Review of arrangements for scheduling substances under *Part 6-3 of the Therapeutic Goods Act 1989* - summary of responses to the panels survey of state and territory members

Review of arrangements for scheduling substances under Part 6-3 of the *Therapeutic Goods Act 1989*

As part of its consultation strategy the review panel conducted a survey of state and territories' nominated members of each of the advisory committees. The survey consisted of 19 questions.

This document contains a summary of responses received to states and territories questionnaire.

System of access controls for goods containing scheduled substances

Section 52A: Definitions

All respondents stated that the definition of 'substance' met their needs. One respondent questioned the need for a definition noting that standard dictionary interpretation, when needed, would be less restrictive. No issues regarding inconsistencies were raised.

Changes to advice provided by ACCS/ACMS and decisions made by the Secretary

One respondent noted that they had requested changes. Other respondents stated that they did not seek any editorial changes or errata of decisions.

Section 52B and 52C; Membership of ACCS and ACMS

All respondents generally agreed that the membership categories and current appointees met their needs. One respondent suggested requiring committee membership to include expertise in the field of drug abuse. Another respondent noted that the ACMS membership should include prescribers and pharmacists while the ACCS should include clinical and non-clinical membership. New Zealand's participation as observer was seen as positive. One respondent expressed concerns that

trans-Tasman harmonisation of scheduling decisions has decreased under the new scheduling arrangements.

Costs have increased for those jurisdictions that have decided to nominate different people to each of the respective committees.

Section 52E(2)(b): matters Secretary must have regard to

Some respondents agreed that the SPF meets the needs of their jurisdiction while others stated it did not. All respondents agreed that the SPF required amendment.

Generally, neither positive or adverse outcomes as a result of an amendment to the Poisons Standard at the Secretary's initiative were noted.

Outcomes of administration

Section 52E: Application to amend the Poisons Standard

The application template was considered to be sufficiently comprehensive by all respondents.

Based on the responses received there appears to have been no impact on jurisdictions due to advice relied on other than advice from the respective advisory committees. Some respondents noted that their jurisdiction was able to make faster decisions as a result of the new arrangements, others did not.

Matters relating to the Regulations

Responses varied in relation to outcomes of the new scheduling arrangements. Some saw no adverse outcomes, others raised concerns about the level of uncertainty regarding a scheduling decision and the impact on jurisdiction ability and readiness to implement the decision.

Other issues

Respondents provided a number of suggestions on data that could be used to monitor the efficiency and effectiveness of the scheduling arrangements.