
THE
LIFE SCIENCES
LAW REVIEW

EDITOR
RICHARD KINGHAM

LAW BUSINESS RESEARCH

THE LIFE SCIENCES LAW REVIEW

Reproduced with permission from Law Business Research Ltd.

This article was first published in The Life Sciences Law Review, 1st edition
(published in April 2013 – editor Richard Kingham).

For further information please email
Adam.Sargent@lbresearch.com

THE LIFE SCIENCES LAW REVIEW

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

www.TheLawReviews.co.uk

PUBLISHER
Gideon Robertson

BUSINESS DEVELOPMENT MANAGERS
Adam Sargent, Nick Barette

MARKETING MANAGERS
Katherine Jablonowska, Thomas Lee, James Spearing

PUBLISHING ASSISTANT
Lucy Brewer

PRODUCTION COORDINATOR
Lydia Gerges

HEAD OF EDITORIAL PRODUCTION
Adam Myers

CHIEF SUBEDITOR
Jonathan Allen

SUBEDITOR
Anna Andreoli

EDITOR-IN-CHIEF
Callum Campbell

MANAGING DIRECTOR
Richard Davey

Published in the United Kingdom
by Law Business Research Ltd, London
87 Lancaster Road, London, W11 1QQ, UK
© 2013 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. 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 2013, 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 978-1-907606-60-1

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

BAE, KIM & LEE LLC

BÄR & KARRER AG

CORPORATE LAW GROUP

COVINGTON & BURLING LLP

DIERKS + BOHLE

FAUS & MOLINER

FIEBINGER POLAK LEON & PARTNER RECHTSANWÄLTE

HOGAN LOVELLS

KHURSHEED KHAN & ASSOCIATES

LEE AND LI, ATTORNEYS-AT-LAW

MAPLES AND CALDER

MATTOS MURIEL KESTENER ADVOGADOS

NAGASHIMA OHNO & TSUNEMATSU

NORTON ROSE

NSN LAW FIRM

PLESNER LAW FIRM

ROSCHIER

SÁNCHEZ DEVANNY

CONTENTS

Editor's Prefacevii
<i>Richard Kingham</i>	
Chapter 1	AUSTRALIA..... 1
<i>Bernard O'Shea</i>	
Chapter 2	AUSTRIA..... 20
<i>Karina Hellbert</i>	
Chapter 3	BELGIUM 35
<i>Peter Bogaert and Sarah Forest</i>	
Chapter 4	BRAZIL..... 47
<i>Beatriz M A Camargo Kestener and Marco Aurélio Antas Torronteguy</i>	
Chapter 5	CANADA..... 60
<i>Martha A Healey, Adrienne Blanchard and Jill Daley</i>	
Chapter 6	CHINA 73
<i>Shaoyu Chen</i>	
Chapter 7	DENMARK..... 93
<i>Mikkel Vittrup and Mette Hygum Clausen</i>	
Chapter 8	EUROPEAN UNION 107
<i>Grant Castle and Robin Blaney</i>	
Chapter 9	FINLAND..... 131
<i>Johanna Lilja, Essi Weseri and Mia Eklund</i>	

Contents

Chapter 10	FRANCE.....	144
	<i>Mikael Salmela, Cécile Derycke and Omblin Ancelin</i>	
Chapter 11	GERMANY.....	156
	<i>Christian Dierks, Daniel Geiger and Ben Backmann</i>	
Chapter 12	INDIA.....	168
	<i>Krishna Sarma, Manisha Singh, Riku Sarma and Bhaskar Bhattacharya</i>	
Chapter 13	IRELAND.....	179
	<i>Maree Gallagher</i>	
Chapter 14	ITALY.....	196
	<i>Francesca Rolla and Paola La Licata</i>	
Chapter 15	JAPAN.....	208
	<i>Kenji Utsumi and Kensuke Suzuki</i>	
Chapter 16	KOREA.....	222
	<i>Jung Min Jo and Eun Soo Lim</i>	
Chapter 17	MEXICO	236
	<i>José Alberto Campos-Vargas</i>	
Chapter 18	NORWAY	253
	<i>Are Stenvik, Beret Sundet, Andreas Bjørnebye and Kirsten Wøien Gilhuus</i>	
Chapter 19	PAKISTAN.....	266
	<i>Zulfiqar Khan</i>	
Chapter 20	SOUTH AFRICA	277
	<i>Andrew Parsons, Brian Wimpey, Justin Malherbe, Liesel Kok and Rosalind Lake</i>	

Contents

Chapter 21	SPAIN	290
	<i>Jordi Faus</i>	
Chapter 22	SWEDEN	299
	<i>Håkan Sterner</i>	
Chapter 23	SWITZERLAND	312
	<i>Markus Schott and Markus Wang</i>	
Chapter 24	TAIWAN	324
	<i>Katherine Y C Juang, Jill Niu and Daisy Wang</i>	
Chapter 25	TURKEY	337
	<i>Selma Ünlü</i>	
Chapter 26	UNITED KINGDOM	348
	<i>Grant Castle and Sarah Cowlshaw</i>	
Chapter 27	UNITED STATES	363
	<i>Richard Kingham</i>	
Appendix 1	ABOUT THE AUTHORS	396
Appendix 2	CONTRIBUTING LAW FIRMS' CONTACT DETAILS	415

EDITOR'S PREFACE

It is a pleasure to serve as the editor of the first edition of *The Life Sciences Law Review*, which aims to provide an overview of legal issues of special interest to pharmaceutical, biotechnology and medical device companies in 27 jurisdictions. The life sciences sector is of vital importance to the health and well-being of persons around the world. Innovative manufacturers play a key role in the discovery and development of new therapies, while generic manufacturers serve an equally important function by ensuring availability of inexpensive products once patents and regulatory exclusivity periods expire. Throughout the lifespan of a drug or device – from the earliest discovery stage, through non-clinical tests and clinical trials, the governmental approval process, and after entry to the market – lawyers play a central role as advisers to the industry.

We have sought to organise the regulatory discussion in each national entry to correspond roughly to the key stages of product development: the regulatory classification of the product, which determines requirements for approval; non-clinical studies and clinical trials; compassionate use prior to approval; product pre-clearance; regulatory incentives for investment in drug development; post-approval controls; manufacturing; promotion; distribution; legal status; imports and exports; special rules on controlled substances; and enforcement.

In addition to product pre-clearance procedures, many jurisdictions impose requirements for approval of pricing or reimbursement of pharmaceuticals and, to a lesser extent, devices. These are addressed in the entry for each country. We also set out basic information on administrative and judicial remedies, controls on financial relationships with prescribers and payors, special liability systems, and transactional and competition issues that are specific to pharmaceuticals and medical devices.

Finally, each chapter identifies issues of current interest in the jurisdiction. These include, for example, plans to increase transparency in the regulatory process without undermining protection of intellectual and industry property; efforts to adapt traditional regulatory systems to new and emerging technologies, such as companion diagnostics, gene therapy and cell processing; and implementation of regulatory pathways for

Editor's Preface

'biosimilars' as patents expire for the first generation of biotechnology-derived medicinal properties. As these and other issues develop, we expect to devote additional attention to them in future editions.

I wish to thank all of the contributors who have made this publication possible. They are an impressive group, and it is a privilege to be associated with them in this enterprise.

Richard Kingham

Covington & Burling LLP

Washington, DC

March 2013

Chapter 24

TAIWAN

Katherine Y C Juang, Jill Niu and Daisy Wang¹

I INTRODUCTION

The Taiwanese government places much importance on the life sciences sector with the aim of developing it. With an abundance of laws and regulations governing this sector, such as the Rare Disease Prevention and Medicaments Act ('RDA'), which deals with orphan drugs, the most important law would be the Pharmaceutical Affairs Act ('PAA'). The government strictly scrutinises relevant industries and business operations and often takes a conservative stand on borderline cases so as to ensure civilian protection. The Department of Health ('DOH') is the competent central authority that governs all health-related matters, such as foods, cosmetics, medicines, medical devices and national health insurance ('NHI'). In 2010, the Bureau of Medical Affairs ('the Bureau'), which used to be the agency handling matters related to medicines and medical devices under the DOH, and the Bureau of Sanitation merged to form the Taiwan Food and Drug Administration ('TFDA') to centralise and strengthen regulatory enforcement. Although the DOH is the competent central authority, the enforcement of all health-related laws and regulations and the issuance of all licences, permits and authorisations in the name of the DOH are handled by the TFDA.

II THE REGULATORY REGIME

The PAA provides the basic structure for the regulation of medicines and medical devices, and the DOH has promulgated more than 100 subordinate regulations, guidelines and standards to clarify the implementation of the PAA.

¹ Katherine Y C Juang is a senior associate, Jill Niu is a partner and Daisy Wang is a senior counsellor at Lee and Li, Attorneys-at-Law.

i Classification

Medicines and medical devices are both regulated by the PAA. The PAA provides definitions for medicines and medical devices (jointly ‘medicaments’), to define the scope of its application. Under the PAA, ‘medicines’ are restricted to raw materials and preparations of any of the following:

- a* medicines used in diagnosing, curing, alleviating and preventing the diseases of human beings regardless of whether they are listed in the pharmacopoeia, listed by the PAA or recognised by the DOH;
- b* other medicines capable of sufficiently affecting the body and physiological functions of human beings; and
- c* medicines used in preparing the above-mentioned medicines.

In general, ‘medical devices’ cover instruments, machines, apparatuses and their accessories, fittings and parts, used in diagnosing, curing, alleviating and directly preventing diseases of human beings or that may affect the body or functions of human beings.

Cosmetics and cosmeceutical products, such as cosmetics containing medical or poisonous ingredients, are regulated by the Statute for Control of Cosmetic Hygiene. For cosmeceutical products, the DOH has promulgated the Standards for Cosmeceuticals, which lists ingredients permitted to be used in cosmetics. The Supreme Court has ruled that if a cosmetics product contains a medical ingredient listed in the aforementioned Standards, the Statute for Control of Cosmetic Hygiene should be considered; however, if the ingredient is not listed, the PAA should be considered. Similarly, although foods and food additives are regulated by the Food Sanitation Control Act and health food is regulated by the Health Food Control Act, if a medical ingredient contained within foods, food additives or health food products is not listed as a permitted ingredient for food products as published by the DOH, the PAA needs to be considered. Since the DOH is the sole competent central authority of the PAA, the Statute for Control of Cosmetic Hygiene, the Food Sanitation Control Act and the Health Food Control Act, regardless of which is the applicable law, all cases will be reviewed by the DOH, which will work out the necessary classification.

With respect to chemicals, toxic chemicals are regulated by the Toxic Chemical Substances Control Act, with the Environmental Protection Administration as the competent central authority, while precursor chemicals are regulated by the Narcotics Prevention and Control Act and the Categories and Regulations Governing Inspection and Declaration of Industrial Precursor Chemicals, with the DOH and the Industrial Development Bureau as the competent central authorities, depending on whether such chemicals are manufactured for medical or industrial products. There are no borderline cases at the moment.

ii Non-clinical studies

Currently, there are only two Taiwanese regulations related to non-clinical studies: the Good Laboratory Practice for Non-clinical Laboratory Studies (‘GLP’) and the Guideline for the Non-clinical Pharmacology/Toxicology Studies for Medicinal Products Applications (‘the Guidelines’) amended by the DOH in June 2000. As indicated in their

respective prefaces, the GLP and the Guidelines were drafted by the DOH by referring to the Good Laboratory Practice for Non-clinical Laboratory Studies promulgated by the United States FDA and other relevant regulations or guidelines of the International Conference on Harmonisation, the OECD and other developed countries. Hence, the GLP and the Guidelines are generally in line with, and cover all of the provisions stipulated in, international practices, excluding toxicokinetics studies.

iii Clinical trials

For clinical trials conducted in order to obtain marketing authorisation of medicaments, the PAA and its subordinate Guidelines for Good Clinical Practice ('GCP'), promulgated by the DOH, need to be considered. For human trials initiated and conducted by teaching hospitals or health-care institutions, for the purpose of improving medical care or preventing diseases, the Medical Care Act ('MCA') and its subordinate Regulations on Human Trials ('RHT') need to be considered. While there have been no clear regulations governing other types of trials, the Human Subjects Research Act ('HSRA') was recently enacted in December 2011 to provide general regulations on research (including trials) involving human subjects. In light of this development, all clinical trials and human research should comply with the HSRA, unless the GCP prevails when conducting clinical trials for medicaments registration purposes or the MCA prevails when conducting human trials as the GCP and the MCA are special laws of the HSRA.

In general, approval from an institutional review board or ethics committee and informed consent of the subjects are required prior to conducting any research involving human subjects, unless exempted by the DOH. As for clinical trials under the PAA and human trials under the MCA, approval from the DOH or TFDA and research institutional review board or ethics committee and informed consent from subjects are mandatory requirements. Where a pharmaceutical firm acting as a sponsor engages an institution and an investigator to conduct clinical trials under the GCP, a clinical trial agreement ('CTA') must be executed and any financial support from the sponsor needs to be specified therein. It is also required under the GCP that the sponsor should be responsible for compensation and insurance for injuries inflicted on the human subjects; however, the institutions and investigators do not have such responsibility and local insurance companies do not provide such insurance services to the institutions and investigators. Therefore, allocation of liability between institutions or investigators and sponsors will be determined solely on the terms of the CTAs. Although the GCP does not stipulate that the sponsor must be established in Taiwan, in practice, local hospitals would usually only enter into CTAs with sponsors established in Taiwan to ensure that, in the case of legal dispute, they can claim against local entities. Safety reporting requirements and mechanisms have also been established to ensure the protection of human subjects' safety and to ensure that a trial could be terminated as soon as the study is deemed no longer safe. Since there are no special laws or regulations governing investigator-initiated studies, the GCP should be applicable; for example, an investigator should assume the sponsor's responsibility as set forth in the GCP and a CTA must be executed to specify financial support from a pharmaceutical firm, if any.

iv Named-patient and compassionate use procedures

A teaching hospital may treat seriously ill patients with medicaments not yet registered with or approved by the DOH if they are a project of import medicaments. An application must first pass the internal review of the institutional review board or ethics committee of the applying teaching hospital. In such application to the DOH, the teaching hospital should submit the ethics committee's approval, medical literature regarding treatment, patient's consent and documents evidencing that such medicaments have obtained marketing authorisation from the competent sanitation authority of the country where the medicaments are manufactured.

In addition, pursuant to the RDA, projects to import rare-disease medicaments that have not been registered with or approved by the DOH may also be applied for by government agencies, health-care institutions, patients with rare diseases or their relatives, and relevant foundations or associations. The documents required for submission to the DOH are similar to those mentioned above: the patients' consent, a treatment plan issued by a health-care institution, documents evidencing that such medicaments have obtained marketing authorisation from the competent sanitation authority of the country where the medicaments are manufactured and safety and effect data. Although there have been no relevant laws and regulations, the unofficial verbal response from the TFDA officials indicates that applications for projects of import can be filed for medicaments that have not obtained marketing authorisation in any jurisdiction if there is a urgent need for treatment with such medicaments, and the TFDA will review each application case by case so whether such application would be granted cannot be determined.

After the project of import application is approved by the DOH, the imported medicaments should be labelled 'sample' and are not for sale. Therefore, teaching hospitals may not charge their patients for the costs of the medicaments. If the applicant is an individual, entity, agency, or institution, he or she may apply for reimbursement from the DOH for 80 to 100 per cent of the costs.

v Pre-market clearance

The Regulations for Registration of Medicines ('RRM') and the Regulations for Registration of Medical Devices ('RMD') provide application procedures for the registration and marketing authorisation of medicines and medical devices, respectively. In general, applicants of new chemical entity ('NCE') medicines would need to submit relevant information and data relating to clinical trials, formulation basis, testing specifications, methods and certificates of analysis of raw materials and finished products, manufacturing records, etc. The RRM was amended in July 2012 in order to simplify the procedures: the free sales certificate ('FSC') and the certificate of pharmaceutical product ('CCP') from the country of origin are no longer required documents but the review process may be accelerated if the FSC and the CCP are submitted. However, a post-marketing risk management plan becomes a requirement when filing the application so as to ensure the applicant manages risk after marketing authorisation is granted. As for medical devices, they are subdivided into the three classes of the RMD: Classes 1, 2 and 3. While registration of Class 1 medical devices merely involves simple paper review, registration of Classes 2 and 3 medical devices requires submission of detailed documents, particularly the FSC and clinical trials data.

The application fee of registration of NCE or biological medicines is in the amount of NT\$600,000. The application fee of registration of other types of medicines and medical devices ranges from NT\$15,000 to NT\$50,000. According to the suggested timeline published by the DOH, it takes approximately one year to obtain NCE marketing authorisation, 200 days for other kinds of new medicines, 220 days for new medical devices and only 80 days for Class 1 medical devices. The applicant (prospective marketing authorisation holder) must be a company duly registered under the laws of Taiwan holding a pharmaceutical company licence. Therefore, international pharmaceutical firms usually set up subsidiaries in Taiwan or appoint agents to comply with the above qualifications.

For special circumstances, there is no alternative mechanism to accelerate approval of products for urgent medical needs, however, during the H1N1 pandemic in 2009, the DOH did accelerate its review of H1N1 vaccines. There are, however, special regulations of biological medicines and herbal medicines regulated by the RRM, while the RMD specifies that customised medical devices must also meet the requirements set forth in the Regulations on Pharmaceutical Toll-Manufacturing and Contract Analysis. For generic products, relevant information and data of bioavailability and bioequivalence ('BA/BE') must be submitted. The Guidelines for BA/BE Studies promulgated by the DOH provides guidance on how such studies should be conducted.

vi Regulatory incentives

Although it is provided in the PAA that brand-name pharmaceutical firms should provide information of their NCE patents and when granting marketing authorisation of NCE, the DOH would publish the relevant patent numbers or patent file numbers, such submission of patent information is only for the DOH's records and files and will not be linked to the enforcement of the patents. However, the PAA does provide data exclusivity and study exemption clauses to balance the benefit of brand-name and generic firms.

Data exclusivity for marketing authorisation of NCE grants a five-year protection term preventing other pharmaceutical firms from registering the same by citing the data submitted by the holder without the holder's authorisation. However, after three years from the issuance of such marketing authorisation, other pharmaceutical firms may apply for marketing authorisation of medicines containing the same substance, the same dosage form, the same dose and the same dose unit, and such marketing authorisation may be approved on the day following the expiration of the five-year term. The PAA containing provisions similar to the *Bolar* provision stipulates that research, teaching and testing prior to application for registration by generic pharmaceutical firms are exempted from the scope of patent right protection of new medicines. However, due to the unclear wording employed in such provisions, their application has caused much confusion within the industry. A new provision was thus added to the recently amended Patent Act (which was passed in December 2011 and came into effect on 1 January 2013) for clarification: research and studies conducted for the registration of medicaments in this or other jurisdictions, regardless of whether they are prior to or after application for registration, would be covered by the study exemption. On the other hand, it is provided that the pharmaceutical firm that holds the first marketing authorisation of an orphan

drug may enjoy 10 years' exclusivity for that marketing authorisation so as to encourage the development or introduction of orphan drugs in Taiwan.

In addition, it is provided under the Patent Act that where there is an invention patent directed to a medicine or a manufacturing process thereof, if exploitation of such patent would require regulatory approval pursuant to other laws and if regulatory approval could only be obtained after publication of said invention patent, the patentee may apply for one and only one extension of the term of the invention patent, for up to five years, based on the regulatory approval. A compulsory licensing mechanism has been included into the Patent Act to help developing countries prevent pandemics and other serious diseases.

vii Post-approval controls

The marketing authorisation holder must be a company duly registered under the laws of Taiwan holding a pharmaceutical dealer licence. In addition, such pharmaceutical firm must employ a full-time resident pharmacist as part of its management. For a manufacturer engaged in the manufacturing of biological medicines, a resident technician with a degree in medical science, pharmacy or biology from a domestic or foreign university or college and possessing professional knowledge backed with more than five years of experience in the manufacturing of microbiological and immunological medicines must be employed to supervise the manufacturing.

The DOH, as required under the PAA, has promulgated the Regulation of Medicaments under Monitoring to implement five-year post-approval surveillance to ensure the ongoing safety of marketed medicaments and to compel the marketing authorisation holder to report an adverse event caused by medicaments. After the surveillance period, the PAA still requires health-care institutions, pharmacies and pharmaceutical firms to report serious adverse events caused by medicaments to the DOH. The Regulations Governing the Reporting of Severe Adverse Reactions to Medicines has been promulgated to provide the relevant reporting procedures. After an marketing authorisation has been granted, any variations or amendments to the approved contents of the packages, leaflets or labels would need to undergo review and further approval by the DOH. An marketing authorisation is generally valid for five years (those for rare-disease medicaments are for 10 years); application for marketing authorisation renewal must be filed at least six months prior to the expiration of such marketing authorisation. If any post-approval trials or studies are conducted, they need to comply with the HSRA guidelines.

viii Manufacturing controls

Medicaments must be manufactured by medicament manufacturing factories. Medicament manufacturing factories must obtain a factory registration licence pursuant to the Factory Management Act and a medicament manufacture licence pursuant to the Standards for Medicament Factory Establishment. As specified in the Standards, if a factory passes the DOH's inspection pursuant to the Good Manufacturing Practices for Medicaments ("GMP"), it may further obtain a certificate of GMP. A manufacturer may only commence manufacturing upon receipt of the medicament manufacture licence and if its factory passes the GMP inspection, unless exempted by the DOH through

public notice. In addition, the manufacturing of medicaments must comply with GMP standards. For imported products, the foreign manufacturer must pass the Quality System Documentation ('QSD') examination.

Relocation, expansion and ownership transfer of premise, and expansion of product line(s) require approval from the competent local sanitation authority and renewal of a GMP licence upon passing the GMP inspection by the DOH.

ix Advertising and promotion

According to the PAA, medicaments can only be advertised upon prior approval of the DOH and application for such approval must be filed by the pharmaceutical firm holding the marketing authorisation of such medicaments. Upon approval, the advertisement should be published or broadcasted with the name of the holder and the approval number or numbers. During the approved term of publication or broadcast, the approved particulars of medicaments cannot be modified. Advertisement of prescription medicaments can only be published in medical academic journals. Direct-to-patient promotion and advertisement for prescription medicaments is prohibited.

The term 'pharmaceutical advertisements' is broadly defined under the PAA to cover any act that would effectively be deemed as communicating the medical efficacy of medicaments with the aim to solicit and promote sales. It is also specified in the PAA that interviews, news reports or propaganda containing information implying or suggesting medical efficacy will be regarded as pharmaceutical advertisements. In this regard, the TFDA and the local competent sanitation authorities are usually strict. There are cases where pharmaceutical firms provided information leaflets to health-care professionals for their reference but such leaflets were disseminated by health-care professionals to their patients; the DOH held that this was disguised promotion so the pharmaceutical firms were fined. The courts usually uphold such a view.

x Distributors and wholesalers

Salespersons employed by pharmaceutical firms are only permitted to promote sales after their employment has been registered with the competent local sanitation authority. They can only sell medicaments manufactured or sold by their respective employers and can only sell such products to pharmacies, pharmaceutical firms, health-care institutions, and medical research institutions. Salespersons should not commit the acts of peddling, street vending, tampering with medicaments without authorisation and illegal advertising.

There are no specific regulations governing the licensing of distributors and wholesalers. However, from the spirit of the PAA, marketing authorisation holders can only license sales of their products to distributors or wholesalers with a pharmaceutical dealer licence, qualified for conducting the business of selling medicaments. Salespersons hired by such distributors and wholesalers must also comply with the above regulations concerning salespersons.

xi Classification of products

Medicaments are subdivided into prescription-only and over-the-counter. There are no specific procedures on classification. Pharmaceutical firms are required to provide their deemed classification when filing the application for marketing authorisation and the

DOH will rule on such classification and name such on the marketing authorisation. Sales of prescribed medicaments can only be made by pharmaceutical firms and pharmacies, while sales of over-the-counter medicaments can be made by general retailers. The different limitations on promotions are outlined above in Section II, ix.

xii Imports and exports

Only pharmaceutical firms holding marketing authorisation of medicament are eligible to import such product. However, marketing authorisation holders are permitted to license a third-party pharmaceutical firm to import such product as long as such licence is notified to the DOH and the DOH has acknowledged receipt.

For medicaments manufactured and sold under marketing authorisation intended to be sold abroad through export, if an import certificate from the importing country is required, the manufacturer needs to obtain an export certificate from the DOH prior to exportation. In this regard, the DOH may, upon consideration of insufficiency to meet domestic demands, restrict or limit exportation of medicaments.

xiii Controlled substances

Addictive narcotic medicines and psychotropic medicines are defined as controlled medicines and are regulated by the Controlled Medicines Act. Controlled medicines are subdivided into Classes 1 to 4 depending on addictive intensity, with Class 1 being most addictive. Import, export, sales and manufacture of Classes 1 and 2 controlled medicines can only be performed by the TFDA-established factories, while such handling of Classes 3 and 4 controlled medicines can be performed by the pharmaceutical firms upon obtaining marketing authorisation pursuant to the RRM.

All controlled medicines can only be dispensed and supplied upon prescription of a physician. When supplying controlled medicines, the identification certificate, name, address, and uniform serial number of the receiver and the quantity of controlled medicines received need to be listed in detail and be kept with such prescription for future inspection. Such information, data and records should be kept for five years.

xiv Enforcement

The DOH may, from time to time, send officials to inspect the premise(s) of pharmaceutical firms, health-care institutions and pharmacies, and to sample-test medicaments. Pharmaceutical firms, health-care institutions and pharmacies cannot reject such inspection and sample-test without just cause. Competent local sanitation authorities should also conduct annual inspections of pharmaceutical firms and pharmacies.

The DOH or competent local sanitation authorities may impose administrative fines from NT\$20,000 to NT\$25 million for violating statutory requirements and may even impose consecutive fines for continuous violations. For serious violations or refusal to cooperate, authorities may publish the name of such violating pharmaceutical firms, reject renewal application of medicaments, revoke marketing authorisation, and shut down business operations. If such violation involves criminal offence, such as the manufacture, import or sale of counterfeit, prohibited or defective medicaments, authorities can forward the case to the judiciary.

III PRICING AND REIMBURSEMENT

The NHI was launched in March 1995 and is a compulsory social insurance programme. All Taiwanese citizens and foreign nationals living in Taiwan with an alien resident certificate are statutorily obligated to enrol in the programme. The NHI has extensive coverage of medicaments, taking up approximately 90 per cent of the market. The insurer of the NHI is the Bureau of National Health Insurance ('BNHI'), a subordinate agency of the DOH. The BNHI is responsible for collecting premiums from the insured. When the insured use medical services, they do not need to pay for medical expenses other than a co-payment and registration fee. Health-care providers will apply for reimbursement with the BNHI. The National Health Insurance Act ('the NHI Act') was extensively amended in January 2010 (and slightly amended in June 2011), so the calculation of premiums, based on different classification of the insured, was entirely restructured, also known as second generation NHI, which took effect on 1 January 2013. While pharmaceutical firms had no role in first generation NHI, an article was added to the amended NHI Act enabling pharmaceutical firms to voice their opinions with regard to rules on the inclusion of medicaments onto the NHI reimbursement list and determination of reimbursement price standards.

Medicaments included on the NHI reimbursement list and their reimbursement prices are determined by the BNHI pursuant to the Pharmaceutical Benefit Scheme for NHI (PB Scheme), which was also extensively amended by the BNHI, promulgated by the DOH in December 2012 and effective on 1 January 2013, to cope with the changes made to the NHI Act. In general, the reimbursement price of brand-name medicaments is determined by referring to the reimbursement prices of such products in 10 developed countries. The reimbursement price of generics is set to be approximately 80 per cent of the price of brand-name product. As there are usually gaps between the higher reimbursement prices and the lower market prices (known as drug-price black holes), health-care providers have been making profits from such gaps. Since 1999, the BNHI has launched a biannual market survey of actual sales prices of reimbursed medicaments and used the survey results as a benchmark to lower reimbursement prices so as to reflect actual market prices. As a result, pharmaceutical firms have to further lower their sales prices in order to sell medicaments to health-care providers, which is more disadvantageous towards brand-name pharmaceutical firms. Additionally, the amended NHI Act includes a provision that the BNHI should adjust reimbursement prices based on prevailing market conditions; prices for patented medicines should be gradually lowered to reasonable prices within five years from the expiration of patent protection based on prevailing market conditions. This new provision has caused concern among brand-name pharmaceutical firms.

Due to the comprehensive coverage of NHI medicaments in the market, pharmaceutical firms have a disadvantageous position when negotiating medicaments supply agreements with health-care providers. In order to ensure a fair business relationship between health-care providers and pharmaceutical firms according to the amended NHI Act, the DOH and the Fair Trade Commission ('FTC'), the competent authority of the Fair Trade Act (which deals with antitrust and fair competition issues in Taiwan), are to jointly author guidelines for definitive contract clauses to be used in

agreements between health-care providers and pharmaceutical firms, covering matters that must and must not be recorded in such agreements.

IV ADMINISTRATIVE AND JUDICIAL REMEDIES

If a pharmaceutical firm receives an administrative penalty imposed by the DOH or local authority, it may file an opposition against the authority's decision within 15 days of receipt of the decision pursuant to the PAA. The authority is required to re-examine the matter and issue a new decision. The opposition is not a compulsory procedure, but most pharmaceutical firms will file an opposition before pursuing further administrative or judicial remedies, which offers a chance to have a discussion with the authority. Regardless of whether an opposition is filed, the pharmaceutical firm may file an administrative petition with the supervising agency of the DOH, the Executive Yuan, within 30 days of receipt of a decision pursuant to the Administrative Petition Act.

If the petitioner is not satisfied with the Executive Yuan's decision, it may further initiate an administrative suit against both the penalty decision and the petition decision before the administrative courts within two months from receipt of the petition decision. There are two instances for administrative suit: the high administrative courts and the Supreme Administrative Court. While the high administrative courts would review both factual and legal issues, the Supreme Administrative Court only reviews legal issues.

V FINANCIAL RELATIONSHIPS WITH PRESCRIBERS AND PAYORS

There are no laws or regulations that directly regulate the relationships between pharmaceutical firms and physicians or health-care professionals who make decisions relating to the utilisation or reimbursement of medicaments. The International Research-Based Pharmaceutical Manufacturers Association ('IRPMA'), an entity composed of international pharmaceutical firms operating in Taiwan, has issued the IRPMA Code of Practice ('IRPMA COP') to provide guidance to its members when interacting with health-care professionals. The IRPMA COP suggests that all events and meetings held or sponsored by pharmaceutical firms should be purely for scientific or educational purposes, that interactions at such events and meetings should not in any way be conducted with the intention to affect the independence and integrity of the health-care professionals' decision relating to their prescriptions, and that any honorarium, hospitality, entertainment and gifts in such events and meetings should be moderate. The IRPMA COP was recently amended to ensure the honorarium standards therein comply with the Ethics Directives for Civil Servants ('the Ethics Directives', see below). As for local pharmaceutical associations, neither the Taiwanese Generic Pharmaceutical Association nor the Chinese Pharmaceutical Manufacture and Development Association have published similar guidelines.

It is worth noting that in Taiwan, health-care professionals employed by public hospitals are deemed civil servants and subject to the Civil Service Employment Act and the Ethics Directives. As provided in the Ethics Directives, civil servants may not receive any unjustifiable gifts or cash or cash equivalents from private entities and honorarium

for attending a meeting or event is capped at NT\$5,000 per hour; if a civil servant also receives author's remuneration for such activity, such remuneration should not exceed NT\$2,000 per 1,000 words. Health-care professionals employed by public hospitals will be subject to a penalty pursuant to the Service Act of the Civil Servant for violated the Ethics Directives. The DOH has also promulgated the Code of Conduct for the Relationship between Physicians and Corporations ('the Physicians COC') in 2006 to provide ethical standards for physicians employed by public hospitals or private entities. It is stipulated that physicians should keep their independence and integrity relating to prescription decisions, should not be unduly affected by pharmaceutical firms, and should not receive cash or cash equivalents or other improper gifts from pharmaceutical firms. Physicians will be subject to a penalty pursuant to the Physicians Act for violating the Physicians COC. Pharmaceutical firms should refrain from abetting or aiding health-care professionals in violating the Ethics Directives and the Physicians COC.

However, civil servants are narrowly defined in the Criminal Code. In other words, only health-care professionals employed by public hospitals responsible for procurement or listing of medicaments will be deemed civil servants under the Criminal Code and will be subject to criminal liability for receiving bribery. Thus, the anti-bribery clause in the Criminal Code does not apply to most physicians.

VI SPECIAL LIABILITY OR COMPENSATION SYSTEMS

If a user of market-approved medicaments dies or becomes disabled or seriously ill (medicaments injury) due to an adverse reaction to such approved medicaments, such user or his or her relatives may request relief pursuant to the Medicaments Injury Relief Act. Pharmaceutical firms need to allocate 0.2 to 10 per cent of their previous year sales revenue of medicaments to injury-relief funds. The Medicaments Relief Foundation was established in 2001 to manage contributions from pharmaceutical firms and to handle medicaments relief claims.

As for injury caused by use of medicaments not deemed medicaments injury, the user who suffered such injury would need to claim damages against relevant pharmaceutical firms based on torts law; it is possible that any dispute that arises will need to be resolved through civil litigation. The user would need to prove that he or she did suffer injury, that such injury was caused by the use of medicaments and that the damages claimed are well grounded. There are cases where patients sue pharmaceutical firms based on the Consumer Protection Act ('CPA') by arguing that the medicaments, although approved by the DOH, did not meet the appropriate standards and that, while pharmaceutical firms have the obligation to ensure their products meet such standards, the firms should compensate users of such products. However, the courts generally hold the view that since the DOH has set in place a complex system of review of medicaments, unless substantial evidence is provided, pharmaceutical firms would not be deemed to have violated the obligations under the CPA.

VII TRANSACTIONAL AND COMPETITION ISSUES

i Competition law

Brand-name pharmaceutical firms will usually issue warning letters to health-care providers informing them of patent disputes with generic firms. In order to distinguish between the proper exercise and abuse of intellectual property rights, the FTC has promulgated the Guidelines on Reviewing Cases Involving Enterprises Issuing Warning Letters for Infringement on Copyright, Trademark and Patent Rights (‘the FTC Guidelines’) to provide necessary steps that a company must carry out before sending out warning letters to its competitors’ (potential) trading counterparts. In accordance with the FTC Guidelines, brand-name pharmaceutical firms would need to notify relevant generic firms requesting the cease of infringement prior to or simultaneously with the issuance of the warning letter and would need to state the precise content and scope of the patent rights concerned and the concrete facts of infringement in the warning letter so that health-care providers have sufficient knowledge of the rights that could possibly be or are being infringed.

Generally speaking, even if a brand-name pharmaceutical firm loses a patent infringement litigation, the court will not deem that there has been patent abuse since the patentee should have the right to defend its rights through litigation. However, a important judgment rendered by the Intellectual Property Court (‘the IP Court’) in 2011 provides a standard for determining patent abuse. In such case, Takeda Pharmaceutical Co Ltd (‘Takeda’), a Japanese brand-name company, sued Genovate Biotechnology Co Ltd (‘Genovate’), a Taiwanese generic company, for patent infringement and sought a preliminary injunction. The preliminary injunction was granted and later became final; thus, Genovate was prevented from selling the drugs. It was later found during litigation that the patent infringement assessment report submitted by Takeda to substantiate its application for a preliminary injunction was fundamentally erroneous, since the report found that a kind of preparation product could infringe a compound preparation patent. As a brand-name pharmaceutical firm, Takeda ought to have known of the inaccuracy contained in such report, based on its professional background. However, it still filed such a report to obtain the preliminary injunction and to deceive the judge who did not have a technical background. The IP Court therefore held that Takeda’s conduct amounted to patent abuse to unduly affect fair trade order by preventing Genovate’s product from entering the market.

As set forth in Section II, vi above, there is no patent linkage mechanism in Taiwan. Therefore, the possibility of pay-for-delay cannot occur in Taiwan at the moment. However, there have been discussions about whether brand-name pharmaceutical firms can acquire generic firms through hostile takeover so as to put generic products out of business. Since there has been no actual case, no decision or opinion can be found.

ii Transactional issues

International pharmaceutical firms intending to terminate distribution licences with their local agents are often faced with the difficulty of regaining possession of marketing authorisation. Under the PAA, an application for transferring marketing authorisation

must be jointly filed by the original holder and the new holder, but the agent (the original holder) will usually not cooperate with the licensor (the prospective new holder).

Under such circumstance, international pharmaceutical firms would usually consider filing parallel marketing authorisations. Nonetheless, since the TFDA holds a conservative view on issuing parallel marketing authorisations, the review process may be prolonged indefinitely. Therefore, if possible, it would be favourable if international pharmaceutical firms set up subsidiaries in Taiwan for the purpose of holding marketing authorisation. When mergers and acquisitions involve transfer of market authorisation, it is essential to draft clauses to protect the acquirer's right in obtaining marketing authorisation as planned.

VIII CURRENT DEVELOPMENTS

The Computer-Processed Personal Data Protection Act was amended and renamed as the Personal Data Protection Act ('PDPA') in May 2010; the PDPA came into effect in October 2012. The PDPA provides a different set of regulations relating to informed consent when regulating the collection, processing and use of personal data. The conflict between the PPA (including the GCP) and the PDPA has been a focus of discussion in the industry, such as about whether provisions regarding informed consent in the GCP should prevail, and whether the DOH's clarification should be sought. In addition, the newly amended NHI Act might affect the market status quo, particularly the price adjustment of medicaments whose patents have expired.

Appendix 1

ABOUT THE AUTHORS

KATHERINE Y C JUANG

Lee and Li, Attorneys-at-Law

Katherine Juang is a senior associate at Lee and Li, Attorneys-at-Law and has been a member of the Taipei Bar Association since 2002. Ms Juang obtained a masters degree in law in Taiwan and her masters thesis dealt with the protection of medical information. She specialises in pharmaceutical regulatory compliance, data protection compliance, IP law and competition law. She has been advising various local and foreign clients on pharmaceutical regulatory matters, relevant patent litigation and compliance struc

JILL NIU

Lee and Li, Attorneys-at-Law

Jill Niu is a partner at Lee and Li, Attorneys-at-Law, the largest law firm in Taiwan. Her practice focuses on medical and health-care laws (including compliance of privacy and data protection in conducting clinical studies and marketing programmes), employment and labour laws, corporate governance and compliance, and tax litigation. Ms Niu also acts as a counsel to a local association of multinational pharmaceutical firms and has been advising the association on the code of marketing practices, including privacy and data protection issues, from the perspective of clinical trial laws and regulations. She has been a member of the Taipei Bar Association since 1992.

DAISY WANG

Lee and Li, Attorneys-at-Law

Daisy Wang is a senior counsellor at Lee and Li, Attorneys-at-Law. After received LLB from National Taiwan University, Ms Wang pursued and received her LLM from University of Illinois. She served with the National Bureau of Standards (the former IPO) for more than two years and joined Lee and Li in 1979 for handling patent and IP related matters. Ms Wang is experienced in handling patent procurement and strategy

consultation, patent dispute resolution, technology licensing etc., and, since the 1990s, has handled various leading patent and IP cases for Intel, Philips, ABB, Sony, Celanese etc. Since 2000 Ms Wang has started to help clients with their Greater China patent and IP matters, including both prosecution and enforcement aspects. Since 1999, Ms Wang has been continually nominated as reputable IP professional via surveys done by various international organizations, such as *IP Asia*, *MIP*, *Who's Who*, Chambers & Partners (*Chambers Asia*), *IAM*, American Biographical Institute, *Expert Guide* (Euromoney), *Intercontinental Finance Magazine*, etc.

LEE AND LI, ATTORNEYS-AT-LAW

7F, 201 Tun Hua N. Road

Taipei 10508

Taiwan

Tel: +886 2715 3300 Ext. 2150

Fax: +886 2 2713 3966

katherinejuang@leeandli.com

jillniu@leeandli.com

daisywang@leeandli.com

www.leeandli.com/web/e/default.htm