

#### **Disclaimer**

This presentation has been prepared by Sidley Austin LLP and Affiliated Partnerships (the Firm) for informational purposes and is not legal advice. This information is not intended to create, and receipt of it does not constitute, a lawyer-client relationship. All views and opinions expressed in this presentation are our own and you should not act upon this information without seeking advice from a lawyer licensed in your own jurisdiction. The Firm is not responsible for any errors or omissions in the content of this presentation or for damages arising from the use or performance of this presentation under any circumstances.

Do not convey to us confidential information until you speak with one of our lawyers and receive our authorization to send that information to us. Providing information to the Firm will not create an attorney-client relationship in the absence of an express agreement by the Firm to create such a relationship, and will not prevent the Firm from representing someone else in connection with the matter in question or a related matter. The Firm makes no warranties, representations or claims of any kind concerning the information presented on or through this presentation. This presentation is dated **March 11, 2024**, and changes in laws, rules and regulations (or their interpretation) thereafter could materially affect the content of this presentation.

Attorney Advertising - Sidley Austin LLP, One South Dearborn, Chicago, IL 60603, +1 312 853 7000. Prior results do not guarantee a similar outcome. Photos may include Sidley alumni or other individuals who are not Sidley lawyers. Photos may be stock photographs.

### Bilaterale III and Motion 20.3211 Müller Best of Both Worlds

#### **Bilateral III Package**

- Counter-measures against the erosion of the bilateral way.
- Update existing & concluding new Single Market Agreements
- Mutual Recognition Agreement (MRA) as part of market access agreement.
- Key differences:
  - Vertical vs. sectoral approach
  - Institutional issues now dealt with individually (dynamic assumption of rights, dispute settlement)
  - No guillotine clauses
  - Clear constitutional process.

#### Motion 20.3211 Müller

- What does the re-negotiation mean for the implementation of Motion 20.3211 Müller?
- Recognition of US Food and Drug Administration (FDA) authorizations shall be no reason for the EU to refuse MRA update and renegotiation.
- Legally, there is no reason why Switzerland could not have "best of both worlds".
- It must be ensured that this is clearly upheld in the **new negotiations**.

# Compatibility of Recognition with MRA No Reason to Reject the Update

Would an adaptation of the Swiss medical device regulation, according to which medical devices with FDA authorizations are eligible for the Swiss market (cumulative to the marketability of medical devices with CE marking), mean

- ➤ that Swiss regulation of medical devices would no longer be equivalent to that of EU?
- ➤ that an update of the MRA between the EU and Switzerland for the medical device sector could therefore be rejected by the EU?
- ➤ that this would lead to a **distortion of competition** in the form of unjustified advantages for Switzerland?



# Compatibility of Recognition with MRA No Reason to Reject the Update

The recognition of conformity assessments or marketing authorizations for medical devices from third countries as a basis for market access for such devices in Switzerland would

- ➤ not affect the equivalence of Swiss and EU medical device regulations,
- > not allow the EU to refuse to update the MRA,
- > not lead to a distortion of competition in the sense of an unjustified preferential treatment of Switzerland.



# Recognition of FDA Authorizations Not Affect Equivalence

The recognition of conformity assessments or market authorizations for medical devices from third countries (e.g., US FDA) as the basis for market access for such products in Switzerland would have no influence on the equivalence of Swiss medical device regulation with EU regulation.

- Equivalence: basic prerequisite for MRA between EU and Switzerland.
- Equivalence applies to MRA scope.
- Outside the scope of application: the question of what requirements the contracting parties impose on medical devices that are authorized for sale on the respective domestic markets is not relevant to the MRA.
- MRA itself: expressly presupposes that agreements with third countries may exist in addition to the MRA.
- Example of Australia: shows that acceptance of medical device authorizations from FDA had no influence on equivalence of Australian MD regulation to EU regulation.



### Recognition of FDA Authorizations No Reason to Reject Update of MRA

From a legal point of view, there is <u>no reason</u> to assume that the recognition of market authorizations other than the EU conformity marking (such as an FDA approval) for Swiss market access could be a reason for the EU <u>to refuse to update the MRA</u>.

- Objective of the EU-Switzerland MRA: Eliminate trade barriers in medical products sector, aligning with the World Trade Organization (WTO) Technical Barriers to Trade (TBT) Agreement.
- MRA Provisions: No exclusion of third-country market authorization recognition.
- Impact on CE-Certified Products: Unilateral recognition of thirdcountry authorizations does not affect the import of EU CE-certified products into Switzerland
- Marketability in the EU: Products from third countries marketable in Switzerland cannot enter the EU without meeting EU market access requirements.



# **Adjustment to Swiss Regulation No Distortion of Competition**

An adjustment to the Swiss regulation of medical devices, whereby medical devices with a market approval other than the EU conformity marking (such as an FDA authorization) unilaterally recognized for the Swiss market, would <u>not lead to a distortion of competition</u> in the sense of unjustified advantages for Switzerland.

- Currently: Recognition of conformity marks is limited to the relationship EU/Switzerland. Recognition of third country marketing authorizations is not a topic of the EU/Swiss MRA.
- Technical regulations: only to the extent necessary (e.g., ensure health).
- No distortion of competition by market openings.
- In accordance with the intention of the legislator, coordination of several legislations must be possible.



# Compatibility of Recognition with MRA No Reason to Reject the Update

The recognition of conformity assessments or marketing authorizations for medical devices from third countries as a basis for market access for such devices in Switzerland would

- not affect the equivalence of Swiss and EU medical device regulations,
- > not allow the EU to refuse to update the MRA,
- > not lead to a distortion of competition.

In the forthcoming negotiations, it is essential to ensure that both,

- the updating of the MRA with the EU and
- the recognition of FDA-authorized medical devices are clearly and resolutely affirmed.



#### Assessing the Future Revision of Swiss Legislation Overview & Outlook

#### Methodology

- Representative medical devices groups selected
- Identify regulatory differences
- Risk-based assessment of negative differences
- Bridging the gaps

#### **Timeline**

End of 2024: Federal Council decision on key options