

# Minister for Regulation

## Information Release

### Agricultural and Horticultural Products Regulatory Review: Progressing Recommendations

February 2025

This information release is available on the Ministry for Regulation website at:

<https://www.regulation.govt.nz/about-us/our-publications/>

#### Documents in this information release

#	Reference	Type	Title	Date
1	ECO-25-SUB-0006	Cabinet paper	Agricultural and Horticultural Products Regulatory Review: Progressing Recommendations	19 February 2025
2	ECO-25-SUB-0006	Cabinet paper summary	Summary: Agricultural and Horticultural Products Regulatory Review: Progressing Recommendations	19 February 2025
3	ECO-25-SUB-0006	Cabinet Economic Policy Committee Minute of Decision	Agricultural and Horticultural Products Regulatory Review: Progressing Recommendations	19 February 2025
4	CAB-25-MIN-0036	Cabinet minute	Cabinet Minute of Decision	24 February 2025

#### Information withheld

Some parts of this information release would not be appropriate to release and, if requested, would be withheld under the Official Information Act 1982 (the Act). Where this is the case, the relevant sections of the Act that would apply have been identified. Where information has been withheld, no public interest has been identified that would outweigh the reasons for withholding it.

Sections of the Act under which information has been withheld:

- Section 9(2)(f)(iv) – to protect the constitutional conventions for the time being which protect the confidentiality of advice tendered to Ministers of the Crown and officials

The following information has been excluded from this proactive release:

- information being published through a separate process on the Ministry for Regulation website (for example Cabinet paper Appendix 1: Final Report the Agricultural and Horticultural Products Regulatory Review (long form and summary))
- information not related to the Agricultural and Horticultural Products Regulatory Review.

### **Accessibility**

Documents are available in PDF format only.

### **Copyright and Licensing**

Cabinet material and advice to Ministers from the Ministry for Regulation and other public service departments are Crown copyright but are licensed for re-use under Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International (CC BY 4.0) licence (<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>).

Office of the Minister for Regulation

Office of the Minister for Food Safety

Office of the Minister for the Environment

Cabinet Economic Policy Committee

## **Progressing the recommendations of the Agricultural and Horticultural Products Regulatory Review**

### **Proposal**

- 1 This paper seeks endorsement of the recommendations of the Agricultural and Horticultural Products Regulatory Review (the Review), and to note the preliminary work underway to improve the approval path for agricultural and horticultural products.

### **Relation to government priorities**

- 2 The Review was undertaken as part of the Government's commitment to carry out regulatory sector reviews and reduce farming regulation. The Review's recommendations support the Government's priorities of ensuring regulations are fit for purpose, reducing regulatory burden, and maximising economic growth and productivity.

### **Executive Summary**

- 3 Agricultural and horticultural products, such as fungicides, insecticides, veterinary medicines and environmental inhibitors, are important to protect and manage plants and animals in primary production. Farmers and growers in New Zealand already face competitive disadvantages in terms of accessing needed products because of our market size, production scale, farming practices and remote location. There have been concerns that additional regulatory burden is worsening their international competitiveness, which triggered the Review.
- 4 The Ministry for Regulation undertook this Review from August to December 2024. They met with over 50 groups, received over 80 submissions and undertook analysis to assess how the current regulatory approach balances access to products while ensuring that relevant risks are effectively managed. Throughout this Review, the Ministry for Regulation worked closely with the Ministry for Primary Industries (MPI), particularly the Policy and Trade branch and New Zealand Food Safety (NZFS), the Ministry for the Environment (MfE), and the Environmental Protection Authority (EPA). All these agencies provided comprehensive feedback and expertise to the Review.
- 5 Overall, the Review found that the existing regulatory systems are effective in managing risks to human, animal and plant health, trade, agricultural security (biosecurity) and the environment. However, the approval path does not always enable efficient and timely access to products. A range of issues were

identified, including the uncertainty and timing of assessments, the lack of strategic direction, disproportionate and complex regulation, and concerns relating to regulators' resources, tools and engagement. An area of significant concern is that the EPA's risk assessment models are outdated and not fit-for-purpose, leading to overly conservative risk management. It is estimated that reducing the current approval times for new products by half can generate present value benefits of \$272 million over 20 years to product users.

- 6 The Ministry for Regulation recommended 16 changes that would, as a package, improve the proportionality, efficiency, transparency and certainty of the approval path. We particularly support the recommendation to establish a Sector Leaders Forum, and to update the EPA's risk assessment models to improve proportionate decision-making. We seek your endorsement of these recommendations to improve access to products and increase regulatory efficiency for the growth of primary industries.
- 7 Agencies have started work to improve regulatory systems in support of the Review's recommendations. This includes committing the EPA's and NZFS's resources to support the establishment of the recommended Sector Leaders Forum. As responsible Ministers for Food Safety and the Environment, we have directed agencies to implement preliminary work programmes. We intend to report back to Cabinet by no later than May 2025 on detailed work programmes, s 9(2)(f)(iv)

## Background

- 8 Farmers and growers use a range of agricultural and horticultural products to protect and manage their animals and plants. These products include herbicides and fungicides, veterinary medicines, pet food and animal feeds, and environmental inhibitors. Access to these products is important to maintain competitiveness, facilitate innovation, increase productivity, boost exports and support biosecurity, in addition to improving outcomes for animal, plant and human health, and the environment. The products play an important role in facilitating a \$55 billion export trade of primary produce.
- 9 While contributing significant benefits to primary industries, these products can also pose risks to human, animal and plant health, trade, and the environment. In New Zealand, access to these products is primarily regulated by the Agricultural Compounds and Veterinary Medicines (ACVM) and Hazardous Substances and New Organisms (HSNO) regulatory systems. ACVM is administrated and implemented, respectively, by MPI and NZFS, and HSNO by MfE and the EPA. The legal framework for these regulatory systems is the ACVM Act 1997 and the HSNO Act 1996 respectively.
- 10 New Zealand already faces a competitive disadvantage in terms of accessing products, given its relatively small market size, reliance on minor crop production in international terms, different farming practices and remoteness from the main manufacturing bases. In response to concerns about additional regulatory barriers to access to needed agricultural and horticultural products, Cabinet agreed the Terms of Reference of the Review on 29 July 2024 [CAB-

24-MIN-0276]. The Review sought to assess how the current regulatory approach delivers on and balances access to products while ensuring that relevant risks are effectively managed.

**The Agricultural and Horticultural Products Regulatory Review has now been completed**

- 11 The Ministry for Regulation undertook the regulatory review from August to December 2024. During this period, they met with over 50 organisations and received more than 80 written submissions. They also had ongoing engagement with a Sector Reference Group and other stakeholders, and worked closely with relevant regulatory and policy agencies throughout.
- 12 The Ministry for Regulation investigated issues raised by agencies, industry, other stakeholders and the public, and identified the underlying causes of those issues. In addition to policy analysis of the effectiveness, efficiency, proportionality and transparency of regulation, they undertook an economic analysis to confirm the market failures that warrant Government intervention. Quantitative modelling was also undertaken to estimate the costs of the current approach and benefits of regulatory improvements.
- 13 The Final Report of the Review was presented to us as Joint Ministers on 30 January 2025. The Report is attached at **Appendix 1**.

**The Review found the approval path is effective in managing product risks but does not always enable efficient and timely access to products**

- 14 The Review found that the regulatory systems are effective in managing risks to human, animal and plant health, trade, agricultural security (biosecurity) and the environment. However, the Review also found that the approval path through the two regulatory systems does not always enable efficient and timely access to agricultural and horticultural products.
- 15 Several major concerns were surfaced through the Review. The current approval path is time consuming and uncertain, taking up to 5.6 years to introduce a new product with a new active ingredient. Interface issues across the two approval systems have added regulatory burden on industry. It appears the two regulators are not using international regulators' information to the greatest extent, and there are instances of disproportionate regulation. There are also concerns around regulators' resources, tools, and engagement, with differing levels of concerns for each agency. An area of significant concern is that the EPA's risk assessment models are outdated and not fit-for-purpose, leading to overly conservative risk management. Finally, there is currently no single strategic direction or oversight of this approval path across the two regulatory systems.
- 16 Quantitative modelling has given an indication of the costs of our current approach. Reducing the current approval times for new products by half is estimated to generate present value benefits of \$272 million over 20 years to product users. A reduction in access to European Union markets for horticultural products, which could occur if older products are banned in

importing countries while newer ones are not yet available to our farmers and growers, is estimated to have a present value cost of \$250 million over 20 years. Reducing delays in access to a new, hypothetical methane inhibitor could have a present value benefit of between \$43 million and \$183 million over 20 years.

- 17 Given our relatively small market, reliance on crops that are minor in international terms, our different farming practices and remoteness from main manufacturing bases, New Zealand already faces a competitive disadvantage in accessing these products. It is crucial that the costs associated with our local approval path be at an absolute minimum to effectively manage risks. If New Zealand's systems do not evolve, our competitive disadvantage could worsen and jeopardise our goal of doubling primary sector exports by value over the next 10 years.

**The package of recommendations should help improve the efficiency, proportionality, transparency and certainty of the approval path**

- 18 The Review identified a package of 16 recommendations for action. These are detailed in **Appendices 1 and 2** and are summarised below:

*To address strategic issues:*

- 18.1 establishing a Sector Leaders Forum that brings together policy and regulatory agencies and stakeholders at a senior level to improve transparency and facilitate strategic discussions for the whole approval path; and
- 18.2 responsible Ministers use their available levers to prioritise prompt implementation of the Review's recommendations and consider issues raised by the Sector Leaders Forum on an ongoing basis.

*To specifically address the application queues and assessment time*

- 18.3 Minister for the Environment and Minister for Food Safety request specific and ambitious targets to reduce HSNO and ACVM applications queues and accelerate assessment process.

*To reduce the complexity of an approval path across two regulatory systems*

- 18.4 making the two regulatory systems easier to navigate by better coordination between the two regulators, for example offering combined guidance, sharing industry knowledge and technical expertise, and supporting alignment of workable controls.

*To improve efficiency and proportionality of regulation*

- 18.5 increasing the use of HSNO rapid pathways and group standards, and ACVM registration exemptions and self-assessments for appropriate product and application types;

- 18.6 reducing ACVM efficacy requirements for inhibitors to the minimum required to manage risks;
- 18.7 the EPA and NZFS further use international regulators' assessments to save time and resources;
- 18.8 the EPA and MPI (including NZFS) prioritise engagement at the international level to support harmonisation of requirements; and
- 18.9 MPI (including NZFS), MfE and the EPA explore a strategic pathway for priority products to mitigate the impacts of waiting time in the current queues, considering lessons learnt from similar approaches in other regulatory systems.

*To improve regulators' resource, tools and engagement*

- 18.10 updating the EPA's outdated risk assessment models and considering how to keep them up to date for the future;
  - 18.11 reviewing HSNO cost recovery provisions;
  - 18.12 strengthening the framework overseeing ACVM independent data assessors;
  - 18.13 the EPA and NZFS improve their performance reporting, and MfE and MPI review statutory timeframes;
  - 18.14 the EPA and NZFS prioritise the provision of up-to-date guidance, pre-application support, and transparency on application processing;
  - 18.15 extending existing NZFS and EPA stakeholder engagement forums to operate across both regulatory systems for agricultural and horticultural products; and
  - 18.16 reviewing HSNO emergency provisions to better enable products to be approved for biosecurity responses.
- 19 We consider the efficiency of the approval path must be improved to enable more timely access to agricultural and horticultural products, while still maintaining effective management of products' risks. As Joint Ministers for the Review, and as the Ministers responsible for these regulatory systems, we have agreed to progress all 16 recommendations. We believe these decisions will improve the proportionality, efficiency, transparency and certainty of the approval path.
- 20 We are seeking Cabinet's endorsement to our decisions for action.

**Work is already underway to deliver on the Review's recommendations**

- 21 The 16 recommendations include both operational and legislative changes. A range of actions are already underway to give effect to the recommendations, including § 9(2)(f)(iv)

operational improvements (**Appendix 3**). We will report back to Cabinet by no later than May 2025 on detailed work programmes.

22 s 9(2)(f)(iv) [Redacted]

23 We expect to progress s 9(2)(f)(iv) [Redacted] operational changes at pace to give effect to the Review recommendations. Progressing work swiftly on improving regulators' performance reporting s 9(2)(f)(iv) [Redacted] will be important to inform Letters of Expectations for the regulators.

**Next steps**

24 Subject to Cabinet's endorsement of the Review's recommendations, MPI (including NZFS), MfE, and the EPA will develop detailed implementation plans and further progress these recommendations. The Minister for Food Safety and the Minister for the Environment intend to report back to Cabinet by no later than May 2025 on this work s 9(2)(f)(iv) [Redacted]

25 To ensure progress continues to be made, MPI (including NZFS), MfE, and the EPA will report quarterly on implementation progress to Joint Ministers until the end of the 2026/2027 financial year. The Ministry for Regulation will continue to provide advice to Joint Ministers on request on matters related to the scope of the Review.

26 We intend to release Cabinet's decisions here alongside the release of the Final Report to demonstrate the action that is being taken to ensure farmers and growers have access to the products they need to thrive and grow.

**Cost-of-living Implications**

27 The recommendations to improve the approval path for agricultural and horticultural products are expected to reduce some regulatory compliance costs for introducing and accessing products.

**Financial Implications**

28 The preliminary actions underway have been funded through agencies' baselines. Any further financial implications of specific recommendations will be considered as part of the May 2025 report back (alongside implementation plans) and with an expectation they are managed within current baselines in the first instance or may need to be subject to Budget processes.



### Use of external resources

- 29 The Ministry for Regulation commissioned Sense Partners, a consultancy with experience in regulatory economics, to model three scenarios estimating the benefits of improving the assessment process for agricultural and horticultural products as reported in **Appendix 1**. MSO Design provided design services for two figures of the report.

### Legislative Implications

- 30 Recommendations on changes to primary and secondary legislation of the ACVM and HSNO systems require further regulatory impact assessments by MPI and MfE respectively. <sup>s 9(2)(f)(iv)</sup>

### Impact Analysis

#### Regulatory Impact Statement

- 31 This paper does not seek policy decisions on legislative change. Therefore, Cabinet's impact analysis requirements are not triggered. A regulatory impact statement will be prepared when future Cabinet papers seek detailed implementation decisions.

#### Climate Implications of Policy Assessment

- 32 The Climate Implications of Policy Assessment (CIPA) team has been consulted and confirms that the CIPA requirements do not apply to this policy proposal, as the emissions impact is indirect. This proposal could support the approval of environmental inhibitors, which reduce the climate impacts of agriculture and horticulture.

#### Population Implications

- 33 The Review seeks to improve access to agricultural and horticultural products while ensuring that risks of products are known and appropriately managed. This overarching objective means no negative impacts are expected on workers' and consumers' health resulting from implementing the Review's recommendations. We expect the proposed work programmes will generate positive impacts for manufacturers, importers, sellers and users of products. The specific level of impacts will be estimated when agencies implement the recommendations.

#### Human Rights

- 34 There are no New Zealand Bill of Rights Act 1990 or Human Rights Act 1993 implications. New Zealand is party to the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights, which recognises the fundamental right of everyone to be free from hunger and to the enjoyment of the highest attainable standard of health. This includes a commitment to take measures

to improve methods of production of food and to improve environmental hygiene, which the Review can positively impact.

## Consultation

- 35 The following departments and agencies were consulted on this paper: MPI, MfE, the EPA, the Treasury, the Ministry of Business, Innovation and Employment, the Ministry of Health, WorkSafe New Zealand, the Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Trade (MFAT), the Department of Conservation, and Ministry of Justice. The Department of Prime Minister and Cabinet has been informed.
- 36 MFAT has advised that some of the proposals may engage New Zealand's trade law obligations. MPI, MfE and the EPA will work with MFAT to ensure the proposals are developed and implemented in a way that is consistent with New Zealand's international obligations.

## Communications

- 37 Subject to Cabinet decisions, we will announce the completion of the Review and Cabinet decisions. The Ministry for Regulation intends to release the Final Report on its website following Cabinet decisions, alongside other key documentation for the Review. The Review has already generated some media, and there is likely to be more media coverage following publication of the Final Report. Public announcements of these Cabinet decisions and the Review Report will not specifically commit to actions that set an expectation of further Crown funding.

## Proactive Release

- 38 We intend to proactively release this Cabinet paper once decisions have been made subject to redactions as appropriate under the Official Information Act 1982.

## Recommendations

The Ministers for Regulation, Food Safety and the Environment recommend that the Committee:

- 1 **Note** Cabinet agreed to the Terms of Reference of the Review on 29 July 2024.
- 2 **Note** the Ministry for Regulation has undertaken the Review and presented a Final Report with 16 recommendations to the Ministers for Regulation, Food Safety and the Environment (Joint Ministers).
- 3 **Note** that Joint Ministers have agreed to progress all the 16 recommendations.
- 4 **Endorse** the 16 recommendations as presented in the Report in **Appendix 1** and summarised in **Appendix 2**.
- 5 **Note** that work is already underway to give effect to the recommendations as detailed in **Appendix 3**.
- 6 s 9(2)(f)(iv) [REDACTED]
- 7 **Invite** the Minister for Food Safety and Minister for the Environment to report back to Cabinet no later than May 2025 with detailed implementation plans.
- 8 **Note** that the Ministry for Regulation will publish the Review Report, subject to minor editorial and formatting changes, along with this Cabinet paper and other Review documentation on its website following Cabinet decisions.

Hon David Seymour

Minister for Regulation

Hon Andrew Hoggard

Minister for Food Safety

Hon Penny Simmonds

Minister for the Environment

**Appendix 1: Final Report the Agricultural and Horticultural Products  
Regulatory Review (long form and summary)**

## Appendix 2: Review's Recommendations

Recommendation 1: Recommend the formation of a Sector Leaders Forum

Recommendation 2: Recommend that the Minister for the Environment and Minister for Food Safety ensure prompt implementation of this Review's recommendations and are required to consider issues raised by the Sector Leaders Forum

Recommendation 3: Recommend that the Minister for the Environment and Minister for Food Safety set expectations for targets to accelerate HSNO and ACVM processes and reduce queues

Recommendation 4: Recommend that MPI, MfE, NZFS and the EPA make the two regulatory systems easier to navigate

Recommendation 5: Recommend that agencies increase the use and better design of group standards, rapid assessment pathways, registration exemptions, and self-assessable changes

Recommendation 6: Recommend that MPI and NZFS reduce ACVM efficacy requirements for inhibitors to the minimum required to manage risks

Recommendation 7: Recommend that the EPA and NZFS maximise their use of assessments by international regulators for assessing the risks of a product while still considering aspects unique to New Zealand

Recommendation 8: Recommend that the EPA and MPI (including NZFS) prioritise engagement at the international level to support harmonisation of requirements

Recommendation 9: Recommend that MPI (including NZFS), MfE and the EPA explore a strategic priority pathway, in addition to the current first come, first served queue

Recommendation 10: Recommend that the EPA update their outdated risk assessment models and consider how to keep them up to date for the future

Recommendation 11: Recommend that MfE and the EPA review HSNO cost recovery provisions. We recommend that consideration be given to (but options should not be limited to): whether the current level of cost recovery from industry is appropriate; and an annual levy to support general regulatory functions which do not provide applicant specific benefits.

Recommendation 12: Recommend that MPI strengthen the framework overseeing independent data assessors

Recommendation 13: Recommend the EPA and NZFS improve their performance reporting and MfE and MPI review statutory timeframes in their respective legislation

Recommendation 14: Recommend that the EPA and NZFS prioritise the provision of up-to-date guidance, pre-application support, and transparency on application processing

Recommendation 15: Recommend that NZFS and the EPA extend existing stakeholder engagement forums to operate across both regulatory systems

Recommendation 16: Recommend that MfE review the emergency approval provisions under the HSNO Act, including better enabling products to be approved for biosecurity responses

### **Appendix 3: Preliminary actions underway**

#### **Environmental Protection Authority (EPA)**

The EPA has been working with the Ministry for the Environment (MfE) to develop legislative amendments to the Hazardous Substances and New Organisms (HSNO) Act 1996, to address a previous directive from the Minister for the Environment, which will also cover some of the issues raised during the MfR review.

Through EPA's budget reforecasting process completed in November 2024, the EPA has identified existing funding that can be reprioritised to support additional resourcing in HSNO. The EPA expect to begin recruitment of up to eleven additional staff in the hazardous substances applications area shortly.

In February 2024 the EPA initiated a prioritisation project to create a system that will identify the relative risks and benefits of applications and so may influence the sequence in which applications are processed. The project was paused in August 2024 to accommodate the MfR review. The EPA will consult with applicants and industry stakeholders on the criteria for prioritisation in coming months.

The EPA is continuing to look for opportunities to make best use of information from international regulators, including considering applications that are eligible for the international regulator rapid assessment pathway. Prior to the review the EPA also identified options for the development of additional group standards to cover certain types of substances.

The EPA is committed to increasing and improving their communication with applicants and stakeholders, and have recently contacted chemical manufacturers to ascertain their plans for "softer/greener" pesticides. The EPA is working with New Zealand Food Safety (NZFS) to establish the recommended Sector Leaders Forum.

#### **Ministry for the Environment (MfE)**

At the request of the Environment Minister, MfE began a programme of work to improve hazardous substance approvals under the HSNO Act in early 2024. Many of review's recommendations pertaining to the HSNO regime relate to options already considered and being developed as part of this work.

The scope of MfE's work is broader than the Review and considers implications on a wider group of stakeholders than just the agricultural and horticultural sector. Their work also contains actions responding to the Gene Technology reform, s 9(2)(f)(iv) and corrects minor and technical issues identified with the HSNO Act. MfE officials advise that they are prioritising the development of actions that require legislative changes as those typically take the most time to develop and implement.

All recommendations will require resource from the EPA to implement and doing so is likely to take away resource from processing hazardous substances applications in the short to medium term. The recommendation relating to updating the EPA's risk assessment models is entirely dependent on additional funding and cannot be progressed until this is available.

**Ministry for Primary Industries (MPI)**

MPI is proposing to address recommendations as part of a wider Agricultural Compounds and Veterinary Medicines (ACVM) Modernisation work programme.

MPI is working on amendments to ACVM Act to action any recommendations, as well as improve the ACVM regulatory system.

MPI assessed that eight out of 13 applicable recommendations are already in progress or can begin progress now.

Already underway or business as usual work examples include streamline inhibitor efficacy requirements administratively to focus on core statutory risks, s 9(2)(f)(iv) and regular programme of international engagements and overseas competent authorities to streamline standards for ACVM products.



# Cabinet Economic Policy Committee

## Summary

*This document contains information for the New Zealand Cabinet. It must be treated in confidence and handled in accordance with any security classification, or other endorsement. The information can only be released, including under the Official Information Act 1982, by persons with the appropriate authority.*

### Agricultural and Horticultural Products Regulatory Review: Progressing Recommendations

**Portfolio** Regulation / Environment / Food Safety

**Purpose** This paper seeks endorsement of the 16 recommendations presented in the final report of the Agricultural and Horticultural Products Regulatory Review (the Review).

**Previous Decisions** In July 2024, EXP agreed to the Terms of Reference for the Review [EXP-24-MIN-0033].

**Proposal** The Review sought to assess how the current regulatory approach delivers on and balances access to products while ensuring that relevant risks are effectively managed. During the review, the Ministry for Regulation (MfR) worked closely with relevant agencies, met with over 50 groups, and received over 80 submissions.

Overall, the Review found that existing regulatory systems are effective, but the approval path does not always enable efficient and timely access to products. A range of issues were identified, including outdated risk assessment models and overly conservative risk management.

Responsible Ministers have agreed to progress all 16 recommendations made in the final report (attached as **Appendix 1**, with recommendations summarised in **Appendix 2**), and work has commenced to deliver on the recommended operational and legislative changes (**Appendix 3**).

**Impact Analysis** Not applicable.

**Financial Implications** None from this paper. Potential value benefits from recommended changes are outlined in **paragraph 16**.

**Legislative Implications** s 9(2)(f)(iv)





- Timing Matters** The Ministers for the Environment and Food Safety intend to report back to ECO by May 2025 with detailed implementation plans <sup>s 9(2)(f)(iv)</sup> [REDACTED]
- Communications** MfR will publish the final report on its website, along with other Review documentation.
- Consultation** Paper prepared by MfR, MPI (Food Safety) and MfE. DoC, EPA, MfE, Treasury, Health, MoJ, MBIE (Workplace Relations and Safety) and MFAT (Trade and Investment) were consulted. DPMC was informed. WorkSafe New Zealand was also consulted.

The Minister indicates that the Prime Minister, Deputy Prime Minister, Minister of Finance, Minister of Housing, Minister of Health, Minister of Immigration, Minister of Justice, Minister for the Public Service, Minister of Statistics, Minister for Emergency Management and Recovery, Minister of Agriculture, Minister for Workplace Relations and Safety, Minister for Regional Development, Minister for Building and Construction, Associate Ministers of Agriculture (Hon Nicola Grigg, Hon Mark Patterson) and the Minister of Commerce and Consumer Affairs were consulted.

The Minister also indicates that discussion has occurred with the Government parties.

**The Minister for Regulation, Minister for the Environment, and Minister for Food Safety recommend that the Committee:**

- 1 note that in July 2024, the Cabinet Expenditure and Regulatory Review Committee agreed to the Terms of Reference for the Agricultural and Horticultural Products Regulatory Review (the Review) [EXP-24-MIN-0033];
- 2 note that the Ministry for Regulation has undertaken the Review and presented a Final Report with 16 recommendations to the Minister for Regulation, Minister for Food Safety, and Minister for the Environment (joint Ministers);
- 3 note that joint Ministers have agreed to progress all 16 recommendations in the Final Report;
- 4 endorse the 16 recommendations as presented in the Final Report, attached as Appendix 1 and summarised in Appendix 2 under ECO-25-SUB-0006;
- 5 note that work is already underway to give effect to the recommendations, as detailed in Appendix 3 under ECO-25-SUB-0006;
- 6 <sup>s 9(2)(f)(iv)</sup> [REDACTED]
- 7 invite the Minister for Food Safety and Minister for the Environment to report back to ECO by May 2025 with detailed implementation plans;

- 8 note that the Ministry for Regulation will publish the Review Report, subject to minor editorial and formatting changes, and other Review documentation on its website following Cabinet decisions.

Rachel Clarke  
Committee Secretary

---

**Hard-copy distribution:**

Cabinet Economic Policy Committee  
Minister for the Public Service



# Cabinet Economic Policy Committee

## Minute of Decision

---

*This document contains information for the New Zealand Cabinet. It must be treated in confidence and handled in accordance with any security classification, or other endorsement. The information can only be released, including under the Official Information Act 1982, by persons with the appropriate authority.*

---

### Agricultural and Horticultural Products Regulatory Review: Progressing Recommendations

**Portfolio**                      **Regulation / Environment / Food Safety**

On 19 February 2025, the Cabinet Economic Policy Committee (ECO):

- 1        **noted** that in July 2024, the Cabinet Expenditure and Regulatory Review Committee agreed to the Terms of Reference for the Agricultural and Horticultural Products Regulatory Review (the Review) [EXP-24-MIN-0033];
- 2        **noted** that the Ministry for Regulation has undertaken the Review and presented a Final Report with 16 recommendations to the Minister for Regulation, Minister for the Environment, and Minister for Food Safety (joint Ministers);
- 3        **noted** that joint Ministers have agreed to progress all 16 recommendations in the Final Report, attached as Appendix 1 under ECO-25-SUB-0006;
- 4        **endorsed** the 16 recommendations as presented in the Final Report and summarised in Appendix 2 under ECO-25-SUB-0006;
- 5        **noted** that work is already underway to give effect to the recommendations, as detailed in Appendix 3 under ECO-25-SUB-0006;
- 6        s 9(2)(f)(iv) [REDACTED]
- 7        **invited** the Minister for Food Safety and Minister for the Environment to report back to ECO by May 2025 with detailed implementation plans s 9(2)(f)(iv) [REDACTED];
- 8        **noted** that the Ministry for Regulation will publish the Review Report, subject to minor editorial and formatting changes, and other Review documentation on its website following Cabinet decisions.

Rachel Clarke  
Committee Secretary

---

**Present: (see over)**

**Present:**

Hon David Seymour  
Hon Nicola Willis (Chair)  
Hon Chris Bishop  
Hon Simeon Brown  
Hon Brooke van Velden  
Hon Shane Jones  
Hon Erica Stanford  
Hon Paul Goldsmith  
Hon Louise Upston  
Hon Dr Shane Reti  
Hon Todd McClay  
Hon Tama Potaka  
Hon Simon Watts  
Hon Chris Penk  
Hon Andrew Bayly  
Hon Andrew Hoggard  
Hon Nicola Grigg  
Hon Mark Patterson  
Hon James Meager  
Simon Court MP

**Officials present from:**

Office of the Prime Minister  
Office of Hon David Seymour  
Officials Committee for ECO



# Cabinet

## Minute of Decision

---

*This document contains information for the New Zealand Cabinet. It must be treated in confidence and handled in accordance with any security classification, or other endorsement. The information can only be released, including under the Official Information Act 1982, by persons with the appropriate authority.*

---

### **Report of the Cabinet Economic Policy Committee: Period Ended 21 February 2025**


On 24 February 2025, Cabinet made the following decisions on the work of the Cabinet Economic Policy Committee for the period ended 21 February 2025:

ECO-25-MIN-0006	<b>Agricultural and Horticultural Products Regulatory Review: Progressing Recommendations</b> Portfolios: Regulation / Environment / Food Safety	CONFIRMED
-----------------	--	-----------

Outside scope

A large rectangular area of the page is completely redacted with a solid grey fill, covering the majority of the lower half of the document.

Outside scope



Rachel Hayward  
Secretary of the Cabinet