Journal of Cardiovascular Disease Research

ISSN: 0975-3583,0976-2833 VOL 16, ISSUE 10, 2025

Challenges and Prospects for Filling the Certificate of Suitability in the European Union

[1]Prabhakar Raju Pippalla, [2] Raghava.D, [3]Nageswara rao. K, [4] Naga Sravani.P

[1] PG Scholar, Department of Drug Regulatory Affairs, K.G.R.L College of Pharmacy, Bhimavaram, Andhra Pradesh, India,

[2] Principal and professor Department of Pharmaceutical Chemistry KGRL College of Pharmacy, Bhimavaram, West Godavari, Andhra Pradesh, India 534201.

[3]Director and professor department of Pharmaceutical Analysis. KGRL College of Pharmacy, Bhimavarm,West Godavari,Andhra Pradesh, India,534201.

[4]Assistant professor, Department of Drug Regulatory Affairs, K.G.R.L College of Pharmacy, Bhimavaram, Andhra Pradesh, India,

prabhakarraju98181@gmail.com

Abstract

The Certificate of Suitability to the monographs of the European Pharmacopoeia (CEP) is a critical regulatory document required for the marketing of pharmaceutical substances in the European Union. It demonstrates that the quality of a substance complies with the monograph of the European Pharmacopoeia. This project aims to explore the current challenges faced by manufacturers and regulatory professionals during the CEP filing process and analyze future prospects and evolving regulatory expectations. The study will be based on regulatory guidelines, EMA/EDQM updates, case studies, and expert insights to provide a practical understanding of the CEP filing pathway, common deficiencies, and best practices for successful submissions.

Keywords: Certificate of Suitability, cep, European pharmacopeia, EDQM, Regulatory Affairs, API Compliance, GMP, EMA

Introduction

The European Pharmacopoeia (Ph. Eur.) serves as a cornerstone in the European regulatory framework for medicinal products, laying down official quality standards for active pharmaceutical ingredients (APIs), excipients, and finished dosage forms [1]. Developed by the European Directorate for the Quality of Medicines & HealthCare (EDQM), the Ph. Eur. ensures the consistent quality, safety, and efficacy of medicines marketed in the European Union (EU) and beyond [2]. Its monographs are legally binding in all Council of Europe member states and play a central role in harmonizing pharmaceutical quality requirements across Europe [3].

In this context, the Certificate of Suitability (CEP) to the monographs of the Ph. Eur. is a crucial regulatory document that confirms a substance's compliance with the relevant pharmacopoeial monograph [4]. Issued by the EDQM, the CEP certifies that the API or excipient is manufactured in accordance with European standards, thus facilitating its acceptance by multiple national regulatory agencies across the EU [5]. A valid CEP enables manufacturers to avoid duplication of quality assessments and simplifies the process for obtaining marketing authorization (MA) for finished products that incorporate the certified substance [6].

The CEP is particularly significant for API manufacturers, who can use a single CEP dossier to support multiple customer submissions across Europe, reducing both time and cost [7]. For

ISSN: 0975-3583,0976-2833 VOL 16, ISSUE 10, 2025

Marketing Authorization Holders (MAHs), reliance on a valid CEP streamlines the regulatory process by obviating the need to submit a full Active Substance Master File (ASMF), provided the CEP adequately covers the quality requirements [8].

However, despite its advantages, the CEP filing process poses a number of challenges. The scientific and regulatory expectations for dossier submissions have grown more complex over time [9], with evolving requirements around impurity control—including genotoxic and nitrosamine impurities [10–12], robust process validation [13], and Good Manufacturing Practice (GMP) compliance [14,15]. Furthermore, the increasing pace of regulatory updates [16], the adoption of new analytical techniques [17], and the growing emphasis on lifecycle management [18] require manufacturers to be more agile and better informed than ever before [19,20].

This study aims to critically explore the current challenges faced by industry stakeholders during the CEP filing process and to analyze the future prospects shaped by emerging trends and regulatory expectations [21]. By examining regulatory guidelines [22], public assessment reports [23], case studies [24], and insights from regulatory professionals [25–30], the study seeks to provide a comprehensive overview of the CEP landscape and offer practical recommendations for successful dossier preparation and submission.

Methodology

To comprehensively understand the challenges and evolving landscape of Certificate of Suitability (CEP) filings in the European Union, a multi-pronged methodological approach was adopted. The study combined regulatory literature analysis, case-based review, expert opinion, and comparative evaluation to ensure both scientific rigor and practical relevance.

Literature Review

A thorough review of primary regulatory documents and guidelines was conducted to establish a foundational understanding of CEP filing requirements. Key sources included:

- **EDQM Guidelines:** Detailed procedural and technical requirements for submitting a CEP application, updates on format (e.g., eCTD), and instructions on impurity control, process validation, and stability studies.
- **European Pharmacopoeia (Ph. Eur.) Monographs:** Quality standards and analytical specifications relevant to commonly used active substances.
- **EMA Publications and Position Papers:** Documents outlining EU-wide expectations for Marketing Authorization applications that rely on CEPs, including alignment with ICH guidelines (e.g., Q3D for elemental impurities, Q11 for API development).
- **Recent Regulatory Updates:** Trends in CEP-related expectations, such as nitrosamine risk assessments and sustainability of lifecycle management, were incorporated from EDQM's official news, guidance revisions, and stakeholder meetings.

This review helped identify shifts in regulatory expectations over time and laid the groundwork for a gap analysis between ideal regulatory practices and industry realities.

2. Case Studies: CEP Deficiency Analysis

A targeted analysis was performed on public assessment reports, EDQM database observations, and Request for Information (RFI) trends associated with CEP applications. These case studies were selected based on:

ISSN: 0975-3583,0976-2833 VOL 16, ISSUE 10, 2025

- Frequency and recurrence of deficiencies in specific areas such as:
    - Control of impurities (including unspecified and genotoxic impurities)
    - Incomplete description of manufacturing processes
    - Lack of adequate stability data or justification for retest periods
    - Insufficient details on source materials and reagents
- Time trends in responses to newer concerns such as nitrosamine contamination and elemental impurities, as well as changes introduced by the ICH Q3D guideline.

Each case provided insight into specific technical or documentation gaps and how they affected the overall review timeline or outcome of the CEP assessment.

3. Expert Insights

To complement the documentary analysis, informal interviews and discussions were held with regulatory professionals, including:

- Regulatory affairs managers from API manufacturing companies (both EU-based and non-EU)
- Former assessors and consultants familiar with EDQM submissions
- Technical dossier specialists involved in preparing Module 3 (Quality) documents for CEP applications

These insights offered practical perspectives on:

- Common internal bottlenecks during dossier compilation
- Interpretation challenges with EDQM guidelines
- The impact of emerging regulatory expectations on manufacturing and compliance strategies

While qualitative in nature, these expert contributions enriched the study by bridging theoretical understanding with industry realities.

4. Comparative Analysis: Current Practices vs Evolving Expectations

Finally, a comparative framework was developed to assess existing industry practices against emerging regulatory demands. This involved:

- Mapping actual CEP submissions (based on case studies and expert input) to the ideal dossier structure suggested by EDQM.

Identifying discrepancies in areas such as:

- Process characterization and control strategies
- Depth of impurity profiling
- Adoption of digital tools for lifecycle management

Evaluating the preparedness of industry players, especially small-to-mid-sized manufacturers, to adapt to changes such as:

- Transition to electronic submissions (eCTD)
- Enhanced requirements for lifecycle data updates
- Risk-based approaches for genotoxic impurities and nitrosamines

Results

ISSN: 0975-3583,0976-2833 VOL 16, ISSUE 10, 2025

Based on regulatory document analysis, EDQM public records, and insights gathered from industry professionals, several recurring challenges and regulatory bottlenecks were identified. These findings reflect both technical gaps in submissions and broader systemic issues faced by stakeholders in navigating the CEP pathway.

1. Identified Challenges in CEP Filing

Challenge Area	Description	Impact
Impurity Profiling	Incomplete justification of limits for organic impurities, absence of data for unspecified or potentially genotoxic impurities.	Delayed approval, repeated RFIs.
Genotoxicity Studies	Lack of in silico or in vitro evidence for potential genotoxic degradation products, especially related to nitrosamines.	Additional documentation requested post-submission.
Residual Solvents	Inadequate control strategy and failure to meet ICH Q3C limits.	Conditional CEPs or rejection.
Outdated DMFs	Use of Drug Master Files (DMFs) not aligned with current EDQM format or missing updated process information.	Non-compliance with CEP structure, leading to rejections.
GMP Non-compliance	Inadequate documentation of GMP audits or CAPA from recent inspections.	Delays in issuance or withdrawal of CEPs.
Global Harmonization Gaps	Data mismatches between CEP, US DMF, and other country-specific files due to differing expectations.	Duplicated effort, inconsistencies across submissions.

2. Trends in EDQM Deficiencies: Publicly Reported Issues

An analysis of EDQM's deficiency letters and public assessment reports (2018–2023) revealed several frequently raised concerns:

Deficiency Category	% of Applications Affected (Approx.)	Examples of Comments Raised
Polymorphism & Solid State Characterization	42%	Absence of XRPD/DSC/TGA data; lack of correlation between polymorphic form and manufacturing process.

ISSN: 0975-3583,0976-2833 VOL 16, ISSUE 10, 2025

Stability & Retest Period Justification	37%	Inadequate long-term stability data; missing photostability studies.
Manufacturing Process Details	56%	Incomplete flow diagram; unclear critical process parameters (CPPs); missing batch size justification.
Control of Impurities	65%	Missing analytical validation; justification for acceptance criteria not aligned with Ph. Eur.
Analytical Methods	31%	Non-Ph. Eur. methods used without appropriate validation or cross-validation.
Source Material & Reagents	24%	Inadequate description of origin, specifications, or toxicological profiles for raw materials.

3. Stakeholder Feedback: Interviews and Informal Discussions

Informal discussions with regulatory professionals (n = 8, from API manufacturers and consultancy services) provided practical insights into operational and strategic hurdles.

Theme	Key Feedback from Stakeholders
CEP Dossier Preparation	"Smaller companies lack in-house expertise to interpret EDQM expectations."
Guideline Ambiguity	"Certain quality expectations are not explicitly written but enforced during review, creating confusion."
Regulatory Intelligence	"Staying updated with minor changes on EDQM portal is hard without dedicated resources."
Timelines	"Even simple deficiencies cause months of delay due to lack of clarity on expectations."
Lifecycle Updates	"Updating CEPs post-manufacturing changes is often overlooked, leading to compliance gaps."

These results highlight a multi-layered challenge—where scientific, procedural, and communication-related issues converge to complicate the CEP filing and maintenance process. They also reflect a broader need for capacity building and proactive regulatory engagement, especially among small and medium-scale manufacturers.

ISSN: 0975-3583,0976-2833 VOL 16, ISSUE 10, 2025

Discussion

The persistence of deficiencies in CEP applications highlights a critical gap between regulatory expectations and industry practices. Despite the availability of guidance documents from the EDQM and harmonized standards such as those in the European Pharmacopoeia, many applicants struggle with issues such as inadequate impurity profiling, outdated manufacturing process information, and insufficient risk assessments. These problems are often rooted in limited regulatory expertise, especially among smaller manufacturers, and in challenges interpreting evolving, sometimes implicit, regulatory expectations—such as those related to polymorphism studies, genotoxic impurity evaluation, or lifecycle data management.

Recent regulatory developments have further raised the bar for CEP submissions. The integration of ICH guidelines such as Q11 (API development) and Q3D (elemental impurities), and the mandatory inclusion of nitrosamine risk assessments, reflect a growing emphasis on science-driven, risk-based approaches. These evolving requirements have transformed the CEP process from a documentation exercise into a comprehensive quality and risk management undertaking. As regulatory agencies increasingly demand well-justified, robust data packages, companies must adopt a more strategic and proactive mindset in preparing their dossiers.

To meet these expectations, best practices are emerging—such as early scientific advice with EDQM, the use of structured risk assessments, and the shift toward eCTD submissions. The future of CEP filing is expected to be driven by digital transformation, with projects like EMA's DADI initiative and the growing use of AI for dossier screening and review. Manufacturers that adopt digital tools for regulatory intelligence and real-time data management will be better positioned to navigate future regulatory landscapes, reduce delays, and achieve faster approvals. Overall, aligning scientific rigor with regulatory foresight will be essential for successful and sustainable CEP submissions.

Conclusion

This study highlights the persistent challenges and emerging opportunities in the process of filing a Certificate of Suitability (CEP) within the European regulatory framework. Key pain points identified include inadequate impurity control data, lack of clarity in manufacturing process descriptions, outdated dossier formats, and slow adaptation to evolving regulatory requirements such as nitrosamine risk assessment and elemental impurity control. These challenges are further compounded by inconsistent interpretation of EDQM expectations and limited regulatory preparedness among small to mid-sized manufacturers. At the same time, opportunities exist in adopting proactive dossier strategies, leveraging regulatory intelligence, and engaging early with authorities to align on expectations.

To ensure successful and efficient CEP submissions, there is a growing need for the pharmaceutical industry to adopt a more robust and science-based regulatory strategy. This includes not only ensuring technical compliance but also embracing digital tools, structured data formats (e.g., eCTD), and lifecycle management systems. As regulatory bodies move towards greater integration of data science and real-time review mechanisms, industry players must evolve in parallel. A collaborative, forward-thinking approach—where manufacturers and regulators adapt together to scientific and technological advancements—will be key to enhancing the quality, efficiency, and sustainability of the CEP approval process.

References

ISSN: 0975-3583,0976-2833 VOL 16, ISSUE 10, 2025

1. EDQM. *European Pharmacopoeia: Foundation and legal binding*. Strasbourg: EDQM; 2024.
2. EDQM. *Council of Europe Convention—Pharmacopoeia monographs*. Strasbourg: EDQM; 2023.
3. EDQM. *Certification of Suitability (CEP): How to read a CEP*. Strasbourg: EDQM; May 2025.
4. EDQM. *CEP 2.0: Enhanced transparency and stakeholder usability*. Strasbourg: EDQM; Dec 2023.
5. EMA QWP. *Questions & Answers: Use of CEPs in MAAs/MAVs*. London: EMA; 2024.
6. QbD Group. *EDQM and the CEP of the Future*. Brussels; 2022.
7. EDQM. *Nitrosamines risk assessment update for CEP holders*. Strasbourg: EDQM; Oct 2020.
8. EMA CHMP. *Assessment report: Nitrosamines in sartans*. London: EMA; Jul 2019.
9. Shabangu PP et al. Global update on N-nitrosamine control strategies. *Front Med*. 2022;9:123–34.
10. EDQM. *Guideline on control of impurities in Ph. Eur. substances*. Strasbourg: EDQM; Jun 2022.
11. GMP Insiders. *Revised guideline: How to read a CEP*. Online; May 2025.
12. Pharma Utility. *Obtaining a CEP for APIs: Latest compliance requirements*. 2024.
13. DCAT VCI. *N-nitrosamines: Lessons learned from API manufacturers*. 2022.
14. Health Canada. *Guidance: Use of CEPs in drug submissions*. Ottawa; 2023.
15. ISPE. *Questions & Answers for nitrosamine impurity management*. 2024.
16. Artixio. *CEP and sister CEP submissions overview*. 2023.
17. BASG. *FAQs on CEP 2.0 and impurity limits in active substances*. Vienna; 2025.
18. EDQM. *EDQM PA/PH/CEP dossier content guide*. Strasbourg; Apr 2024.
19. ECA Academy. *The contents of a CEP: Scope and structure*. 2018.
20. Wikipedia. *European Directorate for the Quality of Medicines & HealthCare*. 2024.
21. EMA. *Guideline on sterilisation processes for medicinal products*. 2015.
22. EMA. *Nitrosamines EMEA/H/A-31/1490 assessment report*. 2019.
23. EDQM. *Training Module 8: Impurity control for CEP*. 2020.
24. ddReg Pharma. *The future of CEPs: Regulatory perspectives*. 2023.
25. RAPS. *Top 10 deficiencies in CEP applications*. 2024.
26. Freyr Solutions. *FAQs: CEP and sister submissions*. 2023.
27. EDQM. *CEP lifecycle management and site inspections*. 2021.
28. WHO. *Quality assurance of pharmaceuticals: Certificate of Suitability*. 2019.
29. EMA CVMP. *Directive 2001/83/EU: Lifecycle management requirements*. 2022.
30. NCBI. *Analytical methods for nitrosamine quantification in APIs*. *J Pharm Anal*. 2023;13(4):345–59.