The RANZCP New Zealand National Committee wishes to thank the Ministry of Health for the opportunity to comment on the Psychoactive Substances Regulations.

The RANZCP is the principal organisation representing the medical specialty of psychiatry in New Zealand and Australia and has responsibility for training, examining and awarding the qualification of Fellowship of the RANZCP to medical practitioners.

Currently there are approximately 3500 Fellows of the College who account for around 85 percent of all practicing psychiatrists in Australia and over 50 percent of psychiatrists in New Zealand. New Zealand also has a significant number of overseas trained psychiatrists who are Affiliate Members of the College.

The vision of the RANZCP is: A fellowship of psychiatrists leading the achievement of quality psychiatric care and mental health for our community.

The RANZCP New Zealand National Committee encourages robust regulation of so-called ‘psychoactive substances’ – in this case the term referring mainly to synthetic cannabinoids.

The discussion on page 13 of the consultation document concerning 'Determining the risk of harm' notes that the Act sets out a role for experts, convened as the Psychoactive Substances Expert Advisory Committee (PSEAC). It is important that this expert advisory group includes a psychiatrist and other AOD clinicians. It may also be useful for the regulations to provide PSEAC with guidance about how narrowly or broadly risks should be defined. For example, risk of seizures (narrow) vs risk of destabilising a pre-existing mental illness (broad).

'Misuse' also needs to be defined. For example is it the same as ‘abuse’ (DSM-IV) or considered as ‘abuse’ (which subsumes dependence) (DSM-5). The RANZCP New Zealand National Committee recommends that 'misuse' = 'abuse' as per DSM-IV. It may be helpful to include a definition of vulnerable populations for PSRA/PSEAC (e.g. young people, those with a history of substance abuse or mental illness). Clear guidance as to the evidentiary standard required by PSEAC to determine levels of harm would also be useful (see response to question #12).

We suggest that it be made more explicit how PSRA and PSEAC will interface with CARM and other relevant agencies such as the National Poisons Centre to monitor the ongoing risk of harm.

Please find below responses to the specific questions posed in the consultation document.

Consultation questions

1. Is the list of proposed information requirements for licence applications comprehensive enough?

   If not, what else should be required, and why?

   Yes, the proposed information requirements are comprehensive.

2. Should retail licence applications be accompanied by evidence of compliance with a local approved products policy if one is in effect in the applicant’s area?

   Yes.

3. Should retail licence applications be accompanied by evidence of compliance with a generic local approved products policy if no policy is in effect in the applicant’s area?

   Yes.
4 Are the factors the Authority should take into account when determining whether a licence applicant is a fit and proper person or whether a body corporate is of good repute in section 16(2) enough? The section 16(2) factors are:
   - whether the applicant has been convicted of a relevant offence
   - whether there has been a serious or repeated failure by the applicant to comply with any requirement of the Act
   - whether there are other grounds for considering that the applicant is likely to fail to comply with any requirement of the Act
   - any other matter that the Authority considers relevant.
   The factors that are taken into account to determine whether an applicant is a ‘fit and proper person’ are enough if they include a police vetting check (Veda Trace Check).

5 Should the regulations require applicants to provide details of their involvement in other regulatory regimes, such as alcohol licensing processes?
   Yes, details of involvement in other regulatory regimes should be provided as evidence of wrongdoing within other regulatory regimes is relevant to a ‘fit and proper person’ test.

6 What records should the regulations require licence holders to keep?
   Licence holders should be required to keep comprehensive records detailing all aspects of the production/manufacture, importing, distribution and sale of psychoactive substances. This should include those listed under the consultation document subheading ‘Proposed additional sales record keeping under the regulations’.

7 How long should licence holders be required to keep records for?
   Records should be kept for a period consistent with similar regulatory regimes, for example 10 years.

8 Do you think there are factors or issues that the Authority should consider when setting discretionary conditions? If so, please provide details.
   Yes, there are factors that should be considered when setting discretionary conditions – these are discussed under consultation question 27 (Internet sale restrictions).

9 Should the regulations prescribe other matters the Authority must take into account when deciding on an application? If yes, what should these matters be?
   We have no comment to make in response to this question.

10 Do you agree a product approval application should include information on proposed manufacturing methods and how they will comply with the Psychoactive Substances Code of Manufacturing Practice?
    Yes, a product approval application should include information on proposed manufacturing methods and how they will comply with the Psychoactive Substances Code of Manufacturing Practice.

11 Do you think any further particulars, information, documents or other material should be prescribed in the regulations? If yes, what should these be?
    Yes, there is additional information that should be prescribed in the regulations. The regulations should further specify the definition of ‘psychoactive substances’ to allow distinction from other illicit substances, for example cannabis sativa and its derivatives (if such a distinction is actually proposed). We note that the definition of a psychoactive substance included in the consultation document includes “...anything that can be used to induce a psychoactive effect in humans.” It is not clear that these regulations don’t apply to other illicit substances. We suggest that a pharmacological definition may be more useful, for example “...synthetic cannabinoids, other than those covered under relevant narcotics legislation”.
12 Do you agree with the proposal that the regulations require applications to contain information and data on the toxicity, pharmacology and related clinical effects of the psychoactive substance they are seeking approval for?
Yes, applications should be required to contain information and data on the toxicity, pharmacology and related clinical effects of the substance for which approval is sought. However, the regulations should also contain clear guidelines about appropriate evidentiary standards for such data.

13 Do you agree with the proposal that the regulations require product approval applications to contain information and data on:
- the psychoactive potential and related behavioural effects of the substance
  Yes, this information should be required.
- the addictive potential
  Yes, this information should be required.
- the proposed directions for use
  Yes.
- previous use, including use in clinical trials and in the wider population?
  Yes, this information should be required.

14 Are the proposed requirements and restrictions on labelling sufficient? If not, please make specific suggestions for further requirements and restrictions.
The RANZCP New Zealand National Committee supports the rules on labelling as set out in the consultation document. However, we do have some comments on this:
- How will the potential appeal of a product’s label to minors be assessed? Will this include input from those working with minors?
- The restrictions around labelling designed to be particularly appealing to minors should also apply to the name of the product.
- It may be useful to consider including the contact number for Youthline or similar crisis contacts on product labels.
- The labels should also allow easy identification for clinical and forensic purposes.

We note that there may be additional labelling guidelines, and would be happy to have input into these.

15 Are the proposed requirements relating to health warnings sufficient?
If not, please make specific suggestions for further requirements (for example, advice on what to do in the case of an overdose).
The proposed requirements relating to health warnings are not sufficient. More clarity is required around the warning “Do not consumer with other drugs, alcohol or medicines.” This implies that individuals should stop taking prescribed medications altogether when using such substances. This is probably not intended, and may pose additional risk. It may be appropriate to include specific warnings against using such products if an individual has current or previous mental illness or a substance use problem. Advice on what to do in the case of overdose would also be useful.

16 Are the proposed packaging requirements and restrictions sufficient? If not, please make specific suggestions for further requirements.
The proposed packaging requirements/restrictions are not sufficient. Again, some of the terminology is not appropriate (i.e. ‘contraindications’) as these products are not therapeutic agents. We also recommend that the prohibitions around the use of words with inappropriate connotations include Māori or other ethnically significant words — for example Tai High: www.taihigh.co.nz describes Tai High as containing a base of Damiana (Turnera diffusa) which was used by ancient cultures for its medicinal properties.
17. Do you agree with the proposal to restrict a pocket to one dose? Please give reasons for your answer. Yes, product packets should be limited to one ‘dose’. In addition, ‘doses’ of products with similar ingredients should be equivalent, so that users of one brand can expect similar outcomes from switching brands.

18. Do you agree with the proposal that a dose, in whatever form the product takes, is split wherever possible? Yes, a ‘dose’ should be split wherever possible, but there should be a corresponding restriction on retailers selling individual quantities that have been split from a packet (akin to selling single cigarettes) as this is likely to increase access to vulnerable groups.

19. Do you think there should be restrictions on the form products can take? If so, what forms do you think should and shouldn’t be allowed? Yes, there should be restrictions on the form products can take. Products or their derivatives should never be injected, and regulations should be consistent with tobacco regulations.

20. Do you think there should be restrictions or requirements on the storage of psychoactive substances? If so, what should the restrictions or requirements be? Yes, there should be restrictions/requirements on the storage of psychoactive substances, particularly around the maximum amount that can be stored at premises at any one time.

21. Do you think restrictions or requirements should be set for the storage of approved products? If so, what should they be? Yes, there should be restrictions/requirements for the storage of approved products that are in line with similar regulatory regimes.

22. Do you think restrictions or requirements should be set regarding the display of approved products? If so, what should they be? Yes, there should be restrictions/requirements for the display of approved products that are in line with similar regulatory regimes.

23. Do you think restrictions or requirements should be set regarding the disposal of approved products? If so, what should they be? Yes, there should be restrictions/requirements for the disposal of approved products that are in line with similar regulatory regimes.

24. Do you think there should be signage requirements in the regulations? If so, please give specific suggestions. Yes, there should be signage requirements in the regulations to align with the labelling requirements so as not to appeal particularly to minors or other vulnerable groups (please refer to the additional comments we made in response to question 4).

25. Do you think the regulations should specify further places where approved products may not be sold? If so, please provide specific suggestions. Yes, further places where approved products may not be sold should be specified, including internet sales.

26. Do you think the regulations should prescribe restrictions or requirements for advertisements of approved products? If so, please provide specific suggestions. Yes, restrictions on advertising of approved products should be prescribed. These restrictions should include flyers in mailboxes and on windscreen as this type of advertising may reach vulnerable groups indiscriminately.

27. Do you think the regulations should prescribe restrictions or requirements on internet sales of approved products? If so, please provide specific suggestions.
The RANZCP New Zealand National Committee believes that internet sales of psychoactive substances should not be allowed at this stage, due to the reduced scrutiny about who is purchasing these substances. We also note that a robust mechanism is needed to verify the age of a person accessing a given website, as a simple mechanism such as ‘click here if you are over 18 years of age’ is not sufficient.

28 Do you think the regulations should prescribe restrictions or requirements on the advertising of approved products? If so, please provide specific suggestions. Yes, there should be restrictions of the advertising of approved products, as noted in the responses to questions 26 and 27, and in Section 4 of the consultation document.

29 Do you agree with the proposed fees for the different licences? If not, please provide specific suggestions. We have no comment to make in response to this question.

30 Do you support a fixed fee or an hourly charge for processing applications for product approvals? We have no comment to make in response to this question.

31 Should fees be set for other specific functions? If yes, please state what they should be set for. We have no comment to make in response to this question.

32 Do you agree with the proposed list of items and process for setting levies? If not, please provide specific suggestions. We have no comment to make in response to this question.
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To Whom It May Concern,

We are writing to support the submission made by ADANZ in Christchurch. The Alcohol and Drug Association of New Zealand, headquarters in Christchurch, does excellent work with addiction service users. They operate the Drug Helpline in three languages and have the most current information about the negative impact substance abuse has on our community.

Mental Health and Addictions Advocacy and Peer Support –MHAPS has a contract to provide peer support and peer advocacy to people with experience of addictions distress. In the role of advocate and peer supporter our staff hear intense stories of the loss and anguish that results from using all kinds of substances. The synthetic cannabis that is available is wreaking havoc on individuals and families in our communities.

Having read the submission ADANZ have made we heartily support good labelling and advertising the Drug Helpline and Poison line noticably.

Thank you for your attention,

Beth M Nobes

Service Delivery Manager
(CAS) Consumer and Advocacy Services
(MHAPS) Mental Health and Addictions Advocacy and Peer Support
P O Box 33 332 Barrington
Christchurch 8244

Phone 03 368 8288 Cell 027 372 7741
Email mgr.cas@mhaps.org.nz
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Consultation questions

1  Is the list of proposed information requirements for licence applications comprehensive enough?
   If not, what else should be required, and why?

Any potential licensing issues in regards to synthetic cannabis should be considered in terms of risks outweighing benefits. Synthetic cannabis should not be licensed in any circumstance. There is no way of regulating the amount of potential chemical combinations that can be quickly synthesized and these substances cause significant deleterious short and long term effects.

2  Should retail licence applications be accompanied by evidence of compliance with a local approved products policy if one is in effect in the applicant’s area?

Synthetic cannabis should not be licensed for distribution in New Zealand.

3  Should retail licence applications be accompanied by evidence of compliance with a generic local approved products policy if no policy is in effect in the applicant’s area?

Synthetic cannabis should not be licensed for distribution in New Zealand.
Are the factors the Authority should take into account when determining whether a licence applicant is a fit and proper person or whether a body corporate is of good repute in section 16(2) enough? The section 16(2) factors are:

- whether the applicant has been convicted of a relevant offence
- whether there has been a serious or repeated failure by the applicant to comply with any requirement of the Act
- whether there are other grounds for considering that the applicant is likely to fail to comply with any requirement of the Act
- any other matter that the Authority considers relevant.

If you think these factors are not enough, please give examples of additional factors the Authority should consider.

New Zealand authority should not grant a license to manufacture, distribute, or sell synthetic cannabis. Synthetic cannabinoids have been made illegal in many countries in Europe. In July 2012, the Synthetic Drug Abuse Prevention Act of 2012 was signed into law. It banned synthetic compounds commonly found in synthetic marijuana, placing them under Schedule 1 of the Controlled Substances Act.

Should the regulations require applicants to provide details of their involvement in other regulatory regimes, such as alcohol licensing processes?

The regulations do not need to be exclusive of other regulatory regimes, however any consideration of conditional approvals/continued licensing of synthetic cannabis should be toward banning these substances.

What records should the regulations require licence holders to keep?

No length as there should be no license granted.

How long should licence holders be required to keep records for?
8. Do you think there are factors or issues that the Authority should consider when setting discretionary conditions? If so, please provide details.

n/a

9. Should the regulations prescribe other matters the Authority must take into account when deciding on an application? If yes, what should these matters be?

I am writing this submission in regards to several recent incidents that occurred on the Wellington Hospital Ward 27. Two weeks ago, a patient managed to procure synthetic cannabis on staff-accompanied leave from the hospital and brought it to the ward (Te Taha Tauru unit). The patient shared it with at least one other patient and several staff expressed concern that other patients also may have accessed it. The substance was called "White Rhino." On Tuesday, February 25, 2014, there was an extremely violent outburst by one of the patients on the ward when he was told that he could not leave the unit to smoke. The other patients remained in a highly agitated and volatile state through the rest of the week. I am extremely concerned about the use of these substances and potential increases in violence and volatility on the psychiatric (and other medical) units. It is nearly impossible to have a therapeutic alliance or treatment plan when a patient is under the influence of synthetic cannabis. The patients become extremely difficult to manage and the usual treatments (psychotropic antipsychotic or mood-stabilising medications) do not control the symptoms. The patients become hostile, demanding, and at times physically violent when under the influence of these substances. They have ongoing hallucinations and paranoia. I worked previously in the United States and we had similar problems until synthetic cannabis was banned in 2012. I send in a plea to the Ministry of Health to strongly consider banning all "legal highs" for the sake of the safety of the individual patients and community at large.

10. Do you agree a product approval application should include information on proposed manufacturing methods and how they will comply with the Psychoactive Substances Code of Manufacturing Practice?
At a minimum, if the licensing/approval application is continued, all of these synthetic cannabinoids should include detailed information on manufacture and processing.

11 Do you think any further particulars, information, documents or other material should be prescribed in the regulations? If yes, what should these be?

As I have stated briefly, all substances under the heading of "synthetic cannabis", "smoking herbs", "spice," "K2" and others should not be permitted for sale and distribution.

12 Do you agree with the proposal that the regulations require applications to contain information and data on the toxicity, pharmacology and related clinical effects of the psychoactive substance they are seeking approval for?

I agree with this proposal and I believe that the more data accumulates, the more the dangerousness of these substances will emerge.

13 Do you agree with the proposal that the regulations require product approval applications to contain information and data on:
- the psychoactive potential and related behavioural effects of the substance
- the addictive potential
- the proposed directions for use
- previous use, including use in clinical trials and in the wider population?

I agree with this proposal and I believe that the more data accumulates, the more the dangerousness of these substances will emerge.

14 Are the proposed requirements and restrictions on labelling sufficient? If not, please make specific suggestions for further requirements and restrictions.
15. Are the proposed requirements relating to health warnings sufficient? If not, please make specific suggestions for further requirements (for example, advice on what to do in the case of an overdose).

These substances, if not banned outright, which I highly recommend, should have a label warning of the potential for hallucinations and violent behaviours.

16. Are the proposed packaging requirements and restrictions sufficient? If not, please make specific suggestions for further requirements.

As above.

17. Do you agree with the proposal to restrict a packet to one dose? Please give reasons for your answer.

Ideally the proposal should restrict these substances altogether.

18. Do you agree with the proposal that a dose, in whatever form the product takes, is split wherever possible?
19 Do you think there should be restrictions on the form products can take? If so, what forms do you think should and shouldn’t be allowed?

As I have stated briefly, all substances under the heading of "synthetic cannabis", "smoking herbs", "spice," "K2" and others should not be permitted for sale and distribution.

20 Do you think there should be restrictions or requirements on the storage of psychoactive substances? If so, what should the restrictions or requirements be?

n/a

21 Do you think restrictions or requirements should be set for the storage of approved products? If so, what should they be?

n/a

22 Do you think restrictions or requirements should be set regarding the display of approved products? If so, what should they be?
Label any products with warnings about the potential for abuse and addiction, hallucinations, violence, aggression, lack of response to calming medications, and potentially self harm or death.

23 Do you think restrictions or requirements should be set regarding the disposal of approved products? If so, what should they be?

n/a

24 Do you think there should be signage requirements in the regulations? If so, please give specific suggestions.

n/a

25 Do you think the regulations should specify further places where approved products may not be sold? If so, please provide specific suggestions.

They should most definitely not be sold close to hospitals where patients may have quick access to these substances while on leave, complicating their care.

26 Do you think the regulations should prescribe restrictions or requirements for advertisements of approved products? If so, please provide specific suggestions.
27 Do you think the regulations should prescribe restrictions or requirements on internet sales of approved products? If so, please provide specific suggestions.

There should be outright bans on the sale of these products through the Internet.

28 Do you think the regulations should prescribe restrictions or requirements on the advertising of approved products? If so, please provide specific suggestions.

There should be no advertising for these dangerous and addictive substances.

29 Do you agree with the proposed fees for the different licences? If not, please provide specific suggestions.

n/a

30 Do you support a fixed fee or an hourly charge for processing applications for product approvals?

Psychoactive Substances Regulations: Submission form
31 Should fees be set for other specific functions? If yes, please state what they should be set for.

n/a

32 Do you agree with the proposed list of items and process for setting levies? If not, please provide specific suggestions.

n/a
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Consultation questions

1. Is the list of proposed information requirements for licence applications comprehensive enough?
   If not, what else should be required, and why?
   
   Yes.

2. Should retail licence applications be accompanied by evidence of compliance with a local approved products policy if one is in effect in the applicant’s area?

   No, not necessary.
   Retailers who hold licences already comply with MOH Regulations or risk losing their licence.
   Police have visited Retailers and if they felt there was a serious problem I'm sure MOH would have heard.
   LAPP so far (Hamilton), have only shown their ignorance of the products and seem hell bent on making as many obstacles for retailers as possible.
   LAPP in any town/city should show the general public the same courtesy as alcohol etc is given.

3. Should retail licence applications be accompanied by evidence of compliance with a generic local approved products policy if no policy is in effect in the applicant’s area?

   Once again, not necessary.
   We retailers are adults who know what is required by us and therefore act responsibly at all times ensuring Compliance at all times.

4. Are the factors the Authority should take into account when determining whether a licence applicant is a fit and proper person or whether a body corporate is of good repute in section 16(2) enough? The section 16(2) factors are:
- whether the applicant has been convicted of a relevant offence
- whether there has been a serious or repeated failure by the applicant to comply with any requirement of the Act
- whether there are other grounds for considering that the applicant is likely to fail to comply with any requirement of the Act
- any other matter that the Authority considers relevant.

If you think these factors are not enough, please give examples of additional factors the Authority should consider.

Yes they cover all necessary required information.
Nothing needs to be added.

5 Should the regulations require applicants to provide details of their involvement in other regulatory regimes, such as alcohol licensing processes?

Most definitely, as the products are not meant to be sold together.
All licences should be equal.

6 What records should the regulations require licence holders to keep?

The standard retail criteria.
Proof of purchase and sales as necessary for accounts.

7 How long should licence holders be required to keep records for?

Standard 7 years.

8 Do you think there are factors or issues that the Authority should consider when setting discretionary conditions? If so, please provide details.
Ensuring retailer safety and co-operation from NZ Police. Less Council bias and education to those opposing products they no nothing about but simply presume.

9 Should the regulations prescribe other matters the Authority must take into account when deciding on an application? If yes, what should these matters be?

Retail shops should not be penalised in opening hours, fairness should be paramount for all. Hours within the courtesy of Liquor outlets seems only fair.

10 Do you agree a product approval application should include information on proposed manufacturing methods and how they will comply with the Psychoactive Substances Code of Manufacturing Practice?

Only if it's deemed vital, so far everything seems to be in order with MOH requirements and guidelines.

11 Do you think any further particulars, information, documents or other material should be prescribed in the regulations? If yes, what should these be?

Packaging has sufficient information already.

12 Do you agree with the proposal that the regulations require applications to contain information and data on the toxicity, pharmacology and related clinical effects of the psychoactive substance they are seeking approval for?

If this is to inform the public and help their understanding of the products they purchase then by all means. Knowledge is power.
13 Do you agree with the proposal that the regulations require product approval applications to contain information and data on:
- the psychoactive potential and related behavioural effects of the substance
- the addictive potential
- the proposed directions for use
- previous use, including use in clinical trials and in the wider population?

Only if alcohol is to be under these strict regulations also. All mind altering substance should be equally put through the same regime.

14 Are the proposed requirements and restrictions on labelling sufficient? If not, please make specific suggestions for further requirements and restrictions.

Yes, adults are capable of making up their own minds and acting sensibly. As long as information is true on labels then the purchaser can manage to decide whether they wish to buy or not.

15 Are the proposed requirements relating to health warnings sufficient? If not, please make specific suggestions for further requirements (for example, advice on what to do in the case of an overdose).

Yes, with any substance abuse is always possible, most people know to ring 111 if needed. Every mind altering substance should require health warnings. Alcohol = poisoning, addiction leading to alcoholism etc. Prescription drugs: major warnings.

16 Are the proposed packaging requirements and restrictions sufficient? If not, please make specific suggestions for further requirements.

So far we see no issues in relation to packaging.

17 Do you agree with the proposal to restrict a packet to one dose? Please give reasons for your answer.

No, adults should be permitted to use their own intelligent choice of how much they indulge and limiting to one dose wouldn't make any difference.
18. Do you agree with the proposal that a dose, in whatever form the product takes, is split wherever possible?

No alcohol is purchased per bottle but drunk either by nip, glass of many sizes or by the dozen. Splitting substances doesn't control the intake.

19. Do you think there should be restrictions on the form products can take? If so, what forms do you think should and shouldn't be allowed?

Stay as they are.

20. Do you think there should be restrictions or requirements on the storage of psychoactive substances? If so, what should the restrictions or requirements be?

Keeping all products locked up in a safe is adequate. Restricting amounts is ridiculous as we only stock what we can do so safely. Like any product it relies on availability, popularity etc.

21. Do you think restrictions or requirements should be set for the storage of approved products? If so, what should they be?

Placed inside a safe is commonsense.
22. Do you think restrictions or requirements should be set regarding the display of approved products? If so, what should they be?

No as the products are available in adult stores so don't need such nonsense. Adults need to be treated as adults, which is a basic right. R18 is exactly that, ADULTS only.

23. Do you think restrictions or requirements should be set regarding the disposal of approved products? If so, what should they be?

If necessary return to Wholesaler for safe disposal.

24. Do you think there should be signage requirements in the regulations? If so, please give specific suggestions.

Signage should be permitted just like alcohol as it is a legal substance to purchase.

25. Do you think the regulations should specify further places where approved products may not be sold? If so, please provide specific suggestions.

Keeping shops within CBD area is beneficial to retailer, customer, Police, Council and the community as a whole.
Everyone is safe, the Police can have their watchful eye on everything and ensure everyone remains compliant.
The restrictions set are adequate enough.

26. Do you think the regulations should prescribe restrictions or requirements for advertisements of approved products? If so, please provide specific suggestions.

No, alcohol is freely advertised in papers and on television.
Shops should be permitted to advertise their products freely inside their stores as premises are R18 and customers like to be able to view and read product information.
No sense acting as if prohibition is in force.
27. Do you think the regulations should prescribe restrictions or requirements on internet sales of approved products? If so, please provide specific suggestions.

   Don't use internet.

28. Do you think the regulations should prescribe restrictions or requirements on the advertising of approved products? If so, please provide specific suggestions.

   No again alcohol is freely advertised and these products are only intended for adult use.
   Law should be equal on all mind altering substances.

29. Do you agree with the proposed fees for the different licences? If not, please provide specific suggestions.

   Only if amounts suggested are within the same cost of Liquor licences or similar substances.
   This is not about who can make the big amount of cash it's meant to be about product and process.

30. Do you support a fixed fee or an hourly charge for processing applications for product approvals?

   Whichever is more reasonable to all involved.
   This is meant to be about the product not the money.

31. Should fees be set for other specific functions? If yes, please state what they should be set for.

   The talk of fees, levies etc seem to be more important than the product at hand.
   This way of thinking is no different to the gangs standing over people wanting their tax.
Do you agree with the proposed list of items and process for setting levies? If not, please provide specific suggestions.
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The Manager
Psychoactive Substances Regulatory Authority
Ministry of Health
PO Box 5013
Wellington 6145
To The Manager

Re: Submission on the New Psychoactive Substances (NPS) Regulation

Thank you for the opportunity to respond to the New National Drug Policy for New Zealand discussion document. This submission is from Community Alcohol & Drugs Services (CADS) Auckland.

Community Alcohol & Drugs Services (CADS) Auckland is the largest provider of alcohol and other drug treatment services in NZ. Our services include Counselling, Medical Detoxification, Opioid Treatment, Dual Diagnosis, Youth and the Pregnancy and Parental service. CADS provides 23 satellite counselling services at a range of sites including Auckland University of Technology, Community Mental Health Services, Community Probation Service, Massey University, Middlemore Hospital, University of Auckland, Waiuku and Warkworth. We therefore believe it is important that we respond to this recommendation.

CADS' primary aim is to improve the biopsychosocial wellbeing of people affected by alcohol and/or other drug use or misuse. This includes reducing alcohol and drug abuse related harm, not only to the individual but also to the family, whanau and wider community.

Prevalence estimates for the Auckland region suggest that in any 12 month period up to 62,332 people suffer from diagnosable substance disorders and up to 234,758 people will consume alcohol in a harmful manner. Only a minor proportion will seek treatment.

The total number of consumers in treatment with Community Alcohol & Drugs Services at any given time is approx. 4300. In 2013 CADS:

- Received 15,130 new referrals
- Provided services to 14,521 clients
- Admitted 501 people to the In Patient Detox Unit
- Call centre received 11,428 calls
- Provided 92,765 face to face contacts (individual and group attendance)

Over 70% of presentations to CADS are due to problems relating to alcohol abuse or dependence, followed by cannabis, opioids, and methamphetamine abuse or dependence.

Consultation questions

1. Is the list of proposed information requirements for licence applications comprehensive enough?

   If not, what else should be required, and why?

   The list of proposed information requirements is adequate.

---

1 As defined by the Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders (DSM).
2. Should retail licence applications be accompanied by evidence of compliance with a local approved products policy if one is in effect in the applicant’s area?
   
   Yes – as a minimum requirement.

3. Should retail licence applications be accompanied by evidence of compliance with a generic local approved products policy if no policy is in effect in the applicant’s area?
   
   Yes – as a minimum requirement.

4. Are the factors the Authority should take into account when determining whether a licence applicant is a fit and proper person or whether a body corporate is of good repute in section 16(2) enough? The section 16(2) factors are:
   
   - whether the applicant has been convicted of a relevant offence
   - whether there has been a serious or repeated failure by the applicant to comply with any requirement of the Act
   - whether there are other grounds for considering that the applicant is likely to fail to comply with any requirement of the Act
   - any other matter that the Authority considers relevant.

   If you think these factors are not enough, please give examples of additional factors the Authority should consider.

   The factors under section 16(2) are adequate. However, we suggest that ‘serious or repeated failure by the applicant to comply with any requirement of the Act’ should also specifically stipulate a requirement for the applicant to agree to regular monitoring/ checking of sale products.

5. Should the regulations require applicants to provide details of their involvement in other regulatory regimes, such as alcohol licensing processes?

   Yes – as a minimum requirement.

6. What records should the regulations require licence holders to keep?

   The recording of sales/distribution is a useful approach to monitoring trends in use and significant changes in use by the population. This allows for early detection of public health/prevention needs. Also, allows for early recall of any batches which may be linked to harm (e.g. due to a manufacturing problem or an unexpected adverse effect).

7. How long should licence holders be required to keep records for?

   Licence holders should keep records as the length of time required for any substance which must be recorded in a controlled drugs register under the Misuse of Drugs Regulations – i.e. 4 years.
8. Do you think there are factors or issues that the Authority should consider when setting discretionary conditions? If so, please provide details.

When setting discretionary conditions, the Authority should consider the following:
- trading hours: increased access equates to increased harm & risk of dependence. Trading hours should be restricted
- outlets: Should not be in close proximity to geographical areas linked with vulnerable population sub-groups — e.g. schools, and health provider services, especially, services for mental health and addiction problems.

9. Should the regulations prescribe other matters the Authority must take into account when deciding on an application? If yes, what should these matters be?

Authorities should take into account limiting the number of outlets in an area.

10. Do you agree a product approval application should include information on proposed manufacturing methods and how they will comply with the Psychoactive Substances Code of Manufacturing Practice?

Yes

11. Do you think any further particulars, information, documents or other material should be prescribed in the regulations? If yes, what should these be?

Other information should include adverse effects.

12. Do you agree with the proposal that the regulations require applications to contain information and data on the toxicity, pharmacology and related clinical effects of the psychoactive substance they are seeking approval for?

Yes. This information should be a minimum requirement.

13. Do you agree with the proposal that the regulations require product approval applications to contain information and data on:
- the psychoactive potential and related behavioural effects of the substance
- the addictive potential
- the proposed directions for use
- previous use, including use in clinical trials and in the wider population?

Yes. This information should be a minimum requirement.

14. Are the proposed requirements and restrictions on labelling sufficient? If not, please make specific suggestions for further requirements and restrictions.

The proposed requirements and restrictions on labelling are not sufficient. We propose that labels must list all major ingredients and their quantity (not just the active ingredients).
15 Are the proposed requirements relating to health warnings sufficient? If not, please make specific suggestions for further requirements (for example, advice on what to do in the case of an overdose).

Not sufficient.

We suggest that health warnings should specify inclusions:

- If analogs of the substance have been found to cause dependence, a statement around potential for dependence (as was proposed for over the counter codeine preparations) - i.e. “this substance may cause addiction/dependence in some people”
- advice on who to contact/what to do in case of overdose or if use is escalating;
- advice on risk of harm related to its use in specific population sub-groups considered to be at higher risk of related harm – e.g. individuals with comorbid mental health problems and pregnancy or breastfeeding

16 Are the proposed packaging requirements and restrictions sufficient? If not, please make specific suggestions for further requirements.

The proposed packaging requirements are adequate. We suggest that the package insert should also include information equivalent to that which would be found in a medicine package insert – e.g. what to do in the case of overdose; contraindications; potential drug interactions; adverse effects; how to access help; storage; list of excipients (ingredients); etc.

17 Do you agree with the proposal to restrict a packet to one dose? Please give reasons for your answer.

Agree.

Restricting sales to one dose decreases the likelihood of toxicity, development of tolerance and development of dependence.

We also suggest restricting the amount of doses (packets) an individual can buy.

18 Do you agree with the proposal that a dose, in whatever form the product takes, is split wherever possible?

Agree.

Splitting the dose wherever possible reduces the risk of toxicity and risk of accidental childhood poisoning.
19 Do you think there should be restrictions on the form products can take? If so, what forms do you think should and shouldn't be allowed?

The harm related to dosage forms is a complex issue and not easily addressed in such a forum. The following issues should be considered:

* **Injectable products** carry a high risk of harm and should be restricted.

* Any *smokeable form* is likely to be found to be carcinogenic in the long term (for example there is evidence that cannabis is a causal risk factor in some cancers). Cigarette smoking carries the greatest global burden of disease of any abused substance because it is legal, used by large numbers of people and primarily used in a smoked form. Smokeable forms are also more reinforcing due to their rapid onset of effect.

  From a pharmacokinetic perspective the form with the least likelihood to cause harm is the *oral form* because it will have a slower onset of action and lower peak blood levels so will be less likely to cause toxicity and less reinforcing. However oral forms may be misused by taking large amounts whilst awaiting the onset of the drug, or injected. The former may be mitigated by restrictions on the number of doses which can be purchased at a time. One possibility is to regulate that oral forms must be in formulations which are not easily or readily injected, but this must be balanced against the potential harm if products are injected despite such formulations.

* **Sublingual or buccal forms** (e.g. gum) allow the user to titrate to effect because of rapid onset of effect – but are more likely to be reinforcing due to rapid effect. These are a less harmful alternative to smoked forms.

* **Vapourised forms** may also be a less harmful alternative to smoked forms, but long term effects, for example on respiratory function, are largely unknown.

* **Transdermal forms** may increase risk of harm as they form a tissue depot of drug which is not readily removed in the event of adverse effects. They may also be easily tampered with for injection.

We suggest that the issues related to dosage forms are discussed in a separate forum.

20 Do you think there should be restrictions or requirements on the storage of psychoactive substances? If so, what should the restrictions or requirements be?

* Yes.

  Restrictions should be as for medicines – i.e. temperature regulated and sanitary premises.

  There should also be consideration given to regulating the security of storage.

21 Do you think restrictions or requirements should be set for the storage of approved products? If so, what should they be?

* Yes.

  Restrictions should be as for medicines and should stipulate required level of security of storage.
22 Do you think restrictions or requirements should be set regarding the display of approved products? If so, what should they be?

Yes.

Restrictions should be as for tobacco.

(Smokefree environments act 1990, sect 23A)

A person who offers tobacco products for sale (whether by retail or wholesale) must not allow any part of a tobacco product, tobacco package, or tobacco carton at the outside of or inside the person’s place of business to be for any reason visible—

• (a) from outside the place; or
• (b) from an area inside the place to which members of the public are allowed access.

23 Do you think restrictions or requirements should be set regarding the disposal of approved products? If so, what should they be?

Yes.

Restrictions should be as for tobacco.

24 Do you think there should be signage requirements in the regulations? If so, please give specific suggestions.

Yes.

Restrictions should be as for tobacco.

25 Do you think the regulations should specify further places where approved products may not be sold? If so, please provide specific suggestions.

Yes.

Approved products should not be sold at:

outlets in close proximity to geographical areas linked with vulnerable population sub-groups —e.g. schools, and health provider services, especially, services for mental health and addiction problems.

Authorities should also restrict the proximity of outlets. The higher the density of outlets, the higher the related harm.

26 Do you think the regulations should prescribe restrictions or requirements for advertisements of approved products? If so, please provide specific suggestions.

Yes.

• Regulations should be comparable to those for tobacco advertisements
• The use of direct marketing via social and other media should be regulated. There is evidence that alcohol companies are currently using such media to directly market to youth.
27 Do you think the regulations should prescribe restrictions or requirements on internet sales of approved products? If so, please provide specific suggestions.

Yes.

Authorities should restrict internet sales to a maximal number of doses per sale/in a specified timeframe (e.g. number of doses to same person in 24 hours) and require proof that the purchaser is over 18.

NB: The sale of alcohol via the internet has been recently shown to be a less than robust process with respect to ensuring the age of the purchaser. We suggest that sales of psychoactive substances online require a pre first purchase validation process which involves the purchaser attending in person to the retailer and providing adequate identification. Once identification is validated their online authority may be activated. (This would be similar to online banking, inland revenue and other secure online processes).

28 Do you think the regulations should prescribe restrictions or requirements on the advertising of approved products? If so, please provide specific suggestions.

Yes.

Products should not be marketed as products linked with ‘fun’ and ‘recreation’ — e.g. party pills, There should be no association with sexual imagery or conferred increase in sexual attractiveness, and there should be no use of sporting or other (e.g. entertainment) ‘heroes’ to market products. (Similar to voluntary code for alcohol advertising — “marketing should not imply a connection with business, sporting, sexual or social success”)

29 Do you agree with the proposed fees for the different licences? If not, please provide specific suggestions.

Yes.

30 Do you support a fixed fee or an hourly charge for processing applications for product approvals?

Yes.

31 Should fees be set for other specific functions? If yes, please state what they should be set for.

Yes – fees should contribute to funding harm reduction activities with vulnerable population sub-groups at higher risk of harm from psychoactive products.

32 Do you agree with the proposed list of items and process for setting levies? If not, please provide specific suggestions.

Yes.

However, levies should also be used to fund harm reduction activities with vulnerable population sub-groups at higher risk of harm from psychoactive products.
This submission was completed through a process of consultation with the leadership team at CADS Auckland. In particular, acknowledgment to be given to Dr. Grant Christie (Consultant Psychiatrist, Altered High, CADS); Sheridan Pooley (CADS Regional Consumer Advisor); Dr. Vicki Macfarlane (Clinical Lead, Detoxification Services, CADS), Dr Zelda Strydom (Clinical Lead, Auckland Opioid Treatment Service), Adrian Gray (Medical Officer, Auckland Opioid Treatment Service), Carina Walters (Senior Addictions Pharmacist).

This submission was completed by: Dr. Susanna Galea & Robert Steenhuisen on behalf of CADS Auckland, Waitemata District Health Board

Address: 50, Pitman House, Carrington Road, Point Chevalier,

Auckland.

Email: susanna.galea@waitematadhb.govt.nz

Organisation (if applicable): Community Alcohol & Drug Services

Position (if applicable): Clinical Director & Regional Manager

Submitting this as a treatment provider.

We would like to receive updates about the development of the psychoactive substances regulations.

Your submission may be requested under the Official Information Act 1982. If this happens, the Ministry of Health will release your submission to the person who requested it. However, if you are submitting as an individual (rather than representing an organisation), the Ministry will remove your personal details from the submission if you tick the following boxes. I would like to confirm that I am happy with the above.

Kind regards,

Dr. Susanna Galea
Service Clinical Director
CADS Auckland, WDHB

susanna.galea@waitematadhb.govt.nz
This substance has almost destroyed my son he has been in ward 17 tauranga psyc ward ... I don't know if we will ever get him back ... I've had to grieve for his loss of potential as he was a magnetic young man now he is just a shell .. I have faith that he will be healed but please stop this poison being sold in our country !!!!!

Sent from my iPhone
My 21 year old son and nephews consume this crap and are having huge psychological effects on their moral and ethical compass, which has deteriorated in the past two years. Now my nephew is vomiting.

Who turns a blind eye to so many parents concerned about their children and this terrible Whanau destroying drug.

It's a sin to turned a blind eye to the legalisation if this drug

Sent from my iPhone
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https://www.facebook.com/pages/Ban-Synthetic-Cannabis-Nz-Wide/14160120486548859
look at all these testimonies on how many lives this dangerous substance is effecting.

Sent from my iPhone
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Ban synthetic drugs in nz..save our young generation..these drugs are the worst and yet government allow them to be legal!!!!our own green is sooo much safer!!!!and no i do not do drugs just nurse peeps that have!!!BAN BAN BAN
Hi,

I'm writing in the hopes to get this horrible stuff banned from NZ.

I cannot believe this stuff is legal in a civilised country like New Zealand. It is so dangerous, and I personally have experienced this.

My partner and I smoked this for about 4 months until we started to notice it was afecting our relationship and making us both unhappy. Suddenly I was anxious all the time, and my partner started to become very depressed. We both didn't feel like ourselves. We both stopped and feel so much better for it.

My partner's friend has recently just killed himself, and started smoking this 3 months prior to his death. He has no history of mental illness, and had started hearing things. His mum, has been in the newspaper trying to get support from the public. If anybody should be supporting her, it should be the government, especially the Ministry of Health. How can this be legal? Even counsellors are telling teenagers to smoke marijuana rather than this stuff!

It needs to be illegal. It's ridiculous.

Thanks.
Regulations Consultation
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Please please i am begging you ban ALL of these stupid legals!!!! Do you understand that they are ruining happy family relationships, screwing up how people are thinking and even killing people!!!! Because of these legal highs people are committing suicide hurting themselves and others!!! please please ban all of them FOREVER before more people and families are affected its not fair on them please just imagine if your child was smoking the stuff and had just half of the side effects some of the people had let alone they kill themselves!!! How would you feel???? If your not ready to let YOUR kids smoke it or try it yourself DON'T sell it!!!
Please please listen to all of these emails!!
Sincerely
I realise that a lot of these 'personal says' will be all very very similar. But here is mine.

I'm 21 and working mental health residential as well as child and youth. I also work at a drugs and alcohol company for youth that are being effected working as a mentor. While working with this very challenging job/s, I am also a mother, a partner whom is also smoking this synthetic stuff, that a lot of my clients are smoking, and a student studying a bachelor of health science majoring in rehabilitation.

While being a mother to my two year old daughter, working in two jobs to try keep above the poverty line (which is very hard considering all my partners pay is going on this synthetic smoke and rent at the end of the fortnight we have no money spare sometimes no food), I am also caring for my partner because he is hooked on this synthetic smoke and is progressing psychotic episodes of seeing people. Talking to people. Having fits. Sweating. Not being able to function to the point that he can no longer play rugby due to if he has another 'big hit' big tackle he will likely become a vegetable. My partner represented nz in rugby league a numerous of times then went to Australia and played for the Maori team over there as well as being in the top team in the state to represent Queensland in rugby league.

I can not believe how long this has been dragging along. Knowing the numbers of inpatient mental ward number increase due to this substance.

I truly believe that this substance needs to become illegal so New Zealand citizens don't all become vegetables and to decriminalise cannabis. I don't smoke either nor have I tried it and don't plan to but I think for cannabis to become decriminalised will help patients ease off the synthetics. I know this as a personal note through my partner and family that cannabis works until it runs out.

But hey. I guess at the end of the day. It doesn't matter what us New Zealanders that are suffering say it's you guys that can make the difference and have the power at the end of the day. And with john key in the high chair money will be all that he thinks about.
Destroy the demand for synthetic drugs... legalise the real deal and regulate it, tax it, make medicine, make bags, pants, lip balm, whatever. Educate people properly, don't just tell them it's the equivalent to selling their soul to the devil. Free the leaf that frees the people.

Sincerely,        ...
Making a submission

Submissions close on Friday 21 March 2014 at 5 pm.

Please note: any submissions received after this time will not be included in the analysis of submissions.

Please detach and return this part of the document.

Consultation questions

1. Is the list of proposed information requirements for licence applications comprehensive enough?
   - If not, what else should be required, and why?

2. Should retail licence applications be accompanied by evidence of compliance with a local approved products policy if one is in effect in the applicant's area?
   - Yes

3. Should retail licence applications be accompanied by evidence of compliance with a generic local approved products policy if no policy is in effect in the applicant's area?
   - Yes
4 Are the factors the Authority should take into account when determining whether a licence applicant is a fit and proper person or whether a body corporate is of good repute in section 16(2) enough? The section 16(2) factors are:

- whether the applicant has been convicted of a relevant offence
- whether there has been a serious or repeated failure by the applicant to comply with any requirement of the Act
- whether there are other grounds for considering that the applicant is likely to fail to comply with any requirement of the Act
- any other matter that the Authority considers relevant.

If you think these factors are not enough, please give examples of additional factors the Authority should consider.

If the applicant has failed any liquor licensing or sale of tobacco regulations should be taken into consideration

5 Should the regulations require applicants to provide details of their involvement in other regulatory regimes, such as alcohol licensing processes?

Yes and that should be taken into consideration as per question 4

6 What records should the regulations require licence holders to keep?

They should display that they are licensed and any breaches of that license should be displayed on the window of the premises.

7 How long should licence holders be required to keep records for?
As per alcohol licensing

8 Do you think there are factors or issues that the Authority should consider when setting discretionary conditions? If so, please provide details.

There should be absolutely no discretionary conditions to allow licensing of psychoactive substances.

9 Should the regulations prescribe other matters the Authority must take into account when deciding on an application? If yes, what should these matters be?

Yes as below:

Regardless of the LAP the public must be able to contest interim or full retail licenses.

Regardless of the LAP the public must be able to request modifications to opening and closing times of interim or full retail licenses.

10 Do you agree a product approval application should include information on proposed manufacturing methods and how they will comply with the Psychoactive Substances Code of Manufacturing Practice?

Yes

11 Do you think any further particulars, information, documents or other material should be prescribed in the regulations? If yes, what should these be?
There should be prescribed Psychoactive Substances licensing officers provided by the Ministry to City Councils and paid for by the industry to enforce compliance of stores_importers_manufacturers.

It is concerning that the MoH has still not defined what is a low risk Psychoactive Substance, public must have input into the definition of “low risk”.

Public must have input into determining whether the product is addictive, if the product is proven to be addictive then it should be banned.

The following short term negative health effects should be independently tested prior to the approval of the product using the same processes as required for the pharmaceutical industry. If any of these short term negative health effects manifest then the product should be banned.

- reduction/loss of cognitive functions
- reduction/loss of organ functions
- reduction/loss of motor functions
- reduction/loss of sense/all five sense
- reduction/loss of control over emotions
- psychosis/depression/agression/paranoia/risk taking/suicidal behaviour
- hallucinations
- hyperactivity/sedentary
- sleeplessness/drowsiness
- increased/decreased appetite

The following long term negative health effects as below which may take decades to manifest. They should be independently tested using long term epidemiology studies with the products being banned should long term health affects occur in the population as a result of these products.

- permanent psychosis/depression/agression/paranoia/risk taking/suicidal behaviour
- premature organ failure
- immunological related illnesses
- cancer
- birth/defective defects

Driving and heavy machinery operation should be illegal when under the influence of a Psychoactive Substance with penalties similar to drunk driving.

The Psychoactive Substance industry must independently fund the development of detection devices of Psychoactive Substances and provide them free of charge so that law enforcement officers, Council officers and Private firms can test individuals.

The Psychoactive Substance industry must independently fund the monitoring of alcohol/illegal drug/Psychoactive Substance usage and rehabilitation.

The Psychoactive Substance industry must independently fund all rehabilitation of Psychoactive Substance users.

The Psychoactive Substance industry must independently fund education to not take Psychoactive Substances.

The Psychoactive Substance industry must independently fund further epidemiological research into the effects of Psychoactive Substance usage on health, crime, social impacts, alcohol and illegal drug usage.

The Psychoactive Substance industry must fund (via targeted taxes) all costs associated with the new regulation regime?

Loss leader pricing should be banned and minimal pricing of Psychoactive Substances applied including all taxes.

The Ministry of Health must be held accountable for any resulting health and social issues from approved Psychoactive Substances and be prepared to immediately ban and fund the solutions.

Do you agree with the proposal that the regulations require applications to contain information and data on the toxicity, pharmacology and related clinical effects of the psychoactive substance they are seeking approval for?
13. Do you agree with the proposal that the regulations require product approval applications to contain information and data on:
   - the psychoactive potential and related behavioural effects of the substance
   - the addictive potential
   - the proposed directions for use
   - previous use, including use in clinical trials and in the wider population?

Yes as per question 11.

14. Are the proposed requirements and restrictions on labelling sufficient? If not, please make specific suggestions for further requirements and restrictions.

Labelling should follow the same as cigarette labelling.

15. Are the proposed requirements relating to health warnings sufficient? If not, please make specific suggestions for further requirements (for example, advice on what to do in the case of an overdose).

Labelling should follow the same as cigarette labelling.
16 Are the proposed packaging requirements and restrictions sufficient? If not, please make specific suggestions for further requirements.

Labelling should follow the same as cigarette labelling.

17 Do you agree with the proposal to restrict a packet to one dose? Please give reasons for your answer.

Yes to minimise overdoses and to ensure appropriate pricing controls.

18 Do you agree with the proposal that a dose, in whatever form the product takes, is split wherever possible?

Yes

19 Do you think there should be restrictions on the form products can take? If so, what forms do you think should and shouldn’t be allowed?

Should not be allowed to inject (break skin) or inhale via cigarettes (as we are trying to ban smoking).
20. Do you think there should be restrictions or requirements on the storage of psychoactive substances? If so, what should the restrictions or requirements be?

Yes as per Cigarette restrictions.

21. Do you think restrictions or requirements should be set for the storage of approved products? If so, what should they be?

Yes as per Cigarette restrictions.

22. Do you think restrictions or requirements should be set regarding the display of approved products? If so, what should they be?

Yes as per Cigarette restrictions.

23. Do you think restrictions or requirements should be set regarding the disposal of approved products? If so, what should they be?

Yes as per illegal drug disposal.
24. Do you think there should be signage requirements in the regulations? If so, please give specific suggestions.

Yes as per Cigarette restrictions.

25. Do you think the regulations should specify further places where approved products may not be sold? If so, please provide specific suggestions.

They should only be sold in specialty stores and far away from residential, schools, community places.

26. Do you think the regulations should prescribe restrictions or requirements for advertisements of approved products? If so, please provide specific suggestions.

Yes as per Cigarette restrictions.

27. Do you think the regulations should prescribe restrictions or requirements on internet sales of approved products? If so, please provide specific suggestions.

Internet sales should not be allowed as this will be impossible to regulate and monitor.
28. Do you think the regulations should prescribe restrictions or requirements on the advertising of approved products? If so, please provide specific suggestions.

Yes as per Cigarette restrictions.

29. Do you agree with the proposed fees for the different licences? If not, please provide specific suggestions.

Fees must be paid for by the industry, no public money use.

30. Do you support a fixed fee or an hourly charge for processing applications for product approvals?

Fees must be paid for by the industry, no public money use.

31. Should fees be set for other specific functions? If yes, please state what they should be set for.

Fees must be paid for by the industry, no public money use.
Do you agree with the proposed list of items and process for setting levies? If not, please provide specific suggestions.

Fees must be paid for by the industry, no public money use.

You do not have to answer all the questions or provide personal information if you do not want to.

This submission was completed by:  (name)

Address:  (street/box number)  (town/city)

Email:

Organisation (if applicable):

Position (if applicable):

Are you submitting this:
(Tick one box only in this section)

☐ as an interim licence holder
☐ a person or body corporate intending to apply for a licence
☒ other (please specify): As a concerned New Zealander who opposes legalisation of psychoactive substances

Do you wish to receive updates about the development of the psychoactive substances regulations?

☒ Yes  ☐ No
(If yes, please make sure you provide an email address.)
Please return only one copy of your submission no later than 5 pm on Friday 21 March to:
The Manager
Psychoactive Substances Regulatory Authority
Ministry of Health
PO Box 5013
WELLINGTON
Email: psychoactives@moh.govt.nz

Alternatively, electronically complete the submission form available at the back of this document, add your comments and email to:
psychoactives@moh.govt.nz

Please put ‘Regulations Consultation’ in the subject line.

Your submission may be requested under the Official Information Act 1982. If this happens, the Ministry of Health will release your submission to the person who requested it. However, if you are submitting as an individual (rather than representing an organisation), the Ministry will remove your personal details from the submission if you tick the following boxes.

☐ I do not give permission for my personal details to be released under the Official Information Act 1982.

☐ I do not give permission for my name to be listed in the published summary of submissions.

X I am fine with all details of my submission being made public
Subject: Regulations Consultation
Abe Gray
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To: psychoactives@moh.govt.nz,

To whom it may concern:

The Aotearoa Legalise Cannabis Party exists to legalise cannabis for recreational, spiritual, medicinal and industrial purposes; to empower people to work together for peace and true justice; and to institute a proper and just balance between the power of the state and the rights and dignity of the individual.

Psychoactive substances regulations exists to give government some measure of control over what substances people use, how they use them, and who uses them.

Cannabis is not regulated. It is prohibited. Paradoxically, in the case of cannabis, prohibition means that cannabis is almost entirely uncontrolled. Nearly everyone who wants to use cannabis does so, including minors. For minors, cannabis is as readily available as alcohol.

Ostensibly, the purpose of cannabis prohibition is harm reduction. The three pillars of harm reduction are supply control, demand reduction and problem limitation. Under prohibition, there is no control of supply of, no reduction in demand for, and no limitation of problems caused by, cannabis.

Government must regulate cannabis if it is to gain any measure of control over who uses cannabis. Regulation is de facto legalisation. For the government and for the cannabis law reform movement, a regulated, taxable market in cannabis is win-win.

Various parties, including the Associate Minister of Health himself, have suggested that substances currently controlled (or not, in the case of cannabis) under the Misuse of Drugs Act might, in future, be controlled under the Psychoactive Substances Act. A simple legislative amendment to the Misuse of Drugs Act removing cannabis from its schedules would immediately bring cannabis under the Psychoactive Substances Act, where its risk of harm could then be assessed against the same standards as will apply to any other psychoactive substance.

There is more than one way to skin a dead cat, and this is not the Aotearoa Legalise Cannabis Party’s preferred pathway to cannabis law reform. However, the Party makes the present submission on the assumption that the future pathway to legal cannabis will be as has just been suggested.

Cannabis is not a substance, nor is it a product. It is a plant, a plant that anyone with a green thumb can grow. Therefore, many of the consultation questions in the supplied consultation document are inapplicable to cannabis. Since we do not have to answer all the questions, we answer only those questions we deem to be relevant.

Our main concerns are “truth in labelling” and appropriate measures to minimise access to cannabis by minors. Hence, the questions we answer below are mainly those concerning labelling and packaging (in Chapter 4 of the consultation document), and place of sale and advertising (in Chapter 5).
14. Are the proposed requirements and restrictions on labelling sufficient?

15. Are the proposed requirements relating to health warnings sufficient? 16. Are the proposed packaging requirements and restrictions sufficient? 17. Do you agree with the proposal to restrict a packet to one dose? Please give reasons for your answer. No. There is no need to restrict the size of a packet of cannabis. Because no one has ever overdosed on cannabis in all of human history. If there must be restriction, the size of a packet of cannabis should be restricted to 1 oz. There is no need for decimalisation.

18. Do you agree with the proposal that a dose, in whatever form the product takes, is split wherever possible?

No. Consumers can do this themselves with scissors or grinders.

19. Do you think there should be restrictions on the form products can take? If so, what forms do you think should and shouldn’t be allowed?

No. Cannabis should be allowed in smokeable, vaporisable, topical and edible forms.

20. Do you think there should be restrictions or requirements on the storage of psychoactive substances? If so, what should the restrictions or requirements be?

See below. (As previously noted, cannabis is neither a substance nor a product. It is a plant, but can be made into a value-added product.

21. Do you think restrictions or requirements should be set for the storage of approved products? If so, what should they be?

Yes. For security purposes, to prevent cannabis from falling into the hands of minors or of thieves who might on-sell to minors, cannabis retailers should store cannabis products under lock and key when not physically present on the retail premises.

22. Do you think restrictions or requirements should be set regarding the display of approved products? If so, what should they be?

Yes. We suggest that such restrictions or set requirements be in line with those applicable to other psychoactive products. Additionally open discussion around public health best practices such as plain packaging must occur, in the context of whatever is publicly acceptable for tobacco and alcohol should also be acceptable for cannabis.

23. Do you think restrictions or requirements should be set regarding the disposal of approved products? If so, what should they be?

Up in smoke. Persons disposing of cannabis must ensure that there are no minors or non-consenting adults downwind of the conflagration.

24. Do you think there should be signage requirements in the regulations? If so, please give specific suggestions.

There should be no signage requirements, but we recommend a stylised cannabis leaf.

25. Do you think the regulations should specify further places where approved products may not be sold? If so, please provide specific suggestions.
We have no special objections to regulations preventing the sale of cannabis near schools or other places where minors might otherwise tend to congregate.

26. Do you think the regulations should prescribe restrictions or requirements for advertisements of approved products? If so, please provide specific suggestions.

We have no special objections to the regulations that currently apply to advertisements for synthetic cannabinoid products also applying to advertisements for cannabis.

27. Do you think the regulations should prescribe restrictions or requirements on internet sales of approved products? If so, please provide specific suggestions.

We have no special objections to the restrictions and requirements that currently apply to Internet sales of synthetic cannabinoid products also applying to Internet sales of cannabis.

28. Do you think the regulations should prescribe restrictions or requirements on the advertising of approved products? If so, please provide specific suggestions.

We have no special objections to the restrictions and requirements that currently apply to the on-site advertising of cannabinoid products also applying to the on-site advertising of cannabis.

In closing, a few words about the fees and levies proposed (in Chapter 6 of the consultation document) and also on determining the risk of harm posed by cannabis.

The ALCP envisages that many commercial suppliers of legal cannabis will be small scale suppliers. The suggested fees and levies in the consultation document would be harshly punitive in the context of "cottage industry" cannabis. They would provide a major disincentive to comply with the regulations, and drive the cultivation and supply of cannabis underground, where it now is, uncontrolled by the government. We suggest that the PSRA sets the fees or levies payable by homegrown commercial cannabis suppliers commensurate with those set by authorities in the State of Colorado.

Cannabis has been tried and tested over several millennia. Risk of harm has already been determined. We know that cannabis poses no more than a very low risk of harm to those who choose to use it.

This submission was completed by Dr. Richard Goode, Vice President of the Aotearoa Legalise Cannabis Party, on its behalf.
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From: Abe Gray
To: psychoactives@moh.govt.nz,

To whom it may concern,

Please amend paragraph 10 of our submission as follows:

14. Are the proposed requirements and restrictions on labelling sufficient?
   Yes

15. Are the proposed requirements relating to health warnings sufficient?
   Yes

16. Are the proposed packaging requirements and restrictions sufficient?
   Yes

17. Do you agree with the proposal to restrict a packet to one dose? Please give reasons for your answer.

   No. There is no need to restrict the size of a packet of cannabis. Because no one has ever overdosed on cannabis in all of human history. If there must be restriction, the size of a packet of cannabis should be restricted to 1 oz. There is no need for decimalisation.

   Sorry about the formatting confusion. Thank you very much.

Sincerely,
Abe Gray
Deputy Leader
Aotearoa Legalise Cannabis Party
17 March 2014

The Manager
Psychoactive Substances Regulatory Authority
Ministry of Health
PO Box 5013
Wellington 6145

By email: psychoactives@moh.govt.nz

Dear Sirs,

Submission – Psychoactive Substances Regulations: A consultation document

The Wanganui District Council Youth Committee welcomes the release of this consultation document as the issue of psychoactive substances is one of much interest and concern within our community. We thank the Ministry of Health for providing this opportunity to comment on and provide input into the development of the psychoactive substances regulations.

Background

Established in 2006 by the Wanganui District Council the Youth Committee comprises 18 young people aged between 12-24 years who have been selected to ‘speak up and be heard’ on behalf of the youth in the Wanganui District.

Within the Wanganui District there are approximately 8,000 young people aged between 12-24 years; and 9,000 between 0-15 years. Just as the wider Wanganui community is diverse so too are the demographics of the young people living within the Wanganui District.

The purpose of the Committee is to:
1. Represent young people of the Wanganui District;
2. Develop a strategic direction for youth within the Wanganui District;
3. Promote opportunities for youth participation;
4. Develop and monitor policy on youth issues;
5. Provide opportunities for youth to contribute to the Council’s decision-making; and
6. Advise the Council on matters of interest for youth within the Wanganui District.

Since its formation eight years ago past and present Youth Councillors have worked extremely hard to develop both the role and voice of the Youth Committee within the community and Council. This hard work and diligence is recognised by the Wanganui District Council within its official committee structure and has undoubtedly provided a positive influence across the community. Council Officers engage
directly with the Youth Committee and its members are recognised as credible advisors for many policies, projects and initiatives.

In 2012 the Committee was recognised as the best Youth Committee in New Zealand at the ‘Youth in Local Government Conference’ Awards in the category ‘Engaging young people in local/regional government affairs.’

This submission is based on the collaborative views of the young people that make up the 2014 Wanganui District Council Youth Committee.

OUR SUBMISSION:

• Licence applications

The Wanganui District Council Youth Committee support the proposal that all potential licence applicants provide the Regulatory Authority with their residential and mailing address, email address, date of birth, gender, and any other names the applicant may be known by as part of their application; all of which to be confirmed by a Statutory Declaration. The Youth Committee also support the proposal that all applicants undergo a NZ Police check. As part of the police check, or as part of the application process each applicant should be required to advise the appropriate authority of any other licences they may currently hold, or have held in the past along with details of how long they held such a licence and notice of any infringements, suspensions etc., such information is particularly relevant when considering whether the applicant is a ‘fit and proper’ person.

As part of the application process we support the proposal that a Ministry of Health official should inspect the proposed premises of a retail outlet for the sale of psychoactive substances before a licence is granted. However, we believe that in addition to an initial pre-licence inspection there should also be an impromptu (un-notified) inspection of every such premises every six-nine months.

Further, the Youth Committee agree that there should be a statutory duty placed upon all successful licence applicants making them personally responsible to ensure that the Psychoactive Substances Regulatory Authority (“Authority”) always has their current contact details on file.

The Youth Committee believe it is essential that with respect to any retail licence application the applicant must provide evidence that the proposed retail premises complies with the local authorities Local Approved Products Policy (“LAPP”). As not all local authorities will develop their own LAPP, the Youth Committee also strongly endorse the proposal that the Ministry of Health develop a generic local policy which can be applied to all retail licence applications in connection with communities who do not have a LAPP.

Furthermore, as so many local authorities are in the process of developing LAPPs which will be in place before the retail regulations are operational the Youth Committee believe it is essential that the Authority provide local government with urgent guidance as to what process should be followed in the event that the premises for which interim retail licences have been granted are not within a LAPPs designated area.

• Record keeping

As a Youth Committee we believe that all retailers of psychoactive substances should keep sufficiently detailed records so that it can be readily identified that the amount of product brought by the retailer is equal to the amount of product sold. Such records should be kept for seven years.
• **Display of licence**

The Youth Committee supports the proposal that all licences with respect to psychoactive substances must be displayed in a prominent place within the premises; however, it is important that the placement of the licence should not in effect be ‘de facto’ advertising. Further, as a Committee we believe that it is important that the licence also display whether or not the retailer will also be selling these products via the internet.

• **Restricted trading hours**

As a Youth Committee we strongly support restricting the hours in which retailers can legally sell such products. We believe that the retail selling of psychoactive products should only occur during school hours (9am – 3pm) so that the exposure of such products to school students is restricted. Further, we believe that during public holidays and school holidays such products should not be permitted to be sold. In line with this, we believe that it should be mandatory that all psychoactive product retailers must check an appropriate form of ID before selling such products and that some form of tick box be filled out/completed upon a sales docket to confirm that this was done.

• **Labelling and packaging**

The Wanganui District Council Youth Committee believes that the information suggested within the consultation document to be listed in a prominent position on psychoactive substance product labels are sufficient. We believe it is crucial that clear information especially with respect to toxicity and pharmacological effects be prominently displayed.

• **Health warnings**

We believe that a generic health warning about psychoactive products should be on the outside of every psychoactive product with a specific insert included for each product sold detailing the specific details of that product. Such information would include clearly setting out the number of doses contained in that packet (if more than one), the maximum amount of product to use at any one time and over a 24 hour period, the toxicity of the products, a list of the products active ingredients and the amount thereof, the name of the manufacturer and the phone number for the National Poisons Centre.

With respect to ‘smokeable’ products we support the idea that regulations be enacted to ensure that smokeable psychoactive substance products mirror current statutory regulations with respect to tobacco products. Additionally, where local authorities have ‘smokefree’ tobacco policies and bylaws, these should be extended to capture smokeable psychoactive products. However, smokeable psychoactive products should not capture ‘incense’ type products.

• **Storage**

All psychoactive substance products sold via a retail outlet should be stored behind the counter of the premises in opaque or solid cupboards and / or drawers.

As a Youth Committee we also believe that there should be a limit to the amount of product a retail licence holder can purchase from a wholesaler at any one time and that there should be a corresponding limit on the amount of product which is allowed to be kept on a retail premises at any one time.

• **Generally**

We are grateful for the opportunity to have our voice heard with respect to such an important issue affecting our community, and while not addressed in the consultation document we feel we would be
remiss if we did not bring to the Ministries attention our belief that some sort of sales tax should be imposed on these products. Currently, there is no mechanism in place to ensure that a percentage of the monies earned from the sale of these products are returned to the community via community programmes to ensure that the social and health effects and impacts are mitigated.

Yours sincerely


Yth Cr Renee Harrison  
Co-Deputy Chair  
On behalf of the Wanganui District Council Youth Committee


Yth Cr Amaan Merchant  
Co-Deputy Chair  
On behalf of the Wanganui District Council Youth Committee
21 March 2014

Attention: The Manager
Psychoactive Substances Regulatory Authority
Ministry of Health
PO Box 5013
WELLINGTON 6011

To Whom It May Concern

Subject: TDCs Submission on the Psychoactive Substances Regulations: A consultation document

Thank you for the opportunity to submit on the above mentioned consultation document.

Due to the timing of this request the points made are senior officers' comments and our elected representatives will not be able to consider fully this submission until its Taupō District Council (Council) meeting in late April 2014. If there are amendments I will advise you accordingly.

Council supports the community's overwhelming opposition to shops selling these 'legal highs' and recommends that these be banned. Although we recognise that this consultation document is about the regulations, Council still recognises the need to represent our community's opposition regarding these inherently harmful products.

Since Council has very few responsibilities or enforcement powers under the Act we have chosen to comment only on the questions related directly to us. Council does however note that many of the recommended proposals relating to the licence applications would be of benefit.

Council supports any delay in the implementation of the regulations, particularly those related to the Local Approved Products Policy (LAPPs), that assist small councils like us.

Council is concerned at the lack of opportunities for community say under the Act. The new alcohol reforms were developed to allow greater say from communities into the sale and supply of alcohol, in contrast this Act provides very little opportunity for community input. We feel that this lack of community input might be appropriately considered with the development of further regulation at a national level. The need for more community participation is evidenced by the number of submissions councils are receiving around the country on the development of their draft LAPPs.

Reference: A1235342
The Review Questions that Council wishes to comment on:

Q2 Should retail licence applications be accompanied by evidence of compliance with a local approved products policy if one is in effect in the applicant's area?
Council supports the onus of responsibility on the applicant and would support a statutory declaration from the applicant that they meet any local approved product policy (LAPP) rather than council.

Q3 Should retail licence applications be accompanied by evidence of compliance with a generic LAPP if no policy is in effect in the applicant's area?
Council supports the development of a generic LAPP. Council believes that a nationally developed LAPP by the Ministry of Health (the Ministry) would lead to consistency across the country, and would not lead to councils being overly restrictive and transferring the problem to their neighbours. Council supports LGNZs offer of assistance in developing the generic LAPP.
However, Council is concerned with the lack of any detail associated with the generic LAPP and would like to be included in any further consultation on its development.

Q25 Do you think the regulations should specify further places where approved products may not be sold? Council supports regulating where approved products cannot be sold. Council also supports restrictions on the retail outlets ensuring that the outlets are not attractive in any way, for example limiting the range of products and opening hours, and making them specialist shops.

Again, Council would like to thank the Ministry for the opportunity to submit on the consultation document.

If you require further information, please contact Jane Budge, ddi (07) 376-0369.

Kind regards

Rob Williams
Chief Executive

Reference: A1235342
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From:
To: <psychoactives@moh.govt.nz>,

TO WHOM IT MAY CONCERN:

My submission regarding psychoactives is AGAINST having this interim law CHANGED TO legalised law.

There is so much misery and mental health issues around users taking this addictive poison the government should STOP the sale of this legal high. Why would this government allow this poison to be sold knowing all these chemicals contained in this product are causing so much harm TO OUR people of NZ.

My goodness just read all the sad stories shared on face book “Ban Synthetic Cannabis in Nz” or Let’s Ban Synthetic Cannabis in Taupo or any of these Ban Synthetic Face Pages how much misery and mental health issues are out there. I am not and never have taken this drug but I want it taken off the market and completely removed from our country. If anything Legalise Marajuana its natural product and not a chemical, and no I am not a user. I care about the future of our young ones as it affects the development of their brain, so please remove this poison. BECAUSE YOU ARE SAYING ITS LEGAL OUR YOUNG THINK IT’S OK. BECAUSE IT’S SO EASY TO ACCESS AT THE SHOP THEY THINK IT’S OK. BUT IT’S NOT OK.

Until you or someone you love or know becomes a user and is suffering then you will feel the hurt and concern I am trying to express.

Please listen to what is being said, NOT THE MIGHTY $$$$$$ being made from this poison.

Regards
Making a submission

Submissions close on Friday 21 March 2014 at 5 pm.

Please note: any submissions received after this time will not be included in the analysis of submissions.

Please detach and return this part of the document.

Consultation questions

1. Is the list of proposed information requirements for licence applications comprehensive enough?
   If not, what else should be required, and why?
   Yes – we believe the details proposed are sufficient.

2. Should retail licence applications be accompanied by evidence of compliance with a local approved products policy if one is in effect in the applicant’s area?
   Yes – we believe they the retail applications should be accompanied with evidence to demonstrate compliance with a Local Approved Products Policy (LAAP).

3. Should retail licence applications be accompanied by evidence of compliance with a generic local approved products policy if no policy is in effect in the applicant’s area?
   Yes – we believe they the retail applications should be accompanied with evidence to demonstrate compliance with a generic LAPP or with the general legislation, in absence of a generic LAPP.
Are the factors the Authority should take into account when determining whether a licence applicant is a fit and proper person or whether a body corporate is of good repute in section 16(2) enough? The section 16(2) factors are:

- whether the applicant has been convicted of a relevant offence
- whether there has been a serious or repeated failure by the applicant to comply with any requirement of the Act
- whether there are other grounds for considering that the applicant is likely to fail to comply with any requirement of the Act
- any other matter that the Authority considers relevant.

If you think these factors are not enough, please give examples of additional factors the Authority should consider.

Additional factors necessary are:

- Whether the applicant has previous history in regards to importing and their compliance records;
- Whether the applicant has had previous history relating to alcohol licensing processes or similar.

Should the regulations require applicants to provide details of their involvement in other regulatory regimes, such as alcohol licensing processes?

Yes we believe the applicant should provide these details, particularly regarding alcohol licensing and gambling, in particular pokies and TAB’s.

What records should the regulations require licence holders to keep?
License holders should keep records of sales including quantity of products received and distributed. In addition license numbers should be noted on every transaction of the seller and purchaser.

Records need to be kept for a number of reasons, two important factors that are important to consider are ensuring compliance of legal obligations and health risks and monitoring. There have been no long term studies done on the safety of these products. The documentation including batch numbers (linking back to ingredients and processing methods) and numbers of people purchasing these products could be of great value to us in the years to come.

- Manufacturers: Batch numbers including ingredients and processes of manufacture.
- Records set up so that the Batch numbers can be followed through from manufacturer to retailer.
- Retail: Record the number of units per individual buyer so that potential illegal on selling can be assessed. (IE. if large numbers are being purchased in one transaction this could flag up to authorities that there is a potential on selling issue in the community. This would be particularly vital if our submission that sales be limited to one dose is not accepted.
- Retail: Time of sale so that the local authorities can monitor clusters of sales with regard to future legislation on opening hours. This could also help identify if school children are making purchases on route to and from school.
- Retail: Record which document was observed when checking Identification to ensure correct age. IE. Drivers Licence (this will help to focus the minds of licence holders to be checking ID to ensure that age restrictions are adhered to).
- Retail: Age bracket of purchasers 18-24 then over 25. (The Dunedin Longitudinal study has proven through their research that adolescent brains are affected differently by alcohol and marijuana use than adult fully developed brains-reference to The Brainwave Trust www.brainwave.org.nz. It will be important to have a record of adolescent consumption so that we can use this later to look at health issues and compare that to consumption in adolescents.

7 How long should licence holders be required to keep records for?

It is important to have these records available for at least 15 years so that the information can be used in the future, as the long-term health implications of these products are unknown and must be monitored. Batch numbers need to be included so that the data can be linked with the product ingredients and processing methods.

8 Do you think there are factors or issues that the Authority should consider when setting discretionary conditions? If so, please provide details.

We believe that the licence must be displayed on the premises at all times.

There should be a requirement to have security at distribution centres/warehouses, in addition to a restriction of any signage for such premises.

We further submit that additional issues that should be considered include issues for smaller towns and communities, as in larger towns it may be easier to reduce the exposure to young and vulnerable people in the community. In smaller towns this is much harder to do.

Smaller towns and communities also often have less social support services in place to assist with issues that may arise from addiction to these substances.

The Authority should be mindful of this when considering issuing licences in smaller communities.

Please refer to #9 for what details.
Should the regulations prescribe other matters the Authority must take into account when deciding on an application? If yes, what should these matters be?

Considerations as above (#8) - does the community that the products are to be sold in have free drug and alcohol social support services?

Concerns for smaller rural communities: Is the community equipped to manage the fallout from the consumption of these products? In our community, we have seen ambulance officers attacked. Also theft and burglary in an attempt to get money to purchase these drugs. Does the community have a police station on hand within ten kilometres?

In our community we have seen young people having seizures when using these products; does the community have a police station and medical support on hand within ten kilometres?

Is there a family violence agency in the community to support families that may be being threatened or manipulated by an addict in an attempt to elicit money for drug purchases? (This has been in issue in our community in 2014.)

If answers to the above are 'no,' then there should be some mechanism to allow those communities to further restrict or even ban sales of psycho-active substances.

Do you agree a product approval application should include information on proposed manufacturing methods and how they will comply with the Psychoactive Substances Code of Manufacturing Practice?

Yes we agree with this practice.

Do you think any further particulars, information, documents or other material should be prescribed in the regulations? If yes, what should these be?

The on-going monitoring, inspection and enforcement of manufacturing methods as described above, with an associated fee regime. Any such regime must be enforced and the costs of doing so imposed on the manufacturer.

Do you agree with the proposal that the regulations require applications to contain information and data on the toxicity, pharmacology and related clinical effects of the psychoactive substance they are seeking approval for?
13 Do you agree with the proposal that the regulations require product approval applications to contain information and data on:
- the psychoactive potential and related behavioural effects of the substance
- the addictive potential
- the proposed directions for use
- previous use, including use in clinical trials and in the wider population?

Yes we agree with the details sought, however request that this is detailed in plain English.

14 Are the proposed requirements and restrictions on labelling sufficient? If not, please make specific suggestions for further requirements and restrictions.

Yes we agree with the details sought, however request that this is detailed in plain English / commonly used language.

15 Are the proposed requirements relating to health warnings sufficient? If not, please make specific suggestions for further requirements (for example, advice on what to do in the case of an overdose).

We believe that the wording of the warnings are:
- too long and not plain English
- Need to include to consume them at your own risk
- There needs to be details regarding what is in the product
- The packaging of these products should be bland e.g. brown packaging and black writing. This should be along the same lines as plain packaging of cigarettes legislation
- Need to be clear that usage it not for anyone under 18 years
16 Are the proposed packaging requirements and restrictions sufficient? If not, please make specific suggestions for further requirements.

Yes – but we would also submit that they should be plain/bland packaging as per plain packaging cigarette legislation.

17 Do you agree with the proposal to restrict a packet to one dose? Please give reasons for your answer.

Yes – as we believe that this provides the consumer with the information necessary as to what can be safely consumed (according to the Authority). Providing multiple doses in one packet could encourage their over-use and is not seen as a way to minimise harm.

18 Do you agree with the proposal that a dose, in whatever form the product takes, is split wherever possible?

We agree with this proposal, as it is one dose split into smaller proportions. Therefore a consumer can take ½ dose and monitor side effects better. If they take a whole dose and have a negative reaction the effects and reactions can be overwhelming for them and others around them. They would still be buying one dose but it would be split in 2 or 4.

19 Do you think there should be restrictions on the form products can take? If so, what forms do you think should and shouldn’t be allowed?

Yes – we believe these products should be restricted to pill format only. If the government’s aim is to create Smoke Free NZ by 2025, we would have to question why a new and even more damaging form of smoking would be legalised? Especially when no one knows the effects of passive smoking of these substances.
20 Do you think there should be restrictions or requirements on the storage of psychoactive substances? If so, what should the restrictions or requirements be?

Yes – we submit that the storage amounts should be minimal e.g. no more than 10 doses of a type, and no more than 10 types per premise’s i.e. 100 doses.

This is to minimise the likelihood of theft from the premises and minimise the harm if it does occur.

21 Do you think restrictions or requirements should be set for the storage of approved products? If so, what should they be?

Yes – we submit that the storage amounts should be minimal e.g. no more than 10 doses of a type, and no more than 10 types per premise’s i.e. 100 doses.

Also, these should not be visible to the public, should be securely locked, and potentially have some type of minimal temperature control to ensure the chemicals contained are not damaged (the chemist could set limits that would make sense).

22 Do you think restrictions or requirements should be set regarding the display of approved products? If so, what should they be?

We do not believe that the products should be on visible display within the premises e.g. similar to the constraints of tobacco.

23 Do you think restrictions or requirements should be set regarding the disposal of approved products? If so, what should they be?

Yes – these should be treated in a similar manner as a hazardous substance, as if this are not disposed of carefully, they could create a significant hazard to someone who finds them e.g. child.
24 Do you think there should be signage requirements in the regulations? If so, please give specific suggestions.

We believe that signage should not be permitted on or in these premises, to advertise the sale of these products. To minimise harm from these products, especially for those with addiction problems, we need to minimise their visibility. Word-of-mouth will mean people know where to find them. If communities are not being allowed to choose to outright ban them, they should at least have the opportunity to minimise their impact through minimised publicity.

25 Do you think the regulations should specify further places where approved products may not be sold? If so, please provide specific suggestions.

Yes – we believe that the restrictions should state that premises selling these products should not be within 200 metres of licensed premises, TAB, school, bus stop, residential area, dairy, youth club, church or sports venues (i.e. where children congregate).

Furthermore such premises should be no more than 10 kilometres from a hospital or a doctor’s surgery or a pharmacy and no more than 10 kilometres from a 24-hour manned police station. (Rural, small communities are vulnerable when it comes to problems that arise from substance abuse and addiction. To reduce the risk of harm in communities where access to medical help and police are limited or take longer to reach them.)

Only be sold from retail outlets specifically restricted to selling legal highs. This would prevent casual purchases by people who initially head to a shop to buy stamps, groceries, books or whatever. It makes such purchase a deliberate choice, easily visible to the wider community.

26 Do you think the regulations should prescribe restrictions or requirements for advertisements of approved products? If so, please provide specific suggestions.

We agree with the proposed restrictions in the Act and would submit that whilst this includes the internet, to avoid doubt, the use of social media should also be prohibited.

27 Do you think the regulations should prescribe restrictions or requirements on internet sales of approved products? If so, please provide specific suggestions.
Yes – we submit that the restrictions should include internet sales, including those only used for the sale of such products.

28 Do you think the regulations should prescribe restrictions or requirements on the advertising of approved products? If so, please provide specific suggestions.

We submit that advertising should not be permitted on-site i.e. it is stored in a manner that it cannot be seen by the customer. And no signage at all either within the premises, on the external walls/windows of the premise or sandwich board.

29 Do you agree with the proposed fees for the different licences? If not, please provide specific suggestions.

We believe the cost appear reasonable if the above caveats re-marketing restrictions, monitoring and enforcement costs etc are put in place.

If not, then the costs should go up considerably as the community will be paying far more for the downsides of allowing the sale of the psychoactive substances.

If the community has to pay those costs, the people producing and marketing the products should pay considerably higher upfront fees for the opportunity to profit at the community’s costs.

30 Do you support a fixed fee or an hourly charge for processing applications for product approvals?

We believe that a combination of a minimum application fee and an hourly fee on top for processing if complicated or inadequately prepared applications require this is to ensure the community is not cross subsidising potential producers.

31 Should fees be set for other specific functions? If yes, please state what they should be set for.
Fees should be set for specific functions and should reflect the work involved i.e. recover costs of the service.

Other functions that should have a specific fee prescribed include ongoing monitoring of effects, inspection of production facilities, and if necessary, enforcement costs.

32 Do you agree with the proposed list of items and process for setting levies? If not, please provide specific suggestions.

Yes, agree

You do not have to answer all the questions or provide personal information if you do not want to.

This submission was completed by:  (name) Lee Webster
Address:  (street/box number) 10 Gorge Road
           (town/city) Queenstown
Email:  Lee.webster@qldc.govt.nz
Organisation (if applicable): Queenstown Lakes District Council
Position (if applicable): Manager: Regulatory

Are you submitting this:
(Tick one box only in this section)

☐ as an interim licence holder
☐ a person or body corporate intending to apply for a licence
X ☐ other (please specify): On behalf of Queenstown Lakes District Council

Do you wish to receive updates about the development of the psychoactive substances regulations?

☐ Yes ☐ No

(If yes, please make sure you provide an email address.)

Please return only one copy of your submission no later than 5 pm on Friday 21 March to:
The Manager
Psychoactive Substances Regulatory Authority
Ministry of Health  
PO Box 5013  
WELLINGTON  
Email: psychoactives@moh.govt.nz

Alternatively, electronically complete the submission form available at the back of this document, add your comments and email to:  
psychoactives@moh.govt.nz

Please put 'Regulations Consultation' in the subject line.

Your submission may be requested under the Official Information Act 1982. If this happens, the Ministry of Health will release your submission to the person who requested it. However, if you are submitting as an individual (rather than representing an organisation), the Ministry will remove your personal details from the submission if you tick the following boxes.

☐ I do not give permission for my personal details to be released under the Official Information Act 1982.

☐ I do not give permission for my name to be listed in the published summary of submissions.
Making a submission

Submissions close on Friday 21 March 2014 at 5 pm.

Please note: any submissions received after this time will not be included in the analysis of submissions.

Please detach and return this part of the document.

Consultation questions

1. Is the list of proposed information requirements for licence applications comprehensive enough?
   
   If not, what else should be required, and why?

   Police checks should be required not just of applicants for licences but of directors/officers of applicant companies.

2. Should retail licence applications be accompanied by evidence of compliance with a local approved products policy if one is in effect in the applicant's area?

   No. Location of other retailers and sensitive sites will be changeable. Also Council definitions of what are sensitive sites are not always clear. What will happen to a licence application if the data relied upon turns out to be incorrect, or if it changes? It is suggested that this assessment may more usefully be done by the Authority or the local Council itself.

   On this issue, it is suggested that a “point in time” approach is taken, i.e. the LAPP is considered in relation to the date of licence application. If a premise would later become non-compliant due to a sensitive site moving close by, this should not be considered further until the application next comes up for renewal (if at all – there is a strong argument for existing use rights as occurs with liquor licences and brothels). Otherwise there will be no certainty for retailers and no incentive to apply for a licence. This also would guard to some degree against organisations cynically moving close to an approved retailer’s site for the purpose of ensuring they must move – something we have anecdotal evidence of having occurred.

   The status of compliance with a LAPP is something that needs to be considered very carefully. A LAPP has no status in the legislation. It is evident that some Councils are using their LAPP to cut in place prohibition or de facto prohibition. For the Authority to simply accept a Council’s LAPP with no scrutiny as to its reasonableness means that the Authority has fettered its discretion and the Councils are making licensing decisions. This exposes the Authority to legal action and appeals. It interferes with the proper running of the licensing regime. It is stressful and costly for retailers. It is not what the legislation anticipated – Councils are supposed to be saying where retailers can be located, not ensuring that they can’t be.

   The recent suspensions and closure of Hastings and Hamilton demonstrate that there needs to urgently be in place:

   1. A mechanism for LAPPs to be reviewed by the Authority as to reasonableness and legality;

   2. Withdrawal of the discretionary condition on retail licences making approved products sales subject to the terms of the LAPP;

   3. A process whereby a holder of an interim retail licence can move premises (assuming that the LAPP allows space for a site, which there will be if #1 and #2 above are implemented), or an acceptance that they have existing use rights.

3. Should retail licence applications be accompanied by evidence of compliance with a generic local approved products policy if no policy is in effect in the applicant’s area?
Definitely not. We note:

1. It is entirely inappropriate to have generic local approved products policies. If local councils do not wish to have a policy, one should not be imposed upon them.

2. How would the Authority determine where the approved areas should be for a given district? Generic determinations as to approved distances between licensed retailers and proximity to sensitive sites would also not suit all districts, and would take no cognisance of the particular district.

3. There is no provision in the Act for a generic policy, and to include it in the regulations to the Act would exceed the powers to pass regulations.

4. Are the factors the Authority should take into account when determining whether a licence applicant is a fit and proper person or whether a body corporate is of good repute in section 16(2) enough? The section 16(2) factors are:
   - whether the applicant has been convicted of a relevant offence
   - whether there has been a serious or repeated failure by the applicant to comply with any requirement of the Act
   - whether there are other grounds for considering that the applicant is likely to fail to comply with any requirement of the Act
   - any other matter that the Authority considers relevant.

   If you think these factors are not enough, please give examples of additional factors the Authority should consider.

5. Should the regulations require applicants to provide details of their involvement in other regulatory regimes, such as alcohol licensing processes?
   
   Yes.

6. What records should the regulations require licence holders to keep?
   
   Sales data, adverse effects reports.

7. How long should licence holders be required to keep records for?
   
   For at least the period of the licence.

8. Do you think there are factors or issues that the Authority should consider when setting discretionary conditions? If so, please provide details.

   It may be appropriate to have some restrictions on opening hours for some stores, for instance if they are located close to sites where young people may congregate, such as schools. Adult stores should be exempt from this, as should specialty stores which are R18, such as [redacted] and the Hemp store.

9. Should the regulations prescribe other matters the Authority must take into account when deciding on an application? If yes, what should these matters be?
   
   No.
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10 Do you agree a product approval application should include information on proposed manufacturing methods and how they will comply with the Psychoactive Substances Code of Manufacturing Practice?

No. This information has to be provided by the manufacturer in compliance with the Code of Manufacturing Practice. This would simply escalate compliance costs and duplicate the information provided to the Authority, particularly in situations where the manufacturer is also the owner of the product approval. The name of the manufacturer is all that should be supplied.

11 Do you think any further particulars, information, documents or other material should be prescribed in the regulations? If yes, what should these be?

No.

12 Do you agree with the proposal that the regulations require applications to contain information and data on the toxicity, pharmacology and related clinical effects of the psychoactive substance they are seeking approval for?

There needs to be a differentiation between approved products with interim approvals and new products otherwise manufacturing and retail of products with interim approvals, for which full applications for approval are made, would need to cease as the clinical trials are certain to take longer than the date of these regulations coming into force.

13 Do you agree with the proposal that the regulations require product approval applications to contain information and data on:

- the psychoactive potential and related behavioural effects of the substance
- the addictive potential
- the proposed directions for use
- previous use, including use in clinical trials and in the wider population?

Again, there needs to be a differentiation between approved products with interim approvals and new products otherwise manufacturing and retail of products with interim approvals, for which full applications for approval are made, would need to cease as the clinical trials are certain to take longer than the date of these regulations coming into force.

In regard to "previous use, including use in clinical trials and in the wider population?" the words "in the wider population" is a potentially unnecessary qualification that could be restrictive for new chemical entities (NCEs). While there is good reasons for wanting compounds that have had prior exposure to the public without incident, making this a prerequisite is potentially harmful to the spirit of the law, where technological innovation is harnessed to produce provably better (safer, more effective) replacements to existing, possibly illegal, recreational drugs. If the law is prejudiced against NCEs, this innovation is stifled. If previous use is just something with which to bolster an application, rather than being contingent on it, then we agree with this proposal.

It is not agreed that a product containing the same mix of active ingredient in a different size package or with different flavouring ought to require approval as an additional product. A different size package is not a different product. It does not justify an additional $10,000 fee. Parameters should be set as to how big or small a packet may be at the time of the product approval.

Likewise with flavouring, it is unlikely that the addition of simple flavouring changes the nature of the product to such a degree that $10,000 more of the Authority's time needs to be spent assessing the product.

14 Are the proposed requirements and restrictions on labelling sufficient? If not, please make specific suggestions for further requirements and restrictions.
In relation to recommended dose, the proposed trials do not test for psychoactive effect - only safety. Consequently, on what basis does one recommend a dose? If a dose is recommended based solely on safety data it may prove to be wildly inappropriate for actually enjoyable or even safe effects for a consumer, particularly if they are drug or particular-substance naïve. This largely depends on criteria safety trials are comprised, and these will differ from category to category - e.g. for hallucinogens (specifically for this example, 5-HT2A agonists, e.g. LSD, psilocin, 2C-B, and so on), which are often very physically benign, a dose extrapolated from physical safety data would result in a far too powerful effect for the consumer. A near-inverse relationship applies for say, a CNS depressant, such as any GABAergic agonist (ethanol, GHB, benzodiazepines, etc).

Plain packaging is not considered to be desirable. It removes intellectual property rights that owners of product approvals have built up over time. It makes counterfeiting product easier. It will make it difficult for consumers to know what products they are buying. With the risk assessment undertaken with approved products, they must be safer than tobacco products and do not need to be subject to the same limits.

15 Are the proposed requirements relating to health warnings sufficient? If not, please make specific suggestions for further requirements (for example, advice on what to do in the case of an overdose).

A suggestion that users keep hydrated could usefully be added.

16 Are the proposed packaging requirements and restrictions sufficient? If not, please make specific suggestions for further requirements.

Rather than packaging inserts, required information could be printed inside the packet.

It's difficult to comment on the proposal to prohibit words with "inappropriate connotations" without examples. However it must be remembered that for these products there is language used which may be considered inappropriate to non-users of psychoactive products, but which are entirely in keeping with the sub-culture. Making a moral judgement will accordingly be difficult.

17 Do you agree with the proposal to restrict a packet to one dose? Please give reasons for your answer.

This is practically difficult. As noted above, the proposed trials do not test for psychoactive effect - only safety. Consequently, on what basis does one recommend a dose? If a dose is recommended based solely on safety data it may prove to be wildly inappropriate for actually enjoyable or even safe effects for a consumer, particularly if they are drug or particular-substance naïve. This largely depends on criteria safety trials are comprised, and these will differ from category to category - e.g. for hallucinogens (specifically for this example, 5-HT2A agonists, e.g. LSD, psilocin, 2C-B, and so on), which are often very physically benign, a dose extrapolated from physical safety data would result in a far too powerful effect for the consumer. A near-inverse relationship applies for say, a CNS depressant, such as any GABAergic agonist (ethanol, GHB, benzodiazepines, etc).

18 Do you agree with the proposal that a dose, in whatever form the product takes, is split wherever possible?

Refer comments at 17 above.

19 Do you think there should be restrictions on the form products can take? If so, what forms do you think should and shouldn't be allowed?

Products should not be developed to be injected.

20 Do you think there should be restrictions or requirements on the storage of psychoactive substances? If so, what should the restrictions or requirements be?
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Do you think restrictions or requirements should be set for the storage of approved products? If so, what should they be?</td>
<td>Refer above at 20.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you think restrictions or requirements should be set regarding the display of approved products? If so, what should they be?</td>
<td>No, the Act is sufficiently restrictive.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you think restrictions or requirements should be set regarding the disposal of approved products? If so, what should they be?</td>
<td>We suggest that disposal is approached in much the same way as other fine chemicals.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you think there should be signage requirements in the regulations? If so, please give specific suggestions.</td>
<td>Retailers should be required to display an R18 sign, and a sign providing that a retailer has a right not to serve customers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you think the regulations should specify further places where approved products may not be sold? If so, please provide specific suggestions.</td>
<td>No. Retailers are already facing difficulties from the effects of scarcity of retailers in terms of anti-social behaviour, a second-tier (unlawful) market for products, gang interest and so on. There needs to be a process for examination of the Council LAPPs so as to ensure that Councils are not de facto deciding licence applications. The Authority has regretfully already fettered its discretion with the discretionary condition on all interim licences. This needs to be rectified urgently.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you think the regulations should prescribe restrictions or requirements for advertisements of approved products? If so, please provide specific suggestions.</td>
<td>No, the Act is already sufficiently restrictive.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you think the regulations should prescribe restrictions or requirements on internet sales of approved products? If so, please provide specific suggestions.</td>
<td>Does not support internet sales of approved psychoactive products. Under 18s can now obtain debit cards and it is therefore easy for them to obtain products through internet sales.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you think the regulations should prescribe restrictions or requirements on the advertising of approved products? If so, please provide specific suggestions.</td>
<td>No, the Act is already sufficiently restrictive.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
29 Do you agree with the proposed fees for the different licences? If not, please provide specific suggestions.

The product approval fee is out of alignment with fees in the pharmaceutical industry, yet the process for approval is being modelled it seems on that industry (except that efficacy does not need to be determined). Many products contain the same active ingredient – is a new $180,000 fee required for each product whose ingredient has already gained approval in another product? A scale along the lines of that used in the pharmaceutical industry would be much more appropriate.

It seems similarly out of proportion that retailer fees are higher than those for wholesalers. Also they are out of alignment with licences in other relevant areas such as liquor licensing.

30 Do you support a fixed fee or an hourly charge for processing applications for product approvals?

Presumably some applications will be more time-consuming to process than others. The difficulty with an hourly rate approach however is that it will make it impossible for applicants to prepare for the costs. The applicant would need to be able to withdraw from the process if the fees were going to be too costly. It seems like it would be difficult to manage and administer. An hourly rate is therefore not supported.

31 Should fees be set for other specific functions? If yes, please state what they should be set for.

Possibly audits, although presumably this is covered in the annual levy.

32 Do you agree with the proposed list of items and process for setting levies? If not, please provide specific suggestions.

The annual fee for a retailer is again out of proportion to the equivalent regime of liquor licensing where the highest annual fee is $1,250.

An annual fee for a product approval of $70,000 seems inordinately high in relation to what administration there could be expected in relation to each product approval on an annual basis.

You do not have to answer all the questions or provide personal information if you do not want to.

This submission was completed by: (name)
Address: (street/box number)
(town/city)
Email:
Organisation (if applicable):
Position (if applicable):

Are you submitting this:
(Tick one box only in this section)
√ as an interim licence holder
☐ a person or body corporate intending to apply for a licence
☐ other (please specify): .................................................................

Do you wish to receive updates about the development of the psychoactive substances regulations?
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✓ Yes  □ No
(If yes, please make sure you provide an email address.)

Please return only one copy of your submission no later than 5 pm on Friday 21 March to:
- The Manager
- Psychoactive Substances Regulatory Authority
- Ministry of Health
- PO Box 5013
- WELLINGTON
- Email: psychoactives@moh.govt.nz

Alternatively, electronically complete the submission form available at the back of this document, add your comments and email to:
- psychoactives@moh.govt.nz

Please put ‘Regulations Consultation’ in the subject line.

☐ Your submission may be requested under the Official Information Act 1982. If this happens, the Ministry of Health will release your submission to the person who requested it. However, if you are submitting as an individual (rather than representing an organisation), the Ministry will remove your personal details from the submission if you tick the following boxes.

☐ I do not give permission for my personal details to be released under the Official Information Act 1982.

☐ I do not give permission for my name to be listed in the published summary of submissions.

✓ requests that details of its submission not be made public or released under the Official Information Act 1982. It has responded to the call for submissions in a frank manner and utilising a degree of confidential business information. It is not appropriate that this is released to the public.