Published Standard – No.1 – Applications (Centralised)

	App Type	No. of Apps	Performance
1	Centralised: New MAs / Extensions	13	100%
2	Centralised – UK as Rapp: Variations / Renewals	9	100%

Published Standard – No.1 – Applications (DCP)

	Арр Туре	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)	21	100%
5	DCP – UK as RMS: New MAs & Variation-Extensions (Phase 2)	27	100%
6	DCP – UK as CMS: New MAs & Variation-Extensions (Phase 1)	51	100%
7	DCP – UK as CMS: New MAs & Variation-Extensions (Phase 2)	65	100%

Published Standard – No.1 – Applications (MRP)

	Арр Туре	No. of Apps	Performance
8	MRP – UK as RMS: New MAs (Phase 1)	12	100%
9	MRP – UK as RMS: New MAs (Phase 2)	13	100%
10	MRP – UK as CMS: New MAs (Phase 2)	18	100%
11	MRP – UK as RMS: Type IA Variations	56	100%
12	MRP – UK as RMS: Type IB & II Variations, and Renewals (Phase 1)	124	100%
13	MRP – UK as CMS: Type IB & II Variations, and Renewals (Phase 1)	303	99.7%

	App Type	No. of Apps	Performance
14	MRP – UK as RMS: Type IB & II Variations, and Renewals (Phase 2)	93	100%
15	MRP – UK as CMS: Type IB & II Variations, and Renewals (Phase 2)	185	99.5%

Published Standard – No. 1 – Applications (National)

	Арр Туре	No of Apps	Performance	Target Days	Average Days
16	New MAs & Variation-Extensions: Initial Assessment	86	100%		
	75 Day Clock	12		75	52.5
	90 Day Clock	74		90	89.9
17	New MAs & Variation-Extensions Sign-Off	82	100%		
	130 Day Clock	2		130	121.0
	180 Day Clock	80		180	159.0
18	New Homeopathic	0	-	-	-
19	Type IA Variations	151	100%	30	18.3
20	Type IB / II Variations: Initial Assessment	140	97.9%		
	 Type IB 	105		30	23.8
	Type II	26		60	52.9
	Renewal	6		60	51.0
21	Type IB / II Variations: Sign-Off	125	100%		
	Type IB	96		30	9.5
	Type II	25		60	34.6
	 Renewals 	4		60	48.0
22	Admin Variations	44	100%		
	< 10 Changes	44		30	25.5
	> 10 Changes	0		60	-
23	ATCs	8	100%		
	Type A/S	6		30	29.5
	Type B	1		50	32.0
	 Variations / Renewals 	1		30	20.0
24	Batch Release	3251	100%	10	0.7

	App Type	No of Apps	Performance	Target Days	Average Days
25	Specific Batch ControlNo questions askedQuestions asked	29 24 5	100%	10 20	0.9 12.2
26	AVA*	7	71.4%	45	60.4

Published Standard – No. 1 – Applications (Other)

	App Type	No of Apps	Performance
27	Mock-Ups	573	99.3%
28	Validation	872	99.9%
29	Issue of authorisation documentation	1192	99.7%

Published Standard – No. 2 – Quality of Documentation

Арр	Гуре	Total No Performar		
30 Autho	risation Documentation	2619	98.8%	

Published Standard – No. 3 – Import and Export Certificates

	Арр Туре	No of Apps	Performance	Target Days	Average Days
31	Applications for new products	362	99.7%	15	2.0
32	All other applicationsUrgentNon-Urgent	360 8 352	100%	2 10	1.0 2.0
33	Export	425	100%	10	4.9

Published Standard - No. 4 - Public Assessment Reports

	App Type	No of Apps	Performance	Target Days	Average Days
34	Publish link to SPC, or EMA	192	99.5%	30	2.0
35	Publish PuAR within 120 days	147	100%	120	51.0
36	Update PuAR within 60 days	94	100%	60	13.0

Published Standard - No. 5 - Pharmacovigilance

	Task	No.	Performance
37	Human, Animal & Environmental AERs	7188	99.8%
38	Human, Animal & Environmental AERs – Follow Up	3744	99.9%
39	PSURs	1641	99.8%
40	Inspections	17	100%

Published Standard - No. 6 - Inspections

	Task	No.	Performance	Target Days	Average Days
41	GMP Inspections within 3 years of last inspection**	37	97.3%	-	-
42	GDP inspections within 5 years of last inspection	34	100%	-	-
43	Send deficiency or post	69	98.6%		
	inspections letter • GMP	36		30	17.0
	• GDP	32		30	17.0
44	Issue GMP Certificates and final inspection reports	36	100%	90	55.0
45	Send final inspection report to wholesaler site	46	97.8%	90	55.0
46	Product defect reports • High risk <5 days • Low risk <10 days	38 2 40	100%		

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.