**Question for written answer E-015428/2015**
**to the Commission**
Rule 130
**Francesc Gambús (PPE)**

Subject: EU vs US approach to generic veterinary medicines detrimental to the EU industry

A report on competition in the pet medications industry, published in May 2015 by the US Federal Trade Commission, analyses the negative consequences of the absence of generic competition. According to the report 'the absence of generic competition allows pioneer companies to continue to raise prices on and market drugs whose patents have expired, decreasing their incentive to innovate'.

Against this background, direct grants are offered in the US to innovators when a specific problem has been identified. Public-private partnerships seem to be another alternative to long exclusivity periods.

1. Why did the Commission opt for a cumulative exclusivity period in its proposal on veterinary medicinal products, knowing that other solutions exist, such as the grants proposed by the US?

2. Will it apply this approach to other sectors or does it consider that this type of logic is only appropriate for the veterinary medicines sector?