

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	9	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)	21	100%
5	DCP – UK as RMS: New MAs & Variation-Extensions (Phase 2)	24	100%
6	DCP – UK as CMS: New MAs & Variation-Extensions (Phase 1)	39	100%
7	DCP – UK as CMS: New MAs & Variation-Extensions (Phase 2)	59	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)	16	100%
11	MRP – UK as RMS: Type IA Variations	50	100%
12	MRP – UK as RMS: Type IB & II Variations, and Renewals (Phase 1)	118	100%
13	MRP – UK as CMS: Type IB & II Variations, and Renewals (Phase 1)	244	99.6%

	App Type	No. of Apps	Performance
14	MRP – UK as RMS: Type IB & II Variations, and Renewals (Phase 2)	82	100%
15	MRP – UK as CMS: Type IB & II Variations, and Renewals (Phase 2)	140	99.3%

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>	74	100%		
	• 75 Day Clock	5		75	75.0
	• 90 Day Clock	69		90	89.9
17	New MAs & Variation-Extensions <i>Sign-Off</i>	76	100%		
	• 130 Day Clock	7		130	125.3
	• 180 Day Clock	69		180	161.0
18	New Homeopathic	0	-	-	-
19	Type IA Variations	121	100%	30	17.2
20	Type IB / II Variations: <i>Initial Assessment</i>	124	97.6%		
	• Type IB	96		30	23.5
	• Type II	27		60	53.5
	• Renewal	1		60	51.0
21	Type IB / II Variations: <i>Sign-Off</i>	115	100%		
	• Type IB	89		30	8.4
	• Type II	22		60	33.8
	• 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	2615	100%	10	0.7

	App Type	No of Apps	Performance	Target Days	Average Days
25	Specific Batch Control	28	100%		
	• No questions asked	23		10	1.0
	• Questions asked	5		20	12.2
26	AVA*	5	60.0%	45	69.8

Published Standard – No. 1 – Applications (Other)

	App Type	No of Apps	Performance
27	Mock-Ups	472	99.2%
28	Validation	724	100%
29	Issue of authorisation documentation	1003	99.7%

Published Standard – No. 2 – Quality of Documentation

	App Type	Total No	Performance
30	Authorisation Documentation	2150	98.7%

Published Standard – No. 3 – Import and Export Certificates

	App Type	No of Apps	Performance	Target Days	Average Days
31	Applications for new products	244	100%	15	2.0
32	All other applications	276	100%		
	• Urgent	5		2	1.0
	• Non-Urgent	271		10	2.0
33	Export	336	100%	10	5.3

Published Standard – No. 4 – Public Assessment Reports

	App Type	No of Apps	Performance	Target Days	Average Days
34	Publish link to SPC, or EMA	182	99.5%	30	2.0
35	Publish PuAR within 120 days	137	100%	120	50.0
36	Update PuAR within 60 days	86	100%	60	13.0

Published Standard – No. 5 – Pharmacovigilance

	Task	No.	Performance
37	Human, Animal & Environmental AERs	5939	99.9%
38	Human, Animal & Environmental AERs – Follow Up	3147	99.9%
39	PSURs	1300	99.8%
40	Inspections	14	100%

Published Standard – No. 6 – Inspections

	Task	No.	Performance	Target Days	Average Days
41	GMP Inspections within 3 years of last inspection	30	96.7%	-	-
42	GDP inspections within 5 years of last inspection	29	100%	-	-
43	Send deficiency or post inspections letter	59	98.3%		
	• GMP	29		30	20.0
	• GDP	30			
44	Issue GMP Certificates and final inspection reports	31	100%		
				90	55.0
45	Send final inspection report to wholesaler site	39	97.4%		
46	Product defect reports	29	100%		
	• High risk <5 days	2			
	• Low risk <10 days	27			

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.