### The Client & Their Challenge

Allergy Therapeutics (AT) develops, makes and sells pharmaceutical products to cure allergies. These are prescribed only by medical practitioners and are administered either by injection or dissolution under the tongue. As well as branded products, ‘specifics’ are developed to address rare or unique combinations of allergies, in some cases, for a single patient. AT is a £45m business, headquartered in the UK, but with extensive sales and marketing operations in several European countries.

Incidents of non-conformance were too high and taking too long to resolve. The financial implications of this waste and the unpredictability of supply was threatened the company’s ability to meet the requirements of new markets. It was also having a detrimental impact on morale.

### Benefits Delivered

- Wasted product reduced by a third in the first 12 months of the programme
- Customer satisfaction improved by a third
- Financial savings realised 33% above target

### Highlights of the Intervention

- A three year improvement programme called Odyssey was launched with a governance and project management structure.
- Potential risks facing the business were identified and analysed to enable them to be proactively managed.
- Greater collaboration with suppliers to solve problems.
- A number of mechanisms were introduced to ensure that improvements were monitored and tracked.

---

"The S A Partners approach focused on skills transfer so that we would be able to continue the improvement ourselves. Key to our success was integrating the problem solving work with our compliance system, and S A Partners were instrumental in helping us to that."

Ray Keeling, Head of Supply Operations

---

### Ways of Working

- Weekly PDCA meetings held to monitor progress of small projects
- All staff are involved at all levels and teams have been built working across functional boundaries
What we did and found?

- A three year improvement programme called Odyssey was launched with a governance and project management structure. We held a communications event one year into the intervention to raise awareness of what had been done and achieved so far.

- The potential risks facing the business were identified and analysed to enable them to be proactively managed. A series of process failure mode and effect analysis (PFMEA) workshops. We analysed the potential risks facing the business. We surfaced risks to begin the process of proactively managing those risks. We carried out a series of process failure mode and effect analysis (PFMEA) workshops. Teams of people attended more than 40 PFMEA workshops in which we examined the potential risks in producing core products.

- Greater collaboration with suppliers to solve problems. We worked with suppliers to eradicate the variability that may be caused by raw materials.

- A number of mechanisms were introduced to ensure that improvements were monitored and tracked. We appointed a full-time manager to the improvement project and gave sponsorship roles to senior managers to reinforce the impact of the project in supporting the company’s overall strategy.

Summary & next steps

- AT initially conceived of a three year improvement programme. They assumed that they would need to make an investment in skills development and diagnostic work and probably wouldn’t see tangible results in the first six months. However the first year’s results exceeded their expectations.

- AT are now fully self sufficient and capable of developing their own organisation. They are no longer dependent on external consultants.