

[REDACTED]
Homoeopathic Team-PLAT 5
MHRA
151 Buckingham Palace Road
London SW1W 9SZ

13th September 2011

[REDACTED]
Thank you for your letter regarding our kits and, may I assure you, that it is our intention to do everything possible to comply with current legislation.

I confirm that our understanding has been that the kits sold in this country were supplied under our Specials License rather than our principle MIA. The name Number One kit, which we licensed originally, proved to be unsalable and was discontinued prior to the new kits being supplied on practitioner request. I understand now we erred in this assumption and are keen to redress the situation as soon as possible.

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED] We have been supplying these kits for over ten years and rely on them as a substantial part of our business. In addition the reputation of these kits has spread globally and a number of them are sold outside of the EU. Therefore, we are keen to proceed with licensing those elements of the kits, which are currently unlicensed.

Homoeopathy, as you will no doubt be aware, has been suffering considerable attacks in the media and the whole industry is suffering a downturn as a result. McCarthy-style reporting, encouraged by the self-appointed detractors of homoeopathy, together with intransigence towards advertising of homoeopathy by the ASA, has protracted this decline, without serving public purpose, to an industry that has served many.

We appreciate the MHRA has done its best to introduce a level playing field into the homoeopathic marketplace where there are five main players, with three having the substantial advantage of PLRs over the other two. This advantage is two-fold – firstly, in the cost of licensing and, secondly, in their dominion over a well established market.

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

Our aim is to arrive at a fair and rational formula, that is acceptable to all, for moving from our present situation to full compliance and seek your assistance in this matter with both the costs and the timeframe. To this end, I would be grateful if you could supply us with:

- An exact timeframe for the processing of all the applications requiring submission.
- An opportunity to discuss the cost of bulk applications.
- An opportunity to discuss a possible transition between the current kits and the newly licensed kits.
- Proposals for flexibility of dual formulations in our applications with cost factors.

Although our intention, is finding the most economical means of licensing and applying for HRs, we would like to say that, should it be possible to reach an agreement over bulk fees that allows us such an option, we would be keen to apply for NRs.

Finally, in your letter you requested a confirmation of my understanding of the issue and a timeframe for removal of the present kits from the market. I confirm my understanding of the situation [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] May I perhaps ask instead, if it is at all possible for a timeframe of one year in which to change to fully licensed kits. Maybe in your consideration of this request, you could bear in mind that the PLRs have been and still remain on the market since 1971.

With thanks for your kind consideration and I look forward to your early reply.

Warm regards

[REDACTED]