADOS
VILAF
WONGPARTNERSHIP LLP

CONTENTS

Editor's Preface	vii
<i>Richard Kingham</i>	
Chapter 1 INTERNATIONAL HARMONISATION	1
<i>Richard Kingham</i>	
Chapter 2 AUSTRALIA.....	7
<i>Bernard O'Shea</i>	
Chapter 3 AUSTRIA	31
<i>Karina Hellbert</i>	
Chapter 4 BELGIUM.....	46
<i>Peter Bogaert and Sarah Forest</i>	
Chapter 5 BRAZIL	61
<i>Beatriz MA Camargo Kestener, Rubens Granja and Marco Aurélio Antas Torronteguy</i>	
Chapter 6 CANADA	75
<i>Adrienne Blanchard and Jill Daley</i>	
Chapter 7 CHINA.....	91
<i>Shaoyu Chen and John Balzano</i>	
Chapter 8 DENMARK.....	122
<i>Mikkel Vittrup and Mette Hygum Clausen</i>	
Chapter 9 ECUADOR	140
<i>Álvaro Sevilla, María de Lourdes Maldonado, Hipatia Donoso, Francisco Ortiz and José Antonio Fabara</i>	

Chapter 10	EUROPEAN UNION.....	156
	<i>Grant Castle and Robin Blaney</i>	
Chapter 11	FINLAND	181
	<i>Hanna Paloheimo and Hilma-Karoliina Markkanen</i>	
Chapter 12	FRANCE	192
	<i>Sophie Pelé</i>	
Chapter 13	GERMANY	205
	<i>Christian Dierks and Daniel Geiger</i>	
Chapter 14	INDIA	218
	<i>Pravin Anand and Archana Shanker</i>	
Chapter 15	IRELAND.....	229
	<i>Maree Gallagher</i>	
Chapter 16	ISRAEL.....	249
	<i>Dovev Apel</i>	
Chapter 17	ITALY	267
	<i>Massimiliano Mostardini, Giovanni Galimberti, Mauro Turrini and Evelina Marchesoni</i>	
Chapter 18	JAPAN	282
	<i>Kenji Utsumi and Kensuke Suzuki</i>	
Chapter 19	KOREA.....	297
	<i>Jung Min Jo and Eun Soo Lim</i>	
Chapter 20	MALAYSIA.....	310
	<i>Lee Lin Li and Lim Wee Liang</i>	
Chapter 21	MEXICO.....	328
	<i>José Alberto Campos-Vargas</i>	

Chapter 22	NETHERLANDS344 <i>Arber Gjunksi, Erik Vollebregt, Carine van den Brink and Annemieke Kooy</i>
Chapter 23	NEW ZEALAND360 <i>Robert Andrew Bycroft</i>
Chapter 24	NORWAY376 <i>Are Stenvik, Beret Sundet, Andreas Bjørnebye, Fanny Charlotte Tysland and Eirik Basmo Ellingsen</i>
Chapter 25	POLAND388 <i>Ewa Skrzydło-Tefelska and Jacek Myszeko</i>
Chapter 26	PORTUGAL.....400 <i>Paulo Pinheiro and Francisca Paulouro</i>
Chapter 27	RUSSIA.....412 <i>Evgeny Alexandrov and Ilya Goryachev</i>
Chapter 28	SERBIA.....424 <i>Bogdan Ivanišević and Slobodan Trivić</i>
Chapter 29	SINGAPORE437 <i>Melanie Ho and Charmaine Neo</i>
Chapter 30	SOUTH AFRICA.....451 <i>Andrew Parsons, Allison Williams, Justin Malherbe, Liesel Kok and Rosalind Lake</i>
Chapter 31	SPAIN467 <i>Jordi Faus and Juan Suárez</i>
Chapter 32	SWITZERLAND478 <i>Markus Schott and Markus Wang</i>

Chapter 33	TAIWAN491 <i>Katherine YC Juang, Jill Niu and Daisy Wang</i>
Chapter 34	TURKEY506 <i>Selma Ünlü</i>
Chapter 35	UNITED KINGDOM.....519 <i>Grant Castle and Sarah Cowlshaw</i>
Chapter 36	UNITED STATES535 <i>Richard Kingham and Krista Hessler Carver</i>
Chapter 37	VIETNAM571 <i>Võ Ha Duyen, Kevin Hawkins and Pham Si Hai Quynh</i>
Appendix 1	ABOUT THE AUTHORS.....587
Appendix 2	CONTRIBUTING LAW FIRMS' CONTACT DETAILS ...613

EDITOR'S PREFACE

The third edition of *The Life Sciences Law Review* extends coverage to a total of 36 jurisdictions, providing an overview of legal requirements of interest to pharmaceutical, biotechnology and medical device companies. As before, the chapters are arranged to describe requirements throughout the life cycle of a regulated product – from discovery to clinical trials, the marketing authorisation process and post-approval controls. Certain other legal matters of special interest to manufacturers of medical products – including administrative remedies, pricing and reimbursement, competition law, special liability regimes and commercial transactions – are also covered. Finally, there is a special chapter on international harmonisation, which is of increasing importance in many of the regulatory systems that are described in the national chapters.

Each of the chapters has been written by leading experts within the relevant jurisdiction. They are an impressive group, and it is a pleasure to be associated with them in the preparation of this annual publication.

Richard Kingham

Covington & Burling LLP

Washington, DC

March 2015

Chapter 26

PORTUGAL

Paulo Pinheiro and Francisca Paulouro¹

I INTRODUCTION

The life sciences sector in Portugal is heavily regulated, with the legal framework applicable both to medicines and medical devices closely following the EU regulatory framework. Nevertheless, in some areas national legislation goes beyond what is provided for in the relevant directives; this being particularly noticeable, for example, in matters related to promotion, wholesale distribution and clinical trials. Pricing and reimbursement are exclusively dealt with at national level, being beyond the scope of EU legislation, with the exception of transparency measures and procedural requirements provided for in the Transparency Directive.²

The National Authority of Medicines and Health Products, IP (Infarmed) is the Portuguese national regulatory agency for medicines and medical devices. In addition to its competence for technical health regulation, Infarmed's powers also cover pricing and reimbursement. Price approval of prescription products, including products for hospital use, is also attributed to this agency. Infarmed plays a significant role in the reimbursement of medicines, being the entity responsible for conducting the relevant procedures and proposing decisions to the Minister of Health.

1 Paulo Pinheiro is a partner and Francisca Paulouro is an of counsel at Vieira de Almeida & Associados.

2 Council Directive of 21 December 1988 relating to the transparency of measures regulating the pricing of medicinal products for human use and their inclusion in the scope of national health insurance systems.

II THE REGULATORY REGIME

The Medicines Act³ consolidates in one piece of legislation the regime applicable to, among others, the marketing authorisation, manufacture, import, export, marketing, labelling, promotion and pharmacovigilance of medicines; transposing into Portuguese Law several directives, including Directive 2001/83/EC,⁴ as amended (the Directive).

Medical devices, in turn, are governed by Decree-Law 145/2009,⁵ which, further to transposing several Directives (including Directive 93/42/EEC,⁶ as amended) related to the manufacture, marketing and vigilance of medical devices, establishes the regime applicable to promotion; this closely follows the regime foreseen for medicines.

i Classification

The definitions of a medicinal product for human use and of a medical device are identical to those arising from EU legislation, with the distinction between them made on the basis of the intended use and the mechanism through which this is achieved. As is the case under the Directive, where any doubt arises, the classification as a medicinal product prevails.

ii Non-clinical studies

Directive 2010/63/EU⁷ on the protection of animals used for scientific purposes was transposed into Portuguese Law in August 2013.⁸ This regime follows closely the one provided for in the corresponding Directive, thus establishing several requirements applicable to the use of animals for scientific or educational purposes, namely in what concerns the accommodation, care and use of animals in procedures; the origin, breeding, marking and killing of animals; licensing of breeders, suppliers and users; and the procedures for evaluation and authorisation of scientific or educational projects.

In addition, and similarly to what happens at EU level, the testing of finished cosmetic products and cosmetic ingredients on animals is prohibited, with the same applying to the marketing thereof if animal testing was conducted for cosmetic purposes.

iii Clinical trials

In April 2014, a new legal regime for clinical research was approved,⁹ consolidating in one single legal act the provisions applicable to clinical studies, be it interventional or not, and covering medicines, medical devices and cosmetics. The regime set forth therein

3 Decree-Law 176/2006, of 30 August 2006, as amended.

4 Directive 2001/83/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 6 November 2001 on the Community code relating to medicinal products for human use.

5 Decree-Law 145/2009, of 17 June 2009.

6 Council Directive 93/42/EEC of 14 June concerning medical devices.

7 Directive 2010/63/EU of the European Parliament and of the Council of 22 September 2010.

8 Decree-Law No. 113/2013, of 7 August 2013.

9 Law No. 21/2104, of 16 April 2014.

covers that provided for in Directive 2001/20/EC¹⁰ regarding the conduct of clinical trials on medicinal products for human use and the provisions of Directive 2007/47/EC¹¹ on clinical investigation with medical devices.

All clinical studies are subject to a prior favourable opinion from the competent ethics committee. In addition, clinical trials with medicines depend on authorisation from Infarmed, with the same applying to interventional studies with Class III medical devices, implantable medical devices and long-term invasive devices falling within Classes IIa or IIb. For the remaining classes of medical devices, interventional studies depend only on the favourable opinion from the ethics committee and on notification to Infarmed. The conduct of clinical interventional studies with cosmetics should also be notified in advance to Infarmed, with the sponsor being entitled to initiate the study should Infarmed not issue an unfavourable decision within 30 days from said notification.

Both the sponsor and the investigator are jointly and severally liable, regardless of fault, for material and non-material damage suffered by subjects – liability that must be covered by insurance. Should an interventional study be at stake, there is a legal presumption that damage that affects the health of subjects during the study and for a one-year period following its term (which may be extended by the ethics committee) is caused by the study. This reverses the general rule on burden of proof, subject to which whosoever alleges damage should demonstrate the causal relationship between the damage and the act (in this case, the study).

iv Named-patient and compassionate use procedures

Similarly to what happens under EU legislation, the general rule is that medicines can only be marketed following the granting of a marketing authorisation. In exceptional circumstances, however, Infarmed may authorise the use of non-approved medicines, such as, when the product is, subject to a clinical assessment, considered indispensable for the treatment of a given pathology and there is no therapeutic alternative among authorised products.

10 Directive 2001/20/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council, of 4 April 2001, on the approximation of the laws, regulations and administrative provisions of the Member States relating to the implementation of good clinical practice in the conduct of clinical trials on medicinal products for human use.

11 Directive 2007/47/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council, of 5 September 2007, amending Council Directive 90/385/EEC on the approximation of the laws of the Member States relating to active implantable medical devices, Council Directive 93/42/EEC concerning medical devices and Directive 98/8/EC concerning the placing of biocidal products on the market.

Note that within the context of interventional clinical studies, following the conclusion thereof, the sponsor is under an obligation to supply the investigational medicinal product or the device under clinical investigation for free until its marketing, should the investigator consider that continuation of its use by the former participant is indispensable and that there are no therapeutic alternatives with an equivalent degree of safety and efficacy.

v Pre-market clearance

The Medicines Act reflects EU rules in this regard and thus medicines can only be placed in the market following the granting of a marketing authorisation – Infarmed being the competent authority for authorising medicines that follow national procedures.

The marketing, in Portugal, of medical devices bearing EC marking does not require any authorisation from Infarmed. Nonetheless, Infarmed must be notified of all medical devices marketed by a given entity prior to its commercialisation.

vi Regulatory incentives

The Medicines Act reflects the regime provided for in the Directive regarding regulatory data and market exclusivity. Generic applications cannot be submitted for an eight-year period following the first authorisation in the EU. After this eight-year period has elapsed, the generic cannot be launched in the market for an additional two-year period – a period that may be extended for one supplementary year should the innovator, within the data exclusivity period of eight years, obtain a marketing authorisation for one or more indications of significant clinical benefit.

Patent linkage is not permitted. The Medicines Act expressly provides that marketing authorisations cannot be dismissed on the grounds of the potential existence of industrial property rights of the reference product. A similar rule exists for pricing and reimbursement decisions.

There are no special provisions to encourage the development or market launch of innovative products. On the contrary, special provisions to encourage the sale of generics exist in a variety of areas; for example, generics benefit from a simplified regime regarding pricing and reimbursement, and prescription is mandatorily made by active substance once a generic is launched in the market, the rule being that of generic substitution save in very limited circumstances expressly provided for in the law. In addition, in early 2014, the regime applicable to the price approval of prescription medicines was amended to foresee the possibility of pharmacies being compensated in consideration for the dispensation of generics in terms to be provided for in a Ministerial Order. Such an Order has not yet been published.

vii Post-approval controls

Pharmacovigilance rules applicable to medicinal products were modified in 2013 with the transposition into Portuguese Law of Directives 2010/84/EU and 2012/26/EU.¹² In

12 Directive 2010/84/EU of the European Parliament and of the Council, of 15 December 2010, and Directive 2012/26/EU of the European Parliament and of the

this same year, the provisions of Directive 2011/62/EU¹³ as regards the prevention of the entry into the supply chain of falsified medicinal products were also transposed, with the Medicines Act currently closely following the EU legislation on these matters.

The same can be said regarding medical devices, where the vigilance requirements stem from the relevant Directives. In addition, a pharmacovigilance system has been enacted similar to that which applies to medicines.

viii Manufacturing controls

In line with what is provided for in the Directive, the manufacture of medicinal products is subject to prior authorisation from Infarmed, even if products are intended for export. Such an authorisation will only be granted if the applicant has adequate premises that comply with the applicable legislation, and with the European Commission Guidelines on Good Manufacturing Practices, and has a qualified person permanently and continuously at its disposal. Said qualified person who is responsible for all manufacturing activities performed, must be a pharmacist registered with the Portuguese Order of Pharmacists. Any change to the manufacturing authorisation requires prior authorisation from Infarmed. In addition, the Medicines Act was amended in 2013, transposing Directive 2011/62/EU and thus requiring that the manufacturers of active substances established in Portugal register their activity with Infarmed.

The manufacture of medical devices, as well as the assembling, packaging, processing, fully refurbishing, labelling or assigning to them a purpose different from that of its original intended use, among others, is subject to prior notification to Infarmed. The engagement in these activities is dependent on the applicant having adequate premises and equipment with capacity to ensure the manufacture, storage and conservation of medical devices and a technical responsible to ensure the quality of the activities performed.

In addition, and in line with what is set forth in EU regulations, manufacturers or their authorised representatives placing medical devices on the Portuguese market should notify Infarmed thereof, with the level of information to be provided in said notification varying depending on the classification or nature of the device concerned.

ix Advertising and promotion

The regime applicable to the advertising of medicines follows closely the one provided for in the Directive. The major differences relate to the definition of advertising, to the scope of the prohibition on granting benefits to health-care professionals and to the prohibition on granting any kind of benefit to patients, matters in respect of which the Medicines Act goes beyond what is established in the Directive.

The definition of advertising is broader than that set forth in the Directive, advertising being considered, under the Medicines Act, as any kind of information, canvassing activity or inducement that has as its object or effect the promotion of the prescription, dispensation, sale, purchase or consumption of medicines. Contrary to

Council of 25 October 2012.

13 Directive 2011/62/EU of the European Parliament and of the Council, of 8 June 2011.

what is foreseen in the Directive, Portuguese law does not require that a given conduct be designed to promote a given product to qualify it as advertising. It suffices that the conduct at stake has such an effect.

Secondly, the Medicines Act extends the scope of the prohibition on pharmaceutical companies granting gifts, pecuniary advantages or benefits in kind to health-care professionals to also include bonuses – a notion that is associated with the granting of discounts in kind, such as free products. The broadening of this prohibition is particularly relevant to the relationship between pharmaceutical companies and pharmacies, being hardly in line with the EU legal framework and with the principle that promotion rules do not apply to measures or trade practices related to prices, margins and discounts – provided for both in the Directive and in the Medicines Act.

Finally, the Medicines Act was amended in 2013 to prohibit pharmaceutical companies from granting any kind of benefit to patients. Similarly to what, as we have seen, already happened in relation to health-care professionals, currently companies cannot grant or promise to grant, directly or indirectly, gifts, prizes, bonuses, pecuniary advantages or benefits in kind to patients.

Although companies are under an obligation to provide Infarmed with a summary description of all advertising materials, no prior-approval requirement exists. In addition, and as from 2013, companies must notify Infarmed in advance of the sponsorship of any congress, symposia or event of an educational or promotional nature.

The regime applicable to advertising and promotion of medical devices is very similar to that applicable to medicines. There is, however, no prohibition on granting gifts to the public, neither are companies required to notify Infarmed of advertising materials or sponsorship of congresses. The advertising of medical devices the use of which requires the intervention of health-care professionals, such as implantable medical devices, cannot be promoted to the public.

x Distributors and wholesalers

Wholesale distribution of medicines is subject to prior authorisation from Infarmed, with the only exception being – similarly to what happens under the Directive – for holders of manufacturing authorisations in relation to the products covered by said authorisations.

The granting of such an authorisation is dependent on the applicant having adequate equipment and premises, located in Portugal, to ensure proper conservation and distribution of medicines and a technical director, who must ensure, on an effective and permanent basis, the quality of the activities carried out in the distribution premises. The technical director must be a pharmacist registered with the Portuguese Order of Pharmacists and personally fulfil his or her responsibilities in the wholesale premises. Up until 2013, the technical director had to exercise the functions of the role on an exclusive basis and could not perform said functions for more than one company, even if the wholesale distribution premises were the same. Currently a technical director may cumulate functions within the same wholesale premises, up to a limit of five wholesale distribution authorisations.

Wholesalers are under a legal obligation to have permanently available medicines in sufficient quantity and variety to ensure the appropriate and continued supply of medicinal products with a view to guaranteeing the satisfaction of patients' needs. The

minimum quantities of products that wholesalers must keep at all times to comply with this public service obligation were set forth in a regulation issued by Infarmed.

In 2013, to address shortages of medicinal products on the Portuguese market, mainly resulting from parallel exports to other European Union Member States, the Medicines Act was amended, granting Infarmed powers to list the medicines of which it requires notification prior to exportation (within and outside the EU). Said list has been approved, with wholesalers currently being under an obligation to notify in advance all sales made to countries outside Portugal of medicines included therein. In addition, marketing authorisation holders, wholesalers and pharmacies must notify Infarmed, on a monthly basis, of the quantities of certain listed medicinal products that are sold, dispensed, exported or subject to intra-community commerce. Finally, a new legal provision grants Infarmed the power to prevent the exportation of medicines – be it inside or outside the EU – on the grounds of protection of public health or to ensure patient access to a given medicinal product. To the best of our knowledge Infarmed has never used this legal prerogative, the compatibility of which with EU law principles is far from clear.

Finally, the notion of brokering of medicinal products was provided for in the Medicines Act, in 2013, with the transposition of Directive 2011/62/EU.¹⁴ As in the regime foreseen under this Directive, engagement in the activity of brokering does not require prior authorisation from Infarmed; neither is it dependent on the existence of premises or a permanent address in Portugal. Persons brokering medicines with a permanent address in Portugal must register their activity with Infarmed.

Engagement in the activity of wholesale distribution of medical devices, although not subject to express authorisation from Infarmed, must be notified in advance to said authority, and is only permitted if (similarly to what happens with medicines) the applicant has adequate premises and equipment with capacity to ensure good storage, conservation and distribution of medical devices and a responsible technical director is appointed to the wholesale premises to ensure the quality of the activities performed. In contrast to the regime applicable to medicines, the technical director does not have to be a pharmacist but must have an adequate technical qualification to ensure the quality of the distribution activity, as well as adequate knowledge of the legislation and regulations applicable to medical devices. Once more in contrast to what happens with medicines, the wholesale premises do not have to be located in Portugal. Nonetheless, should these be located abroad, the applicant must comply with the Portuguese legal provisions applicable to the wholesale distribution of medical devices, including the good distribution practices applicable to medicines, which are subsidiarily applicable until a specific regime is enacted for medical devices.

xi Classification of products

The criteria laid down in the Medicines Act for classifying a medicine for medical prescription are very similar to those provided for in the Directive.

14 Directive 2011/62/EU of the European Parliament and of the Council of 8 June 2011.

Such a classification has relevant consequences for the regime applicable to advertising, pricing, reimbursement and point of sale or dispensing. Similarly to what happens under the Directive, only non-prescription products may be promoted to the general public. In addition, while there is no price control for non-prescription drugs (and the rule is that non-prescription products are not subject to reimbursement), prescription products have their maximum sales price approved, regardless of whether they are reimbursed or not. Finally, whereas the dispensing of prescription drugs is restricted to pharmacies – unless subject to restricted medical prescription, in which case they can only be dispensed or administered in hospitals – over-the-counter products may be sold at points of sale duly authorised by Infarmed.

xii Imports and exports

In line with the regime set forth in the Directive, and as was described above in relation to their manufacture, the importation of medicines is also subject to prior authorisation from Infarmed, and with very similar requirements. As of 2013, the importation of active substances is also subject to registration with Infarmed. The export of medicinal products does not require any authorisation from Infarmed; neither does such an activity require registration with Infarmed.

As to medical devices, there are no additional requirements related to imports and exports other than those applicable to the manufacture, placing in the market and wholesale distribution, analysed above.

xiii Controlled substances

The manufacture, use, marketing, distribution, importation, exportation and possession of narcotics and psychotropic substances are subject to a specific regime. Narcotics and psychotropic substances are divided into several categories, each category identifying the substances belonging thereto. Infarmed is the entity responsible for authorising engagement in said activities in relation to certain categories of substances. Specific requirements also exist for prescription, dispensing and keeping of records when such substances are included in medicinal products.

Note that further to constituting a misdemeanour punishable with a fine, engagement in any of the above-mentioned activities without the relevant authorisation may be considered as a criminal offence.

xiv Enforcement

Infarmed is entrusted with the supervision and enforcement of regulatory provisions applicable to medicines and medical devices.

The breach of said provisions is considered a misdemeanour punishable with a fine calculated by reference to the infringer's turnover if not exceeding a pre-determined fixed amount – in which case the latter will apply. Together with this penalty, breach of the provisions of the Medicines Act, including advertising, may give rise to additional ancillary sanctions to be applied by Infarmed, such as, a prohibition on exercising the activity, exclusion from participation in public tenders and the suspension of any authorisations and permits – all up to a maximum of two years.

Should the infringement of promotion rules be at stake, both regarding medicines and medical devices, Infarmed may order that the condemnatory decision be published in the media as well as the suspension of advertising of the product concerned for a period of up to two years. Medicinal products may further be delisted as a result of infringement of promotion rules.

III PRICING AND REIMBURSEMENT

Portuguese rules on pricing and reimbursement of medicines differ essentially depending on the classification of the product for dispensing purposes.

Medicines subject to medical prescription yet not restricted to medical prescription, and generally sold in street pharmacies, have to undergo a price approval procedure before Infarmed prior to being launched in the market. In this context, a maximum sales price is approved, which, in the case of branded products, is determined by reference to the price applied in three reference countries. Said price is subject to annual revision in accordance with the same criteria.

Following price approval, the marketing authorisation holder may request reimbursement of the respective price by the state. Approval of reimbursement is within the competence of the Minister of Health and will only be granted should the therapeutic added value and economic advantage of the product be demonstrated. Although not legally mandatory, under the current rule reimbursement depends on the execution of an agreement between Infarmed and the marketing authorisation holder, which typically sets forth a maximum sales value for the reimbursed product, and which, once exceeded, will determine a payback by the marketing authorisation holder to the National Health Service equivalent to the amount of reimbursement in excess of said limit.

A 'reference price' system exists in the context of reimbursement. Until a generic is launched in the market, the percentage of state reimbursement, ranging from 37 per cent to 100 per cent, applies to the retail sales price of the product. The placing in the market of a generic, however, gives rise to the creation of a 'homogenous group', composed of branded or innovative medicines and generics with the same active substance, dosage, method of administration and pharmaceutical form, and to the approval of the correspondent reference price – equivalent to the average of the retail sales price of the five lowest-priced products included in the group. Following approval of the reference price, the maximum amount of state reimbursement for products included in the relevant group will be determined by applying the applicable reimbursement percentage to said price.

Medicines subject to restricted medical prescription, commonly known as 'hospital products', can only be sold to National Health Service hospitals following approval by Infarmed of their respective maximum sales prices to hospitals, in the context of a prior evaluation procedure. As with reimbursement, the therapeutic added value and economic advantage of the product under evaluation must be demonstrated within this procedure for a favourable decision to be issued. Such a decision further implies the execution of an agreement between Infarmed and the marketing authorisation holder whereby, among other aspects, the maximum sales price to hospitals is established. Just as we have seen in the context of reimbursement, these agreements also usually establish

a maximum sales value for the product, which, if exceeded, should be paid back by the marketing authorisation holder.

The rule regarding medical devices is that the relevant sales price is either free or is that arising from public procurement procedures, whenever applicable. Test strips, needles, syringes and lancets destined for persons with diabetes are nevertheless subject to a price control and reimbursement regime. Said regime foresees a fixed maximum sales price per product for the purposes of reimbursement within the National Health Service, with a reimbursement percentage of 85 per cent of the sales price for test strips and 100 per cent for the remaining products.

IV ADMINISTRATIVE AND JUDICIAL REMEDIES

Final decisions from Infarmed in the context of regulatory, pricing and reimbursement matters are subject to judicial review by administrative courts. The decisions are immediately effective, with the initiation of legal action *per se* not suspending the effects thereto. Note that matters of a technical nature are not reviewed by administrative courts except in cases of manifest error; neither do administrative courts issue technical judgments.

In addition, decisions issued by Infarmed within the context of misdemeanour proceedings initiated for breach of regulatory provisions are subject to appeal before the judicial courts.

V FINANCIAL RELATIONSHIPS WITH PRESCRIBERS AND PAYORS

The Medicines Act transposed into Portuguese law the provisions of the Directive on the promotion of medicinal products, including interactions with health-care professionals. The rule is therefore that pharmaceutical companies cannot offer or promise to offer, directly or indirectly, gifts, pecuniary advantages or benefits in kind to health-care professionals, unless they are inexpensive and relevant to the practice of medicine or pharmacy. For several years there was no legal indication as to what should be considered 'inexpensive'. This state of affairs changed in 2013 when a Decree was published that (as had already been similarly foreseen in the Code of Ethics of the Pharmaceutical Industry Association) set €25 as the inexpensive limit. This amount was increased to €60 in late 2014.

In addition, transparency obligations were enacted in 2013, obligating pharmaceuticals companies to notify Infarmed of any payment or offer made, the value of which exceeds €60, to any individual or legal entity, such as health-care professionals, medical or scientific associations, patient associations and health-care institutions. An identical obligation falls upon the recipient. This information is publicly available on Infarmed's website.

Within the context of medical devices, the regime is less strict. Although the principle that no offer can be made to health-care professionals unless of insignificant value and relevant to the health-care professional's practice also exists, no limit is expressly provided for the notion of 'insignificant', neither do transparency obligations exist.

In early 2014, a specific conflict-of-interest regime for the health sector was approved. Said regime prevents, among others, members of commissions, working groups, juries and National Health Service consultants whose role involves the market access of products (e.g., involvement in pricing and reimbursement procedures, in pharma-economic assessments, in the approval of therapeutic guidelines and purchase procedures) from performing functions, either regularly or occasionally, for payment by pharmaceutical companies. Breach of these rules constitutes a misdemeanour punishable with a fine. In addition, in the event of such a breach, the opinions issued or decisions adopted by said commissions, working groups, juries and consultants do not produce any legal effects and any decisions adopted by decision-making bodies based on the same are considered null and void.

VI SPECIAL LIABILITY OR COMPENSATION SYSTEMS

With the exception of damages arising from harm suffered by subjects in clinical studies (the regime for which we have described above), there is no specific compensation or liability regime applicable to damages arising from harm caused by the use of medicines or medical devices. Product liability claims are therefore subject to the general legal regime concerning liability for defective products.

VII TRANSACTIONAL AND COMPETITION ISSUES

The Portuguese Competition Law (Law 19/2012) prohibits agreements, concerted practices and decisions by associations of undertakings, as well as abuses of a dominant position, capable of preventing, distorting or restricting competition in the Portuguese market. Competition rules apply to pharmaceutical companies whenever possible, despite such companies being subject to strict regulation in matters such as market access, distribution and pricing.

Until recently the Portuguese Competition Authority (PCA) seems to have neglected competition issues such as resale price maintenance and parallel trade. This may be explained by the fact that prices are heavily regulated and by the concern that imprudent enforcement of competition rules on parallel trade might cause disruption to supplies to the Portuguese market.

Nonetheless, in 2014, the PCA requested information on a number of cases of refusal to deal with wholesalers. This has been considered as a sign that the PCA may be reviewing its lenient policy on the distribution of medicines.

In 2008 the PCA fined a number of pharmaceutical companies involved in a bid-rigging cartel. Announcing its priorities for 2015, the PCA highlighted the importance of ensuring effective competition in public procurement procedures. Therefore, it will not be surprising to see, in the future, investigations launched by the PCA regarding the conditions under which public hospitals are supplied.

In 2014, the PCA initiated proceedings in relation to settlements closing patent infringement cases. This is the first reported case of intervention having a possible impact on the conditions generic products face when attempting to enter the market. It is, however, too soon to conclude whether the PCA and the European Commission have similar approaches in this sort of case.

VIII CURRENT DEVELOPMENTS

With a view to guaranteeing the sustainability of the National Health Service in relation to the public expense on pharmaceuticals, the Budget Law for 2015 created a requirement for an extraordinary contribution from pharmaceutical companies; these companies will be required to pay a contribution levied on the sales of the majority of medicines, with non-prescription drugs being excluded. The percentage of the contribution varies depending on the classification of the product sold (e.g., reimbursed products or hospital products) and ranges from 2.5 per cent to 14.3 per cent. Pharmaceutical companies that unconditionally adhere to an agreement executed between the government and the industry, setting both maximum levels of public expenditure for pharmaceuticals and a contribution from the industry to achieve these targets, are exempt from payment of this extraordinary contribution. Said agreement between the government and the Pharmaceutical Industry Association was executed in November 2015, with individual companies having the option to adhere to it.

Legislative changes are expected in 2015 in the context of market access, following the presentation, in 2014, by Infarmed, of the National Health Technology Assessment System. The objectives of the system – which will cover products other than medicines, such as medical devices – are essentially to control costs within the National Health Service and to guarantee an efficient allocation of public resources. Changes to the current cost-effectiveness evaluation process are anticipated, with one of the aims of the system being the introduction of measures to ensure cost-effectiveness analysis during the whole life cycle of products based on real data regarding their use and performance.

Appendix 1

ABOUT THE AUTHORS

PAULO PINHEIRO

Vieira de Almeida & Associados

Paulo Pinheiro is a partner at Vieira de Almeida & Associados, head of the firm's life sciences and public law practice groups. He has deep knowledge of regulatory matters, both under EU and national law, and has extensive experience in life sciences (pharmaceuticals, biotechnology, medical devices and cosmetics). For the past 20 years he has been working with the major innovative pharmaceutical companies operating in Portugal as well as the Pharmaceutical Industry Association. He is constantly ranked by *Who's Who Legal* as a recommended lawyer for life sciences. His expertise in public law covers a variety of matters, such as, regulation, public procurement, public-private partnerships, litigation and arbitration proceedings, and multiple sectors of activity, including, health, telecoms, energy and natural gas, transport, water and waste. He is a member of CADA, the Commission for Access to Administrative Documents, an independent administrative body, operating under the aegis of the parliament, and responsible, among others, for issuing opinions on matters regarding citizens' right to access administrative information. As an acknowledgement of his standing in public law, he has for several years been ranked as a leading individual by *Best Lawyers*, *Chambers Europe* and *The Legal 500*.

FRANCISCA PAULOIRO

Vieira de Almeida & Associados

Francisca Paulouro is an of counsel at Vieira de Almeida & Associados, and has worked in the firm's life sciences practice group for more than 10 years. She has significant expertise in regulatory matters related to pharmaceuticals, biotechnology, medical devices and cosmetics, both under EU and national law. She is fully dedicated to life sciences, assisting, on a day-to-day basis, several major innovative pharmaceutical companies operating in Portugal, and the Pharmaceutical Industry Association. Her expertise and

work with clients cover a wide range of matters, such as pricing and reimbursement, distribution and marketing, clinical trials, promotion, marketing authorisation and data exclusivity; matters in which she has been involved in several cross-border projects. She is ranked by *Who's Who Legal* as a recommended lawyer for life sciences.

VIEIRA DE ALMEIDA & ASSOCIADOS

Av. Duarte Pacheco, 26

1070-110 Lisbon

Portugal

Tel: +351 21 311 3451

Fax: +351 21 354 8939

pp@vda.pt

fp@vda.pt

www.vda.pt