



Health Research Authority

Annual Report Summary for RECs in England April 2015 to March 2016

Purpose

To provide a management summary for the Health Research Authority (HRA) of the annual reports in respect of the Research Ethics Committees (RECs) in England. This summary will enable the Board to discharge its function to monitor the performance of the RECs against the requirements of the Department of Health Governance Arrangements for Research Ethics Committees (GAfREC - September 2011)

Background

GAfREC requires that the Health Research Authority as the Appointing Authority for RECs in England receive and adopt the Annual Reports for the Research Ethics Committees (RECs). The Annual Report Summaries and this report have been structured geographically by HRA REC Office.

Copies of the HRA REC Office summary reports and the individual REC annual reports are available to the Board and will be published on the HRA website.

Introduction

Reports have been submitted for 68 RECs from the five HRA REC Offices operating during the reporting period. This has been a period of relative stability for the committees with no REC closures. (One REC was closed in April 2016 outside the reporting period). As a result of a geographical reconfiguration of RECs across the five offices, administrative support for the London – South East and Westminster RECs transferred from the Bristol office to the Manchester office, the Yorkshire and Humber – Sheffield REC transferred from Manchester to the Jarrow office and the West Midlands – South Birmingham and The Black Country RECs transferred from Manchester to the Nottingham office. The East of England – Cambridgeshire and Hertfordshire REC transferred from the Jarrow to the Nottingham office. The Committees continued to meet in the same locations and the transfers were achieved with minimal disruption. As a result of these movements the workload to staff ration of each office is much more consistent with the exception of the London office.

The HRA took responsibility for the Social Care REC in January 2015 and is included in this report for the first time.

REC Centre	No. of RECs reporting	RES Manager for the reporting period
Jarrow REC Office	Total 10 RECs <i>1 London</i> <i>4 North East</i> <i>5 Yorkshire & the Humber</i>	Mark Ryan-Daly
Manchester REC Office	Total 16 RECs <i>7 London</i> <i>9 North West</i>	Ann Tunley
Nottingham REC Office	Total 16 RECs <i>5 East of England</i> <i>5 East Midlands</i> <i>1 London</i> <i>5 West Midlands</i>	Ann Tunley
London REC Office	Total 7 <i>5 London</i> <i>1 South East Coast</i> <i>1 Social Care REC</i>	Mark Ryan-Daly
Bristol REC Office	Total 19 RECs <i>7 London</i> <i>4 South West</i> <i>7 South Central</i> <i>1 South East Coast</i>	Mark Ryan-Daly

Summary Conclusions and Actions

General

Where issues were noted during the review of the annual reports and the production of summary reports they were brought to the attention of the RES and Regional Managers for action.

To supplement the Accreditation Audits, Regional and Deputy Regional Managers undertake Quality Control checks on a proportionate basis but at least yearly for each REC, and a monitoring visit at each REC meeting once each year, or more often if required. Identified issues are subject to action plans.

Membership

All RECs were correctly constituted in terms of the ratio of lay to expert members.

Reports show that a total of 156 members resigned, or completed their term of office; this is a decrease in 3 in the loss of members from the previous year. The number of expert members leaving was 83, compared to 97 in the previous year. Of the expert members leaving, 28 were doctors compared to 55 other registered health care professionals. The number of lay members leaving was 73, compared to 62 in the previous year.

During the reporting period 163 new members have been recruited, this is an increase in recruitment from the 2014/15 reporting period during which time 149 new members were recruited. Of the new members recruited 81 are expert members, but only 19 are doctors, 82 lay members were recruited.

The total membership at the end of the reporting period was 935 with an optimum total membership of 1020 (based on 15 members per REC).

Measures have and are being taken to improve this shortfall and to increase the number of expert members, particularly clinicians, including the placing of local advertisements, advertising in BMJ, advertising with Royal Colleges, and other local advertising. A project is being undertaken to look at widening the recruitment channels for new members which can be shared across the service.

Attendance

Member attendance at meetings is generally good with the majority of members meeting the two thirds attendance requirement; where there were individual shortfalls these are picked up through quality control checks by Regional Managers & Deputy Regional Managers for action through the member management policy.

Training

Attendance at training and recording of self-directed learning has reduced slightly since the previous year, with figures showing that 84% of members complied with training requirements compared to 85% in the previous reporting period. To assist members in meeting training requirements attendance at NREAP hosted Chairs meetings is recorded as training, and REC Managers have managed an increased number of local training events to meet the specific needs of members. Additionally eLearning packages have been developed. RES and Regional Managers have been asked to ensure that shortfalls in training and recording of that training are addressed where necessary, and also that care is taken to ensure that members full training requirements are met.

REC activity

Opinion rates differ significantly across RECs. Comparison figures are presented and discussed at NREAP hosted Chairs meetings. Additionally, where there are significant outliers, Regional Managers are asked to discuss with the RECs concerned.

Timelines for Research Ethics Committee Decisions (see appendix A)

Meeting statutory timelines for the review of new applications and substantial amendments is excellent across the service and London is now in line with other offices. A significant number of RECs are meeting 100% of all statutory timelines. Compliance with KPIs is good across the service with a number of RECs meeting 100% of these tough stretched targets.

Chairs overview

Many Chairs acknowledged the considerable commitment of members and thanked REC staff and managers.

REC Membership, recruitment and quoracy

Each Research Ethics Committee may have up to 18 members, however the HRA optimum is 15. As a minimum, one third of members should be Lay members. Deputies may also be appointed. Arrangements may be made to co-opt members from other committees, where a meeting would otherwise be inquorate.

The recruitment of new members is by an open process and the constitution of the committee is set by GAFREC.

Jarrow REC Office - REC membership ranged from 15 to 17 (including deputies) members and the reports show that all RECs were correctly constituted in terms of the ratio of lay to expert members. During the reporting period 30 members resigned or completed their term of office, 14 were expert members. 17 new members were recruited, 8 are expert members. 101 scheduled meetings were held, 1 meeting held was not quorate and this was managed in line with standard operating procedures. All RECs co-opted members to ensure quoracy. The total number of meetings requiring co-opted members was 30 compared to 19, an increase from the previous year.

Manchester REC Office - REC membership ranged from 10 to 16 members (including deputies) and the reports show that all but 2 committees were correctly constituted in terms of the ratio of lay to expert members, this has subsequently been addressed. During the reporting period 24 members resigned or completed their term of office, 16 were expert members. 35 new members were recruited, 18 are expert members. 161 scheduled meetings were held, 1 meeting was cancelled because of low workload and 1 meeting was cancelled due to being inquorate. 15 RECs co-opted members to ensure quoracy. The total number of meetings requiring co-opted members was 60, compared to 34 in the previous year this was a significant increase.

Nottingham REC Office - REC membership ranged from 9 to 16 members (including deputies) and the reports show that all committees were correctly constituted in terms of the ratio of lay to expert members. During the reporting period 38 members resigned or completed their term of office, 20 were expert members. 46 new members were recruited, 24 are expert members. 160 scheduled meetings were held and all were quorate. 15 RECs co-opted members to ensure quoracy. The total number of meetings requiring co-opted members was 48, compared to 22 in the previous year this was a significant increase.

London REC Office - REC membership ranged from 13 to 18 members (including deputies) and the reports show that all RECs were correctly constituted in terms of the ratio of lay to expert members. During the reporting period, 13 members resigned or completed their term of office, 7 were expert members. 12 new members were recruited, 7 are expert members. 70 scheduled meetings were held, 1 meeting was not quorate and this was managed in line with standard operating procedures. 2 RECs co-opted members to ensure quoracy. The total number of meetings requiring co-opted members was 3 compared to 7, a reduction from the previous year.

Bristol REC Office - REC membership ranged from 11 to 18 (including deputies) and the reports show that all RECs were correctly constituted in terms of the ratio of lay to expert members at the end of the reporting period. During the reporting period 51 members resigned or completed their term of office, 26 were expert members. 53 new members were recruited, 24 are expert members. 190 meetings were scheduled and 176 were held as planned, 14 meetings were cancelled due to quoracy issues or low numbers of applications. 16 RECs co-opted members to ensure quoracy. The total number of meetings requiring co-opted members was 42 compared to 33, an increase from the previous year.

Research Ethics Committees' meetings and member attendance

To maintain competency Research Ethics Committees should meet at least ten times per year and should aim to review between four and six studies at main meetings, one meeting may be used as a training meeting. To meet terms and conditions of appointment members are required to attend two thirds of main REC meetings or take part in Proportionate Review Sub-Committees. The member management policy details the procedure for members not meeting these requirements.

Jarrow REC Office - Of the 10 committees reporting, 9 held 10 meetings, 1 REC held 9 meetings. In addition to full Committee meetings, the RECs managed from this office held a total of 322 Sub-Committee meetings and 111 Proportionate Review Sub-Committee meetings. Attendance at meetings was very good with 5 RECs reporting that all members attended two thirds of meetings, 3 RECs reporting only 1 member not meeting attendance requirements and 2 RECs reporting 2 and 3 members not meeting attendance requirements.

Manchester REC Office - Of the 16 committees reporting, 14 RECs held 10 meetings, 1 RECs held 11 meetings and 2 RECs held 9 meetings. In addition to full Committee meetings, the RECs managed from this office held a total of 471 Sub-Committee meetings and 139 Proportionate Review Sub-Committee meetings. Attendance at meetings was excellent with 9 RECs reporting that all members attended two thirds of meetings, 5 RECs reporting only 1 member not meeting attendance requirements and 2 RECs reporting 2 or 3 members not meeting attendance requirements.

Nottingham REC Office - Of the 16 committees reporting, 14 RECs held 10 meetings, 2 RECs held 9 meetings. In addition to full Committee meetings, the RECs managed from this office held a total of 419 Sub-Committee meetings and 154 Proportionate Review Sub-Committee meetings. Attendance at meetings was generally good with 6 RECs reporting that all members attended two thirds of meetings, 8 RECs reporting only 1 or 2 members not meeting attendance requirements and 2 RECs reporting 3 and 5 members not meeting attendance requirements.

London REC Office - Of the 7 committees reporting, all RECs met the requirements in terms of meetings held. Attendance at meetings was very good with 3 RECs reporting that all members attended two thirds of meetings, 3 RECs reporting only 1 or 2 members not meeting attendance requirements, and 1 REC reporting 5 members not meeting attendance requirements.

Bristol REC Office - Of the 19 committees reporting, 7 RECs held 10 or more meetings, 10 RECs held 9 meetings and 2 RECs held 8 and 7 meetings because of low workload or potential quoracy issues. Attendance at meetings was very good with 9 RECs reporting that all members attended two thirds of meetings, and 5 RECs reporting only 1 or 2 members not meeting attendance requirements, 5 RECs reported 3 to 5 members not meeting attendance requirements.

Training

Terms and conditions of membership require that members attend initial induction training within six months of appointment and the equivalent of one day training annually; this may be by attending training courses provided by the HRA, completing eLearning modules, other suitable training or self-directed learning. Shortfalls are

monitored through quality control and procedures detailed in the member management policy. Members report difficulty in obtaining time off work to attend training sessions. The provision of e-learning modules has facilitated more self-directed learning.

Jarrow REC Office- Reports show that 131 members out of a total membership of 155 at the end of the reporting period had attended training or recorded self-directed learning. RECs show good compliance with training requirements, with 2 RECs reporting that all members had attended training, 4 RECs reporting that only 1 or 2 members had not met training requirements and 4 RECs reporting that 4, 5 and 6 members had not attended training or completed self-directed learning.

Manchester REC Office - Reports show that 156 members of a total membership of 211 at the end of the reporting period had attended training. 10 out of 16 RECs show excellent compliance with training requirements with either all members, or all but 1 or 2 members attending training, 4 RECs reported 3 or 4 members not meeting training requirements and 2 RECs reported 8 and 11 members had not met training requirements, this is being actively managed.

Nottingham REC Office - Reports showed that 154 out of a total membership of 198 at the end of the reporting period had completed some form of training or recorded self-directed learning. 1 REC reported 100% of members met training requirements and 11 RECs reported only 1 to 3 members had not met training requirements, with other RECs showing a shortfall of between 4 and 8 members not complying with training requirements, this is being actively managed.

London REC Office - Reports showed that 104 out of a membership of 111 have attended training or recorded self-directed learning. 3 RECs reported 100% of members met training requirements and 3 RECs reported only 1 member had not met training requirements, 1 REC reported 4 members not complying with training requirements.

Bristol REC Office - Reports show that 236 out of a total membership of 260 at the end of the reporting period had attended training or had completed self-directed learning. Seven RECs reported 100% of members attended training or completed self-directed learning and 8 RECs reported only 1 or 2 members had not met training requirements. 4 RECs reported 3 or 4 members not meeting training requirements.

Summary of REC activity

Numerical Information for REC workload and outcomes contained in the individual reports is summarised below.

The opinion rates reflect an average for each REC Centre. There is variation in opinion rates between RECs. The annual report summaries showing opinion rates for each individual REC are discussed at National Research Ethics Advisor (NREAP) hosted Chairs' meetings. Additionally, where there are significant outliers, discussions with individual RECs are undertaken.

Applications reviewed at full committee meetings

Key

FOSC	Favourable opinion with standard conditions
FOAC	Favourable opinion with additional conditions
UFO	Unfavourable opinion
PO	Provisional opinion
POPC	Provisional opinion pending consultation with referee
SSB	Number of studies sent back to full committee for final opinion

Jarrow REC Office

No. of RECs	No. of applications	% FOSC	% FOAC	% UFO	% PO	No. POPC	No. SSB
10	513	4.49%	11.47%	6.85%	76.97%	1	1

Manchester REC Office

No. of RECs	No. of applications	% FOSC	% FOAC	% UFO	% PO	No. POPC	No. SSB
16	830	6.02%	21.69%	2.77%	69.04%	4	1

Nottingham REC Office

No. of RECs	No. of applications	% FOSC	% FOAC	% UFO	% PO	No. POPC	No. SSB
16	806	3.60%	9.55%	5.83%	81.02%	0	0

London REC Office

No. of RECs	No. of applications	% FOSC	% FOAC	% UFO	% PO	No. POPC	No. SSB
7	340	2.02%	20.06%	9.17%	68.21%	2	6

Bristol REC Office

No. of RECs	No. of applications	% FOSC	% FOAC	% UFO	% PO	No. POPC	No. SSB
19	850	4.14%	19.08%	3.59%	72.50%	6	5

Applications reviewed at Proportionate Review Sub-Committee meetings

Key

NO - No opinion - unsuitable for PR referred to a full committee

UFO - Unfavourable opinion - Application of poor quality requires resubmission

Jarrow REC Office

No. of RECs	No. of applications	% FOSC	% FOAC	% NO	% PO	% UFO
10	292	61.23	10.46	9.22	17.41	1.68

Manchester REC Office

No. of RECs	No. of applications	% FOSC	% FOAC	% NO	% PO	% UFO
16*	361	40.44	23.82	8.86	26.05	0.83

*N.B. 1 REC did not participate in Proportionate Review during the reporting period

Nottingham REC Office

No. of RECs	No. of applications	% FOSC	% FOAC	% NO	% PO	% UFO
16	443	19.64	16.03	6.77	53.50	4.06

London REC Office

No. of RECs	No. of applications	% FOSC	% FOAC	% NO	% PO	% UFO
5*	84	19.72	37.81	7.81	33.87	0.80

*N.B. 2 RECs did not participate in Proportionate Review during the reporting period

Bristol REC Office

No. of RECs	No. of applications	% FOSC	% FOAC	% NO	% PO	% UFO
19	406	28.94	19.57	5.27	45.17	1.05

Workload after REC favourable opinion for all ongoing studies**Key**

NOSA	Notice of Substantial Amendment
MOD	Modified Amendment
INFO	Substantial Amendment received for Information only
PI	Substantial Amendment received for new sites/Pis
Min	Minor Amendment
SR	Safety Report
SAE	Serious Adverse Event
APR	Annual Progress Report

Jarrow REC Office

NOSA	MOD	INFO	PI	MIN	SR	SAE	APR	FR	SSA
981	9	7	198	779	255	59	715	314	95

Manchester REC Office

NOSA	MOD	INFO	PI	MIN	SR	SAE	APR	FR	SSA
1823	58	5	513	1095	451	52	1434	432	143

Nottingham REC Office

NOSA	MOD	INFO	PI	MIN	SR	SAE	APR	FR	SSA
1839	72	4	322	1555	586	97	1702	398	90

London REC Office

NOSA	MOD	INFO	PI	MIN	SR	SAE	APR	FR	SSA
586	22	3	118	413	191	31	368	195	46

Bristol REC Office

NOSA	MOD	INFO	PI	MIN	SR	SAE	APR	FR	SSA
2086	73	19	428	1100	742	51	1199	266	182

(N.B. SAE is an untoward occurrence that: (a) results in death (b) is life-threatening (c) requires hospitalisation or prolongation of existing hospitalisation (d) results in persistent or significant disability or incapacity (e) consists of a congenital anomaly or birth defect. Figures show reporting of SAEs from all ongoing studies not just those approved in the reporting year: SR For each IMP being tested in the trial, the sponsor submits an annual report on the safety of subjects, in all clinical trials of the product for which the sponsor is responsible, whether in the UK or elsewhere. Where a trial has closed in the UK but is continuing in other countries, ASRs continue to be submitted for the duration of the trial.

Timelines for Research Ethics Committee Decisions

All new studies presented to the committees should be given an opinion within 60 calendar days and Substantial Amendments within 35 calendar days. Proportionate Review Applications should be reviewed within 14 calendar days. Site Specific Assessments (SSAs) are now usually carried out by the main REC as part of the review of the main application. Where SSAs are submitted separately, the timeline is 14 days for a Phase 1 application and 25 days for other applications.

The RES is working towards achieving the following KPIs (Key Performance Indicators), 95% of applications to full committee to receive a final decision within 40 calendar days, 95% of amendments to receive a decision within 28 calendar days.

**Please note that some applications were reviewed by these RECs as part of the Proportionate Review Pilot which has been set up to test whether allowing REC staff increased time to work with applicants to ensure that the study documentation is clear, accurate and complete, as well as allowing a minimum number of days for REC members to undertake the ethical review is preferable against set evaluation criteria. One of the objectives of the pilot is to assess the impact of extending the length of review to 21 calendar days rather than 14 calendar days. These figures exclude any applications which were part of the Proportionate Review pilot.*

Performance

Jarrow REC Office

% of full applications reviewed within 60 days	% reviewed meeting the 40 day KPI	% of NOSAs reviewed within 35 days	% reviewed meeting the 28 day KPI	% of PR applications reviewed within 14 days
100	96	100	97	98

513 studies were reviewed by full Committee of which 100% were given an opinion within the 60 day timeline (96% within the 40 day timeline). 292 studies were reviewed by Proportionate Review Sub-Committees of which 98% were given an opinion within the 14 day timeline. Of the 981 Substantial Amendments reviewed, 100% were given a final opinion within the 35 day timeline (97% within the 28 day timeline).

Manchester REC Office

% of full applications reviewed within 60 days	% reviewed meeting the 40 day KPI	% of NOSAs reviewed within 35 days	% reviewed meeting the 28 day KPI	% of PR applications reviewed within 14 days
99.39	92.20	98.57	91.62	93.92*

830 studies were reviewed by full Committee of which 99.39 % were given an opinion within the 60 day timeline (92.20% within the 40 day timeline). 329 studies were reviewed by Proportionate Review Sub-Committees of which 93.92% were given an opinion within the 14 day timeline. Of the 1823 Substantial Amendments reviewed, 98.57% were given a final opinion within the 35 day timeline (91.62% within the 28 day timeline).

Nottingham REC Office

% of full applications reviewed within 60 days	% reviewed meeting the 40 day KPI	% of NOSAs reviewed within 35 days	% reviewed meeting the 28 day KPI	% of PR applications reviewed within 14 days
99.75	91.71	99.89	96.63	97.57*

806 studies were reviewed by full Committee of which 99.75% were given an opinion within the 60 day timeline (91.71% within the 40 day timeline). 433 studies were

reviewed by Proportionate Review Sub-Committees of which 97.57%* were given an opinion within the 14 day timeline. Of the 1839 Substantial Amendments reviewed, 99.89% were given a final opinion within the 35 day timeline (96.63% within the 28 day timeline).

London REC Office

% of full applications reviewed within 60 days	% reviewed meeting the 40 day KPI	% of NOSAs reviewed within 35 days	% reviewed meeting the 28 day KPI	% of PR applications reviewed within 14 days
100	81.5	98	90	85

340 studies were reviewed by full Committee of which 100% were given an opinion within the 60 day timeline, and 81.5% within the 40 day timeline. 84 studies were reviewed by Proportionate Review Sub-Committees of which 85% were given an opinion within the timeline. Of the 586 Substantial Amendments reviewed, 98% were given a final opinion within the 35 day timeline and 90% within the 28 day timeline.

Bristol REC Office

% of full applications reviewed within 60 days	% reviewed meeting the 40 day KPI	% of NOSAs reviewed within 35 days	% reviewed meeting the 28 day KPI	% of PR applications reviewed within 14 days
99.52	87	99	93	93

980 studies were reviewed by full Committee of which 99.67% were given an opinion within the 60 day timeline, and 84.58% within the 40 day timeline. 476 studies were reviewed by Proportionate Review Sub-Committees of which 90% were given an opinion within the 14 day timeline. Of the 2216 Substantial Amendments reviewed, 98.76% were given a final opinion within the 35 day timeline, and 92.68% within the 28 day timeline.

Appeals and Complaints

The Board receives separately an annual report of appeals and complaints.

Office	Appeals	Complaints
Jarrow REC Office	0	0
Manchester REC Office	3 for full applications (all allowed, 2 received a further unfavourable opinion, 1 received a favourable opinion after request for further information)	0
Nottingham REC Office	1 for full applications (not progressed a	1(upheld)

	<p>revised application was submitted to another REC and a favourable opinion given)</p> <p>3 for substantial amendments, not progressed (modified amendments were submitted to the RECs)</p>	
London REC Office	1 for full application (not progressed, revised application resubmitted to the same REC, favourable opinion given). 1 for substantial amendment (modified amendment submitted to the REC).	None
Bristol REC Office	<p>2 for full applications (revised applications resubmitted to the RECs and favourable opinions given).</p> <p>3 for substantial amendments (1 did not proceed and 2 resubmitted as modified amendments)</p>	1 (upheld)

Accreditation of Research Ethics Committees

The HRA Quality Assurance Department audits RECs on a three year rolling programme.

Information related to the Accreditation status of RECs is included in Annual Report Summaries. Reports show the number of RECs audited during the reporting period, together with accreditation status.

REC Centre	RECs achieving accreditation at first review	Number of RECs achieving accreditation having completed an action plan
Jarrow REC Centre	Yorkshire & the Humber - Bradford Leeds	N/A
Manchester REC Centre	North West- Greater Manchester East North West - Preston	London- Queen Square North West - Greater Manchester South
Nottingham REC Centre	West Midlands - Edgbaston West Midlands- Solihull East of England - Essex	West Midlands - South Birmingham West Midlands - Coventry and Warwick

	East of England - Cambridge South	
London REC Centre	National Social Care	South East Coast - Brighton & Sussex
Bristol REC Centre	South Central - Hampshire B South West - Frenchay	South West - Cornwall and Plymouth

All other RECs hold accredited status and will be re-audited as scheduled.

Recommendation

In accordance with GAfREC the Board of the Health Research Authority is required to receive and adopt the Annual Reports for the RECs in England and to publish them on its website.

Acknowledgements

The Health Research Authority acknowledges the contribution made by its volunteer members, staff and managers in providing an effective and robust ethical review service and expresses its appreciation for their commitment to providing high quality ethical review.

Appendix A – Trend Data

Applications reviewed within 60 day statutory timeline

	Jarrow	Manchester	Nottingham	London	Bristol
2015/16	100%	99.39%	99.75%	100%	99.52
2014/15	99.83%	99.7%	99.8%	97.22%	99.67%
2013/14	100%	99.7%	99.7%	94.6%	98.9%
2012/13	99.7%	99.7%	96.5%	82.3%	93.7%
2011/12	100%	100%	99.4%	89.1%	96.5%
2010/11	99.3%	100%	98.6%	90%	93.5%

Applications reviewed within 40 day KPI timeline

	Jarrow	Manchester	Nottingham	London	Bristol
2015/16	96%	92.20%	91.71%	81.5%	87%
2014/15	91.20%	88.8%	93.28%	63.89%	84.58%
2013/14	81.2%	85.8%	75.3%	61.3%	74.0%

Substantial amendments reviewed within 35 day statutory timeline

	Jarrow	Manchester	Nottingham	London	Bristol
2015/16	100%	98.57%	99.89%	98%	99%
2014/15	99.31%	98.6%	99.8%	97.77%	98.76%
2013/14	99.5%	98.5%	99.8%	95.9%	97.6%
2012/13	99%	97.6%	96.3%	73.8%	93.5%
2011/12	97.5%	99.7%	99.3%	82.6%	92.7%
2010/11	99.5%	98.9%	98.5%	85%	88%

Substantial amendments reviewed within 28 day KPI timeline

	Jarrow	Manchester	Nottingham	London	Bristol
2015/16	97%	91.62%	96.63%	90%	93%
2014/15	97.12%	91.7%	97.7%	87.43%	92.68%
2013/14	91.9%	91.0%	96.1%	80.4%	86.0%

Proportionate review applications reviewed within 14 day timeline

	Jarrow	Manchester	Nottingham	London	Bristol
2015/16	98%	93.92	97.57%	85%	93%
2014/15	98.04%	97.3%	97.5%	79.25%	90%
2013/14	97.6%	95.2%	97.4%	75.0%	88.7%
2012/13	94.7%	97.9%	95.9%	47.7%	86.3%