



## Annual Report Summary for RECs in England April 2016 to March 2017

### **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 67 RECs from the five HRA REC Offices operating during the reporting period. Two RECs were closed during the reporting period; London - City Road and Hampstead in April 2016 and North West - Lancaster in January 2017.

A pilot project on the review of applications by the proportionate review service (PRS) was completed during 2016 to test whether it was more acceptable to extend the review timeline from 14 to 21 days to allow RES staff to work with applicants to ensure that the study documentation was clear, accurate and complete, as well as allowing a minimum number of days for members to undertake the ethical review, . As a result, the timeline for PR review was formally extended to 21 days for all UK RECs in December 2016. The data in this report reflects the new timeline of 21 days.

Data on compliance with the KPIs of 40 days for the review of full applications and 28 days for substantial amendments is included in this report. However, as part of the Service Improvement Programme new KPIs are being developed for end to end approval timelines, within which we will continue to monitor REC timelines. Previous stretch targets for the REC timeline are therefore no longer being monitored..

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 &amp; 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>	Ann Tunley
Bristol REC Office	Total 18 RECs <i>6 London</i> <i>4 South West</i> <i>7 South Central</i> <i>1 South East Coast</i>	Mark Ryan-Daly

Head of Research Ethics Service (England) for reporting period Sheila Oliver  
 Director of Operations for reporting period Joan Kirkbride

## 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 but 6 RECs were correctly constituted in terms of the ratio of lay to expert members; this has since been addressed for 2 of these RECs and recruitment of an additional lay member to the remaining 4 RECs is in progress.

Reports show that a total of 172 members resigned, or completed their term of office; this is an increase of 16 in the number of members lost in 2015/16. The number of expert members leaving was 97 compared to 83 in the previous year. Of the expert members leaving, 50 were doctors compared to 28 in the last reporting period. The number of lay members leaving was 75, compared to 73 in the previous year.

During the reporting period 148 new members have been recruited; this is a decrease in recruitment from the last reporting period during which time 163 new members were recruited. Of the new members recruited, 83 are expert members, 32 of these are doctors as compared to 19 in 2015/16, and 65 lay members were recruited.

The total membership at the end of the reporting period was 864 compared to the optimum total membership of 1005 (based on 15 members per REC), giving a shortfall of 141 members; this compares with a shortfall of 85 members in 2015/16.

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 the BMJ, advertising with Royal Colleges, and other local advertising. A project to look at widening the recruitment channels for new members that can be shared across the service has almost been completed and this will be rolled out shortly.

### **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 and Deputy Regional Managers for action through the member management policy.

### **Training**

Attendance at training and recording of self-directed learning is similar to the previous year, with figures showing that 83% of members complied with training requirements compared to 84% in the previous reporting period.

In addition to attendance at face to face courses, attendance at NREAP hosted Chairs meetings is recorded as training, and REC Managers have managed an increased number of local and regional training events to meet the specific needs of members. Additionally further eLearning packages have been developed and rolled out. 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 this 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 continues to compare very favourably 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 exceeding 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 to ensure that a valid ethical opinion can be given .

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 11 to 17 members (including deputies) and the reports show that all but 1 of the RECs were correctly constituted in terms of the ratio of lay to expert members, this is in the process of being addressed. During the reporting period 20 members resigned or completed their term of office, 12 were expert members. 32 new members were recruited, 14 are expert members.

98 scheduled meetings were held, 1 meeting held was not quorate and this was managed in line with standard operating procedures. 6 RECs co-opted members to ensure quoracy. The total number of meetings requiring co-opted members was 15 which was a significant decrease from last year when 30 meetings required co-option.

**Manchester REC Office** - REC membership ranged from 11 to 17 members (including deputies) and the reports show that all but 3 committees were correctly constituted in terms of the ratio of lay to expert members, this has subsequently been addressed for 1 REC and recruitment of an additional lay member to each of 2 other RECs is in progress. During the reporting period 43 members resigned or completed their term of office, 31 were expert members. 33 new members were recruited, 22 are expert members.

154 scheduled meetings were held, 4 meetings were cancelled because of low workload, 1 was cancelled to hold a business meeting and 2 were cancelled due to the closure of a REC. 14 RECs co-opted members to ensure quoracy. The total number of meetings requiring co-opted members was 42, this was a significant decrease on the previous year when 60 meetings required co-opted members.

**Nottingham REC Office** - REC membership ranged from 9 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 been addressed for 1 REC and is in progress for the other. During the reporting period 41 members resigned or completed their term of office, 17 were expert members. 26 new members were recruited, 13 are expert members.

155 scheduled meetings were held and all were quorate. 14 RECs co-opted members to ensure quoracy. The total number of meetings requiring co-opted members was 46, this was a slightly less than the previous year when 48 meetings required co-opted members.

**London REC Office** - REC membership ranged from 12 to 16 members (including deputies) and the reports show that all but 1 REC were correctly constituted in terms of the ratio of lay to expert members; this has subsequently been addressed. During the reporting period, 16 members resigned or completed their term of office, 11 were expert members. 13 new members were recruited, 6 are expert members.

65 scheduled meetings were held, 5 meetings were cancelled due to quoracy issues or low numbers of applications. 2 RECs co-opted members to ensure quoracy. The total number of meetings requiring co-opted members was 3; this is the same number as the previous year.

**Bristol REC Office** - REC membership ranged from 11 to 16 members (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 52 members resigned or completed their term of office, 26 were expert members. 44 new members were recruited, 28 are expert members.

170 meetings were scheduled and 166 were held as planned, 4 meetings were cancelled due to quoracy issues or low numbers of applications. 3 meetings were not quorate and these were managed in line with standard operating procedures. 12 RECs co-opted members to ensure quoracy. The total number of meetings requiring co-opted members was 23; this is a significant decrease on the previous year when 42 meetings required co-opted members.

## **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 applications 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, 8 held 10 meetings, 2 RECs held 9 meetings. In addition to full Committee meetings, the RECs managed from this office held a total of 338 Sub-Committee meetings and 100 Proportionate Review Sub-Committee meetings. Attendance at meetings was very good with 1 REC reporting that all members attended two thirds of meetings, 7 RECs reporting only 1 member not meeting attendance requirements and 2 RECs reporting 2 members not meeting attendance requirements.

**Manchester REC Office** - Of the 16 committees reporting, 10 RECs held 10 or more meetings, 4 RECs held 9 meetings and 1 REC held 5 meetings before its closure. In addition to full Committee meetings, the RECs managed from this office held a total of 421 Sub-Committee meetings and 141 Proportionate Review Sub-Committee meetings. Attendance at meetings was good with 3 RECs reporting that all members attended two thirds of meetings, 8 RECs reporting only 1 or 2 members not meeting attendance requirements, 5 RECs reporting 3 or 4 members not meeting attendance requirements.

**Nottingham REC Office** - Of the 16 committees reporting, 10 RECs held 10 meetings and 5 RECs held 9 meetings. In addition to full Committee meetings, the

RECs managed from this office held a total of 388 Sub-Committee meetings and 171 Proportionate Review Sub-Committee meetings. Attendance at meetings was very good with 3 RECs reporting that all members attended two thirds of meetings, 12 RECs reporting only 1 or 2 members not meeting attendance requirements and 1 REC reporting 3 members not meeting attendance requirements.

**London REC Office** - Of the 7 committees reporting, 3 RECs held 10 meetings, 3 REC held 9 meetings and 1 REC held 8 meetings. In addition to full Committee meetings, the RECs managed from this office held a total of 165 Sub-Committee meetings and 61 Proportionate Review Sub-Committee meetings. Attendance at meetings was very good with 1 REC reporting that all members attended two thirds of meetings and 6 RECs reporting only 1 or 2 members not meeting attendance requirements.

**Bristol REC Office** - Of the 18 committees reporting, 6 RECs held 10 or more meetings, 7 RECs held 9 meetings and 5 RECs held 7 or 8 meetings. In addition to full Committee meetings, the RECs managed from this office held a total of 631 Sub-Committee meetings and 172 Proportionate Review Sub-Committee meetings. Attendance at meetings was very good with 5 RECs reporting that all members attended two thirds of meetings, and 12 RECs reporting only 1 or 2 members not meeting attendance requirements, 1 REC reported 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 and expansion of e-learning modules has facilitated more self-directed learning.

**Jarrow REC Office**- Reports show that 124 members out of a total membership of 142 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, 6 RECs reporting that only 1 or 2 members had not met training requirements, 1 REC reporting that 3 members had not met training requirements and 1 RECs reporting that 7 members had not attended training or completed self-directed learning.

**Manchester REC Office** - Reports showed that 149 members of a total membership of 203 at the end of the reporting period had attended training. 6 out of 16 RECs show excellent compliance with training requirements with either all members, or all but 1 or 2 members attending training, 5 RECs reported 3 or 4 members not meeting training requirements, 2 RECs reports 5 or 6 members not meeting training requirements and 3 RECs reported 7 members had not met training requirements; this is being actively managed.

**Nottingham REC Office** - Reports showed that 159 out of a total membership of 183 at the end of the reporting period had completed some form of training or recorded self-directed learning. 4 RECs reported all members had met training requirements

and 8 RECs reported only 1 to 3 members had not met training requirements, with the other 4 RECs showing a shortfall of 4 or 5 members not complying with training requirements; this is being actively managed.

**London REC Office** - Reports showed that 85 out of a total membership of 97 have attended training or recorded self-directed learning. 3 RECs reported all members had met training requirements and 3 RECs reported only 2 members had not met training requirements, 1 REC reported 6 members not complying with training requirements.

**Bristol REC Office** - Reports showed that 198 out of a total membership of 236 at the end of the reporting period had attended training or had completed self-directed learning. 3 RECs reported all members had attended training or completed self-directed learning and 10 RECs reported only 1 or 2 members had not met training requirements, 4 RECs reported 3 or 4 members not meeting training requirements and 1 REC is showing a shortfall of 10 members not complying with training arrangements; this is being actively managed.

## 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	488	5.73%	16.60%	6.56%	71.72%	0	1

#### Manchester REC Office

No. of RECs	No. of applications	% FOSC	% FOAC	% UFO	% PO	No. POPC	No. SSB
16	751	8.45%	25.25%	4.03%	61.13%	9	2

**Nottingham REC Office**

No. of RECs	No. of applications	% FOSC	% FOAC	% UFO	% PO	No. POPC	No. SSB
16	746	2.01%	8.04%	5.36%	84.32%	2	1

**London REC Office**

No. of RECs	No. of applications	% FOSC	% FOAC	% UFO	% PO	No. POPC	No. SSB
7	287	3.48%	11.15%	5.92%	79.09%	1	1

**Bristol REC Office**

No. of RECs	No. of applications	% FOSC	% FOAC	% UFO	% PO	No. POPC	No. SSB
18	789	5.58%	23.32%	4.69%	64.13%	18	10

**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	238	61.34	15.13	6.72	15.55	1.26

**Manchester REC Office**

No. of RECs	No. of applications	% FOSC	% FOAC	% NO	% PO	% UFO
16	334	32.40	22.52	10.28	34.24	0.56

**Nottingham REC Office**

No. of RECs	No. of applications	% FOSC	% FOAC	% NO	% PO	% UFO
16	483	15.73	15.32	4.35	62.11	2.48

**London REC Office**

No. of RECs	No. of applications	% FOSC	% FOAC	% NO	% PO	% UFO
7	144	22.92	13.89	13.19	49.31	0.69

**Bristol REC Office**

No. of RECs	No. of applications	% FOSC	% FOAC	% NO	% PO	% UFO
18	421	28.75	20.42	9.50	39.43	1.90

**Workload after REC favourable opinion****Key**

NOSA	Notice of Substantial Amendment
MOD	Modified Amendment
INFO	Substantial Amendment received for Information only
PI	Substantial Amendment received for new sites/PIs
NON	Non-substantial Amendment
SR	Safety Report
SAE	Serious Adverse Event
APR	Annual Progress Report
FR	Final Study Report
SSA	Site Specific Assessment for non-NHS sites

**Jarrow REC Office**

NOSA	MOD	INFO	PI	NON	SR	SAE	APR	FR	SSA
1025	15	19	188	1044	208	14	719	767	76

**Manchester REC Office**

NOSA	MOD	INFO	PI	NON	SR	SAE	APR	FR	SSA
1769	53	16	399	1541	479	34	1312	478	175

**Nottingham REC Office**

NOSA	MOD	INFO	PI	NON	SR	SAE	APR	FR	SSA
1820	47	18	349	1697	621	90	1294	285	128

**London REC Office**

NOSA	MOD	INFO	PI	NON	SR	SAE	APR	FR	SSA
615	8	4	106	548	290	13	452	171	49

**Bristol REC Office**

NOSA	MOD	INFO	PI	NON	SR	SAE	APR	FR	SSA
1980	62	32	395	1734	438	57	701	151	159

## Timelines for Research Ethics Committee Decisions

All new applications presented to the committees should be given an opinion within 60 calendar days (with clock stop for any request for correction or clarification) and Substantial Amendments within 35 calendar days. Proportionate Review Applications should be reviewed within 21 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.

During the reporting period the RES was working towards achieving the following KPIs (Key Performance Indicators): 95% of applications to full committee to receive a final decision within 40 calendar days and 95% of amendments to receive a decision within 28 calendar days.

### 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 21 days
99.39	92.01	99.61	95.80	99.55

488 studies were reviewed by full Committee of which 99.39% were given an opinion within the 60 day timeline (92.01% within the 40 day timeline). 220 studies were reviewed by Proportionate Review Sub-Committees of which 99.55% were given an opinion within the 21 day timeline. Of the 1025 Substantial Amendments reviewed, 99.61% were given a final opinion within the 35 day timeline (95.80% 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 21 days
99.46	85.23	98.6	86.01	97.32

751 studies were reviewed by full Committee of which 99.46 % were given an opinion within the 60 day timeline (85.23% within the 40 day timeline). 334 studies were reviewed by Proportionate Review Sub-Committees of which 97.32% were given an opinion within the 21 day timeline. Of the 1769 Substantial Amendments reviewed, 98.6% were given a final opinion within the 35 day timeline (86.01% 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 21 days

99.19	85.50	99.50	94.56	93.70
-------	-------	-------	-------	-------

738 studies were reviewed by full Committee of which 99.19% were given an opinion within the 60 day timeline (85.50% within the 40 day timeline). 460 studies were reviewed by Proportionate Review Sub-Committees of which 93.70% were given an opinion within the 21 day timeline. Of the 1820 Substantial Amendments reviewed, 99.50% were given a final opinion within the 35 day timeline (94.56% 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 21 days
100	86.16	99.02	90.08	93.75

287 studies were reviewed by full Committee of which 100% were given an opinion within the 60 day timeline, (86.16% within the 40 day timeline). 124 studies were reviewed by Proportionate Review Sub-Committees of which 93.75% were given an opinion within the timeline. Of the 615 Substantial Amendments reviewed, 99.02% were given a final opinion within the 35 day timeline (90.08% 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
99.55	85.97	96.41	83.73	90.55

884 studies were reviewed by full Committee of which 99.55% were given an opinion within the 60 day timeline, (85.97% within the 40 day timeline). 381 studies were reviewed by Proportionate Review Sub-Committees of which 90.55% were given an opinion within the 21 day timeline. Of the 1980 Substantial Amendments reviewed, 96.41% were given a final opinion within the 35 day timeline, (83.73% 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	2 for full applications (both allowed, 1 received a further unfavourable opinion and 1 did not proceed but the REC varied its opinion)	1 (partly upheld)

	1 for a substantial amendment (this received a further unfavourable opinion)	
Manchester REC Office	1 for a full application (not progressed, a new application was submitted resulting in a favourable opinion after further information)  4 for substantial amendments (all not progressed, 3 submitted modified amendments and 1 submitted a new application)	0
Nottingham REC Office	2 for full applications (1 was allowed and later withdrawn and a new application was submitted for the other which received a favourable opinion after further information)  1 for a substantial amendment (not progressed, a modified amendment was submitted)	1 (partly upheld)
London REC Office	2 for full applications (1 was allowed and received a favourable opinion after further information and 1 did not proceed)  1 for a substantial amendment (not progressed, a modified amendment was submitted)	1 (upheld)
Bristol REC Office	1 for a full application (did not proceed)  3 for substantial amendments (all not progressed, 3 modified)	1 (partly upheld)

	amendments were submitted)	
--	----------------------------	--

## 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 - Leeds West Yorkshire & the Humber - Sheffield	
Manchester REC Centre	London - Fulham London - Hampstead London - South East North West - Liverpool Central	
Nottingham REC Centre	East Midlands - Nottingham 1 East of England - Cambridge East (after re-audit) London - West London & GTAC	East of England - Cambridge Central
London REC Centre	London - Brent London - London Bridge	London - Dulwich
Bristol REC Centre	London - Camberwell St Giles South Central - Berkshire South Central - Berkshire B South Central - Oxford A South Central - Oxford B	

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 (with clock stop) statutory timeline

	Jarrow	Manchester	Nottingham	London	Bristol
2016/17	99.39%	99.46%	99.19%	100%	99.55%
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 (with clock stop) KPI timeline

	Jarrow	Manchester	Nottingham	London	Bristol
2016/17	92.01%	85.28%	85.50%	86.16%	85.97%
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
2016/17	99.61%	98.6%	99.51%	99.02%	96.41%
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
2016/17	95.80%	86.01%	94.56%	90.08%	83.73%
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 21 day timeline\*

	Jarrow	Manchester	Nottingham	London	Bristol
2016/17	99.55%	97.32%	93.70%	93.75%	90.55%
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%

\* NB the timeline prior to 2016/17 was 14 days