

Published Standard – No.1 – Applications (Centralised)

	App Type	No. of Apps	Performance
1	Centralised: New MAs / Extensions	9	100%
2	Centralised – UK as Rapp: Variations / Renewals	7	100%

Published Standard – No.1 – Applications (DCP)

	App Type	No. of Apps	Performance
3	DCP – UK as RMS: New MAs & Variation-Extensions (Phase 1 – Day 70)	16	100%
4	DCP – UK as RMS: New MAs & Variation-Extensions (Phase 1 – Day 120)	15	100%
5	DCP – UK as RMS: New MAs & Variation-Extensions (Phase 2)	21	100%
6	DCP – UK as CMS: New MAs & Variation-Extensions (Phase 1)	35	100%
7	DCP – UK as CMS: New MAs & Variation-Extensions (Phase 2)	55	100%

Published Standard – No.1 – Applications (MRP)

	App Type	No. of Apps	Performance
8	MRP – UK as RMS: New MAs (Phase 1)	12	100%
9	MRP – UK as RMS: New MAs (Phase 2)	11	100%
10	MRP – UK as CMS: New MAs (Phase 2)	15	100%
11	MRP – UK as RMS: Type IA Variations	47	100%
12	MRP – UK as RMS: Type IB & II Variations, and Renewals (Phase 1)	102	100%
13	MRP – UK as CMS: Type IB & II Variations, and Renewals (Phase 1)	188	99.5%

	App Type	No. of Apps	Performance
14	MRP – UK as RMS: Type IB & II Variations, and Renewals (Phase 2)	68	100%
15	MRP – UK as CMS: Type IB & II Variations, and Renewals (Phase 2)	123	99.2%

Published Standard – No. 1 – Applications (National)

	App Type	No of Apps	Performance	Target Days	Average Days
16	New MAs & Variation-Extensions: <i>Initial Assessment</i>	84	100%		
	• 75 Day Clock	15		75	75.0
	• 90 Day Clock	69		90	89.9
17	New MAs & Variation-Extensions <i>Sign-Off</i>	76	100%		
	• 130 Day Clock	17		130	126.6
	• 180 Day Clock	59		180	166.0
18	New Homeopathic	0	-	-	-
19	Type IA Variations	111	100%	30	17.2
20	Type IB / II Variations: <i>Initial Assessment</i>	107	97.2%		
	• Type IB	86		30	23.5
	• Type II	20		60	53.0
	• Renewal	1		60	51.0
21	Type IB / II Variations: <i>Sign-Off</i>	104	100%		
	• Type IB	81		30	8.2
	• Type II	19		60	35.2
	• Renewals	4		60	48.0
22	Admin Variations	37	100%		
	• < 10 Changes	37		30	25.5
	• > 10 Changes	0		60	-
23	ATCs	4	100%		
	• Type A/S	2		30	28.5
	• Type B	1		50	32.0
	• Variations / Renewals	1		30	20.0
24	Batch Release	2360	100%	10	0.7

	App Type	No of Apps	Performance	Target Days	Average Days
25	Specific Batch Control	27	100%		
	• No questions asked	22		10	1.0
	• Questions asked	5		20	12.2
26	AVA*	4	75.0%	45	84.3

Published Standard – No. 1 – Applications (Other)

	App Type	No of Apps	Performance
27	Mock-Ups	438	99.1%
28	Validation	654	100%
29	Issue of authorisation documentation	914	99.7%

Published Standard – No. 2 – Quality of Documentation

	App Type	Total No	Performance
30	Authorisation Documentation	2008	98.6%

Published Standard – No. 3 – Import and Export Certificates

	App Type	No of Apps	Performance	Target Days	Average Days
31	Applications for new products	120	100%	15	3.0
32	All other applications	229	100%		
	• Urgent	5		2	1.0
	• Non-Urgent	224		10	2.0
33	Export	305	100%	10	4.7

Published Standard – No. 4 – Public Assessment Reports

	App Type	No of Apps	Performance	Target Days	Average Days
34	Publish link to SPC, or EMA	166	99.4%	30	2.0
35	Publish PuAR within 120 days	131	100%	120	50.0
36	Update PuAR within 60 days	81	100%	60	14.0

Published Standard – No. 5 – Pharmacovigilance

	Task	No.	Performance
37	Human, Animal & Environmental AERs	4400	99.9%
38	Human, Animal & Environmental AERs – Follow Up	2315	99.9%
39	PSURs	976	99.7%
40	Inspections	10	100%

Published Standard – No. 6 – Inspections

	Task	No.	Performance	Target Days	Average Days
41	GMP Inspections within 3 years of last inspection	28	96.4%	-	-
42	GDP inspections within 5 years of last inspection	27	100%	-	-
43	Send deficiency or post inspections letter	52	98.1%	30	18.0
	• GMP	25			
	• GDP	27			
44	Issue GMP Certificates and final inspection reports	28	100%	90	72.0
45	Send final inspection report to wholesaler site	36	97.2%		
46	Product defect reports	27	100%		
	• High risk <5 days	3			
	• Low risk <10 days	25			

Key:**Dark Green** -**Excellent 100%****Light Green** -**Excellent, but some targets missed****Amber** -**Effective****Red** -**Ineffective**

Additional information about ‘ambers’ and ‘reds’

The VMD continuously monitors all targets and puts in place countermeasures, where possible, to ensure targets are met.

However, sometimes a performance standard may fall into the effective or ineffective category and there are a number of reasons why this may happen, e.g. high volume of applications, staff resource, complexity of applications requiring additional input, etc

*In the case of the AVA application, this one proved to be much more complex than a ‘normal’ application and additional assessment was required. This meant that the application couldn’t be completed in the normal timeframe. Due to the low volume of applications, the overall standard fell into the ineffective category.