

PULSE CHECK

AgHort products regulatory approvals progress



Regulatory approval process



Regulatory performance - EPA



Regulatory performance - ACVMG

OVERALL RESULT

NO
CHANGE

No sign of meaningful change
0% reported an improved status

Process worse in some areas
e.g. ACVMG with supporting examples

- APHANZ members rated improvements in the regulatory approval process through one-on-one surveys.
- All major global R&D animal/plant companies were surveyed across New Zealand and Australia.
- Results align with APHANZ’s assessment of progress against our *Blueprint for Change*.
- 0% of applicants interviewed gave an improved rating for either regulator.

Overall performance - last 6 months

69.2%	Deal primarily with one regulator (ACVMG), with issues reported with both ACVMG and EPA
76.2%	Rate EPA’s performance as ‘no change’ 23.8% worse , 0% improvement
52.0%	Rate ACVMG’s performance as ‘no change’ 48% worse , 0% improvement

Key indicators of performance	EPA	ACVMG
New product approval timeframes	76.2% no change	54.2% worse
Red tape/complexity of approval process	81.0% no change	52.0% worse
Transparency of communications	28.6% better	20.0% better

ACVMG - The Ministry for Primary Industries’ New Zealand Food Safety business unit (NZFS), who administers the Agricultural Compounds and Veterinary Medicines (ACVM) Act 1997

EPA - Environmental Protection Authority, who administers the Hazardous Substances and New Organisms (HSNO) Act 1996

SNAPSHOT

Voices from the ground

Companies hear good intentions from regulators ongoing, but 0% report an improved application process.

48% say the ACVMG experience is worse - inconsistent risk assessment decisions, transparency on application process, efficiency & reluctance to implement harmonisation were top issues.

Examples of ongoing product delays - international award winning chemistry, new OP/ SP replacements, one overseas innovation 6 years since first approached to register (originally advised 18 months). Products losing IP/data protections rights for products since applying to register. Members ask why invest here?

ACVMG processes are raising questions globally with members reporting themes like requests to reanalyse EU approved clinical study data, management of conflicts and commercially sensitive dossier information in wider ACVMG documents (in one case uploaded onto a public website).

EPA were not starting from a strong baseline, coming up slightly in communications for some but not all applicants.

Only one member had confidence that ACVMG’s harmonisation proposals will move the dial. Consensus was they add red tape to industry proposals - and time. Increased industry funding & investment in global harmonisation groups like VICH have not translated to a more streamlined ACVMG process for members.



RESULTS BREAKDOWN

Responses from a survey of 27 representative APHANZ members completed 3-6 November 2025.

Criteria for selection of respondents for survey considered those with the highest number of applications in the queue and included all major R&D companies.

D - WORSE	C - NO CHANGE	B - BETTER	A - MUCH IMPROVED
No sign of meaningful change and in some instances, has got worse with case examples to support	Some work underway but no change seen on the ground by applicants and end users	Early signs of meaningful progress towards improvement with a trickle of new products	Substantial progress made towards a timely and efficient regulatory approval process with a steady stream of new products

Overall regulator performance - last 6 months

Which regulator do you have dealings with primarily?

ACVMG	69.2%
EPA	-
Both	30.8%
ACVMG	33.3%
EPA	33.3%
Both	33.3%

If both, in the last 6 months, where do you see the biggest issue in the approval pathway?

Overall progress with each regulator?

	ACVMG	EPA
Worse	48.0%	23.8%
No change	52.0%	76.2%
Better	-	-
Much improved	-	-

Key indicators of performance ratings

Number of new products approved and timeframes

	ACVMG	EPA
Worse	54.2%	23.8%
No change	45.8%	76.2%
Better	-	-
Much improved	-	-

Complexity of application process

	ACVMG	EPA
Worse	52.0%	19.0%
No change	48.0%	81.0%
Better	-	-
Much improved	-	-

Transparency of communications

	ACVMG	EPA
Worse	20.0%	23.8%
No change	60.0%	47.6%
Better	20.0%	28.6%
Much improved	-	-