

# Summary of Stakeholder Sessions on the NICNAS draft Cost Recovery Impact Statement (CRIS)

## Meetings:

11 November, 2011 .....Sydney

14 November, 2011.....Melbourne

**Attendance** - Both Sydney and Melbourne had approximately 12 stakeholders booked to attend the Feedback Sessions. These stakeholders were a balance of companies and associations, with one community person attending in Melbourne and one NSW state government employee attending in Sydney.

**Objective** – to gain final input from stakeholders on the draft CRIS.

**Format** – A contextual overview from NICNAS included an explanation of Activity Based Costing from PricewaterhouseCoopers and an overview from the Department of Health and Ageing on the review currently being conducted as part of the Better Regulation Ministerial Partnership (BRMP) between the Minister for Health and Ageing and the Minister for Finance and Deregulation which was announced on 8 September 2011.

NICNAS explained the elements of the draft CRIS relating to the Accelerated Assessment & Prioritisation of Existing Chemicals and Annual Registration. NICNAS also presented the Draft CRIS for New Chemicals. Table discussions were then conducted to gain feedback and input.

Both sessions were facilitated by SAS Strategic.

## **Summary of Stakeholder Feedback:**

### **Accelerated Assessment & Prioritisation of Chemicals & Registration**

- An additional tier(s) above Tier-4, discussed in both Sydney & Melbourne
- Tier-4 paying a lot
- Large increase in charges for Tier-4 registrants
- Very large companies not paying enough
- Impacts on innovation – most introducers of New Chemicals are in Tier-4. New Chemical introducers pay fees for assessment. Companies in other tiers benefit once the New Chemical is listed on AICS.
- Put Accelerated Assessment and Prioritisation of Industrial Chemicals out to tender
- Tier-1 paying too much, proportionately
- May be inefficient to split tier 1
- Look at other chemical regulatory approaches e.g., NZ, Canada & USA

### **New Chemical Fees**

- Fees for New Chemical assessments are a disincentive to introduce safer/greener chemicals
- NICNAS fees are one of a number of increasing fees – cumulative effect is severe for business
- Some discussion that assessment effort may be inefficient and may not match risk, especially self assessment & low concern chemical categories
- Fees are too high and not reflective of industry and country size
- Other options e.g., government subsidisation in Canada

### **Next steps**

Feedback from sessions will be considered in the development of the final CRIS. Issues such as other chemical regulatory approaches are outside the scope of the CRIS, but may be considered under the BRMP review.