Volume 7
Medicines and Cosmetics

Terms of Reference, Committee Members and Report Volumes xv
A note on the footnotes xvi

1 Introduction and overview 1
Scope of this volume 1
Animal and human medicines 1
Cosmetics 4
Audit of uses of bovine tissues 5
Overview and general findings 6

2 The operation of medicines licensing 7
Introduction 7
The licensing regime for human and veterinary medicinal products 8
Which products required a product licence? 8
Who granted a licence? 9
Advice to the Licensing Authority 9
Medicines Commission 10
Section 4 committees 10
Chief Medical Officer and Chief Veterinary Officer 11
National Institute for Biological Standards and Control 12
Licences for medicinal products 12
Product licences, clinical trial certificates and animal test certificates 13
Granting new licences 13
Existing licences: renewal, suspension, revocation and variation 14
Informal action 15
Options available to deal with BSE 16
Adverse reactions 16
How did the UK licensing regime interact with European regulation? 17
Responsibilities for medicines licensing in 1988/89 18
Responsibilities within DH for human medicines licensing 18
(a) Administrative staff 18
(b) Medical staff 19
(c) Pharmaceutical staff 19
Responsibilities within MAFF for Veterinary medicines licensing 20
Evaluation of the arrangements for the control of medicines 21
Human medicines: Evans–Cunliffe Report 21
Overload and delay 22
3 Initial response on veterinary medicines

Introduction

Use of animal materials prior to the emergence of BSE

Consideration of BSE in MAFF from January 1987 to March 1989: a chronological account

Meeting of the Biologicals Sub-Committee of the CSM on
9 September 1987

December 1987 to February 1988

Biologicals Committee considers BP&S paper

June to July 1988

Further consideration by the Biologicals Committee

Immediate action on Pituitary Hormones

July meeting of the Biologicals Committee

September 1988

November 1988

December 1988

January 1989

Conclusions on MAFF’s initial response

4 Initial response on human medicines

Early knowledge of BSE within Medicines Division

July 1987

Meeting of the Biologicals Sub-Committee of the CSM on
9 September 1987

Consideration of BSE in Medicines Division from January 1988 to March 1989: a chronological account
CONTENTS

January 1988 56
Meeting of the CSM/BSC on 6 January 1988 56
March 1988 56
The Chief Medical Officer’s reaction to BSE 56
April 1988 57
Medicines Division learns about BSE 57
May 1988 59
A meeting arranged by the NIBSC 59
Sir Richard Southwood and Dr Pickles become involved 61
June 1988 63
A minute from Dr Pickles 63
The response within Medicines Division 65
August and September 1988 66
November 1988 67
The Rotblat and Purves paper 67
The CSM/BSC meeting on 2 November 1988 70
Sir Richard Southwood’s first letter to the CSM 72
Consideration by the CDSM and CSM 72
Further correspondence between Sir Richard Southwood and Professor Asscher 73
Giving effect to the CSM recommendations 75
Discussion 76
The communication gap between MAFF and DH prior to March 1988 76
Dr Little’s attendance at the CSM/BSC meeting in September 76
After the meeting 77
CSM/BSC discussion of Mr Sloggem’s paper 79
The Medicines Division response after March 1988 81
The response of Medicines Division to the CMO’s concerns 81
Obtaining expert advice 82
Searching the database 82
Action after Dr Pickles’s minute of 21 June – advice from the section 4 committees 84
Who in Medicines Division was responsible for deciding what should be done about BSE, and when? 84
Was the matter put to the section 4 committees with sufficient urgency? 85
Publication of a request for information in MAIL 87
Communication between Medicines Division and MAFF 88

5 Issue of guidelines 92
Introduction 92
Preparation and issue of joint guidelines between January and March 1989: a chronological account 92
January 1989
MAFF and DH agree to keep in step 92
VPC discussion of the draft guidelines 94
Further correspondence with Sir Richard Southwood 95
February 1989
The Human and Veterinary Medicines Briefing Group (HVMBG) 96
Consideration by the Southwood Working Party 98
A draft submission to the Secretary of State: the CMO’s reaction 99
Medicines Division’s response to the CMO’s concerns 100
Briefing to MAFF Ministers 102
VPC approves the guidelines 103
Second meeting of the Human and Veterinary Medicines Briefing Group 105
Consideration by the CSM 106
Joint CSM/VPC guidelines 107
Discussion of the Southwood Report and Medicines with Ministers 109
Briefing for public handling of the outcome of the CSM meeting 110
March 1989
Issue of joint CSM/VPC guidelines by DH 112
Issue of joint CSM/VPC guidelines by MAFF 113
MAFF meeting with NOAH on the guidelines: Continued concern about public reaction 114
Guidelines on medical devices 115
Introduction 115
Responsibility for medical devices 115
Issue of guidelines on medical devices: a chronological account 115
February 1989 115
March 1989 117
Discussion 119
The message contained in the Southwood Report 119
Was it appropriate to issue non-binding guidelines? 120
The scope of the guidelines 121
Products administered orally 122
Products administered topically 124
Did the covering letters convey the appropriate message? 125
Should existing stocks have been withdrawn immediately? 126
Ministerial involvement 130

6 Ensuring medicinal products complied with the guidelines 132
Introduction 132
The agreed policy framework for action in March 1989 132
The period covered in this chapter 133
CONTENTS

Chronicling the events 133
Structure of the chapter 134
Responsibility for managing the process 135
  Human medicines: Medicines Division, MCA 135
  Medical devices: PD/STD, MDD 135
  The BSE Working Group 135
  Veterinary medicines: the VMD and the VPC 136
1989 136
  Preparation for processing the veterinary medicines responses 136
  Meeting of the Joint Committee on Vaccination and Immunisation (JCVI) 137
  Initial consideration of responses to the medical devices questionnaire 137
  Progress in MCA 138
  VMD discussions with ingredient suppliers about the guidelines 139
  Implications for pharmaceuticals of a ban on Specified Bovine Offal 139
  Preliminary review of human medicines responses 140
  MAFF develops detailed proposals for the intended SBO ban 142
  Dr Pickles asks which manufacturers use products covered by the ban 142
  Preparations for public consultation about the SBO ban 143
  MCA updates VMD on progress 144
  Implications of the SBO ban for medicinal products: consideration by Animal Health Division 145
  Veterinary medicines progress report 146
  NOAH’s concern about the practicality of the CSM/VPC guidelines 146
  Further consideration of ingredient suppliers 147
  Medical devices: following up non-responses 147
First meeting of the BSEWG 148
  Responses to the questionnaire 148
  Ranking the risks: the paper by Dr Rotblat and Dr Purves 148
  The BSEWG considers the risks 149
  Identification of high-risk products 150
  Surgical catgut 150
  Medical devices 153
  Veterinary medicines 153
VMD report to the VPC 154
CDSM and CSM consider the BSEWG advice 154
Further consideration of tissues to be covered by the SBO ban 154
Medical devices 155
Inconsistency between the SBO ban and BSEWG advice 156
Human SBO ban: consideration of the implications for medical devices 156
MCA: issues arising from the BSEWG meeting 158
CRM: considering products of concern 159
The Bovine Offal (Prohibition) Regulations 1989 (the SBO ban) 159
Presentation on veterinary medicines to the Royal Society of Medicine 160
Medical devices 160
Update on veterinary medicines 161

1990 161
Second meeting of the BSEWG 161
  Returns to CSM/VPC questionnaire: human medicines 161
  Non-complying products (other than catgut) 161
  Vaccines 162
  Allergen Products 162
  Surgical Catgut 163
  Reviewing the guidelines 163
  The SBO regulations 163
CSM and CDSM receive reports of the BSEWG meeting 163
Medical devices 164
Assurances about bovine insulin 164
CRM meeting 164
Spongiform encephalopathy in a cat 165
Q&A briefing: Agriculture Select Committee 165
Surgical catgut: change to Australasian source 166
Third meeting of the BSEWG 166
  Returns to CSM/VPC questionnaire 166
  Update on epidemiological aspects of BSE 166
  Foetal calf serum 167
  Allergen products 167
  Non-complying vaccines 168
  Topical medicinal products 170
  Medical devices 170
CSM endorses recommendations of third BSEWG meeting 170
Restructuring of Procurement Directorate 170
European working party on human medicines 171
Fourth meeting of the BSEWG 171
  Final returns to CSM/VPC questionnaire 171
  Allergens: an update 171
  Vaccines 172
  Foetal calf serum 172
  The pig 172
  Dural implants 173
  Paper on sterilisation of animal tissues in medical devices 173
BSE in Switzerland 173
CSDM and CSM consider recommendations of fourth BSEWG meeting 174
VMD reports progress on veterinary medicines to the VPC 174
1991–92

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BSE in France</td>
<td>177</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initial steps towards development of European guidelines</td>
<td>177</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second thoughts on the exemption from sterilisation and staining of SBO material used for pharmaceuticals</td>
<td>177</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Further consideration of European guidelines</td>
<td>178</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assurances about contact lens products</td>
<td>179</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Further meeting of the BSEWG proposed</td>
<td>179</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continuing debate on ‘excepted premises’</td>
<td>179</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consideration of TSEs by WHO</td>
<td>180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finalising European guidelines on human medicines</td>
<td>180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fifth meeting of the BSEWG</td>
<td>182</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Products containing French sourced bovine material</td>
<td>182</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vaccines</td>
<td>183</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical Devices</td>
<td>183</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foetal calf serum</td>
<td>184</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consideration of the safety of gelatine</td>
<td>184</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CDSM and CSM meetings</td>
<td>186</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1993–96

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>European guidelines on veterinary medicines</td>
<td>186</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pharmaceutical products: quantitative studies of risk</td>
<td>187</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>German guidelines on the use of bovine and ovine material in medicines</td>
<td>187</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other European issues</td>
<td>188</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Further meeting of the BSEWG proposed</td>
<td>188</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical Devices Agency</td>
<td>188</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeting of the Biologicals Sub-Committee</td>
<td>189</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MCA and VMD audits of manufacturers</td>
<td>190</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Discussion

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>What needed to be done?</td>
<td>191</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(i.) Handling uncertainty</td>
<td>192</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(ii.) The management context of the review exercise</td>
<td>192</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(iii.) Mixed messages on the urgency of the exercise</td>
<td>193</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The response by the Licensing Authorities</td>
<td>194</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. The response on veterinary products</td>
<td>194</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The basis for action</td>
<td>194</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whose job was this?</td>
<td>195</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Securing action</td>
<td>195</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Our general conclusion on the handling of veterinary medicines</td>
<td>197</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. The response on human medicinal products</td>
<td>197</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The basis for action</td>
<td>197</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whose job was this?</td>
<td>198</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The impact of the MCA on handling</td>
<td>198</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identifying and following up the risk products</td>
<td>199</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CONTENTS

Proposals C2a and C2b 226
   Clearing the final draft 226
   The final version 227
Allocation of responsibility for C2a and C2b 229
   Joint responsibility for MAFF and DH 229
   The MCA will ‘look after’ C2a 231
Infectivity studies at the NPU 231
Checking progress on the Tyrrell recommendations 232
   Comments from Supplies Technology Division 232
C2a and C2b: what priority? 233
   Checking suppliers of FCS 234
SEAC questions the relevance of pharmaceuticals research 235
Discussion 236
   How this was approached 236
   Inconsistencies in the approach 237
     1. Was it suitable for industry? 238
     2. Compartmentalised items 238
     3. Detached attitude of the MCA and VMD 238
     4. Divergent perceptions of MAFF, DH and SEAC 239
   Lessons for the future 240

8 Cosmetics and toiletries 241

Introduction 241
   Exotica 241
   Standard topical products 241
   Collagen implants 242
   How the issue was handled 242
Regulatory framework 243
   Enforcement 245
   DTI handling of cosmetics 245
   DH’s role in cosmetics safety 246
Cosmetics and BSE – a chronology 246
   June 1989 246
      The Interim Report of the Tyrrell Committee 246
   January 1990 247
      MAFF is asked about cosmetics 247
      DTI asks DH for advice on cosmetics 247
      DH consideration of Dr Fielder’s letter to Mr Roscoe 247
   February/March 1990 249
      Mr Roscoe advises the CTPA 249
      The CTPA contacts its members 250
   April/May 1990 251
      Dr Pickles drafts paper for SEAC 251
### MEDICINES AND COSMETICS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Event Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>July 1990</td>
<td>The BSEWG considers topical products including cosmetics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March to May 1991</td>
<td>SEAC consideration of the use of bovine material in non-food preparations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 1991</td>
<td>DH contacts the CTPA directly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SEAC recommends an update of DTI’s advice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July/August 1991</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 1991</td>
<td>Consideration of the SBO Regulations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 1991</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1992</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 1992</td>
<td>The CTPA asks its membership for further information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 1992</td>
<td>DH prepares updated advice for the CTPA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 1992</td>
<td>A warning of possible European involvement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 1992</td>
<td>DTI and DH attend a meeting of the EC Working Party on Cosmetics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 1992</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1993</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 1993</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June/July 1993</td>
<td>MAFF seeks an update on EC discussions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1994</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February to April</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 1994</td>
<td>The CTPA releases guidelines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July–November 1994</td>
<td>The SCC issues advice on BSE and Cosmetics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ECWPC decides no amendment to Cosmetics Directive is necessary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1997/98 275
Discussion 276
Was DTI promptly and adequately informed? 276
Did DTI on being informed take appropriate action? 278
What happened next 281
The causes of delays and diversions 281
Consequences for the course of events after 1991 283
Following up the guidance 283
Getting sidetracked 284
Holding the ring and the EC minuet 285
The consequences 287
General conclusions 288

9 Consideration of an audit of the uses of cattle tissues 290
Introduction 290
The need for an audit 290
What happened 290
Consideration of an audit into the fate of cattle tissues: a chronology 292
1988/89 292
Early consideration of an audit 292
Consideration of the fate of cattle tissues by MAFF prior to Tyrrell 293
The Tyrrell Report 295
1990 299
Publication of the Tyrrell Report 299
Consideration of Tyrrell proposal A1d by SEAC 300
The first SEAC meeting: A1d ‘remains high priority’ 302
A meeting with Mr Gummer 303
Correspondence from Dr Pickles 304
The fourth meeting of SEAC 307
1991 307
SEAC asks for a note on non-food preparations 307
MAFF suggests the audit ‘has fallen through the cracks’ 308
The eighth meeting of SEAC 311
The ninth meeting of SEAC 314
1992 315
The SEAC Interim Report on Research: ‘All studies justifying a high priority have been started’ 315
1995 316
A review of MAFF TSE research recognises the need for an audit trail 316
1996 319
SEAC says that an audit is urgent 319
The audit is ‘high priority, and getting higher’ 320
Discussion 322
Why was an audit needed? 322
What happened 322
The consequences 323
The causes 323
  (1) Ambivalent status of the project 323
  (2) The linking with cosmetics 324
  (3) The battle over research funding 324
  (4) Lack of ownership 325
The adequacy of the response 326
1. The MAFF response between 1989 and 1992 326
   Who was responsible for action? 326
   Animal Health Division policy development on BSE 327
   Carrying forward the audit proposal 327
   How matters were handled thereafter 328
   Was the MAFF response adequate? 330
2. New MAFF proposals for an ‘audit trail’ in 1995 331
   Was the 1995 response adequate? 331
3. The DH response 332
Lessons 333

Annex 1 to Chapter 9: The cattle carcass: routes of use in the late 1980s 334

Annex 2 to Chapter 9: Uses made of the cattle carcass 335

Glossary 339

Who’s who 345

Index 353