

Exemption group description	Proposal	Rationale
<i>Substances with no agricultural compound claims</i>	Delete “not being an agricultural compound described elsewhere in this schedule”. Add to the conditions a list of substances the compounds must not contain.	The phrase is confusing and creates uncertainty about the appropriate exemption group for some compounds. It does not improve risk management and may prevent people from taking advantage of the exemption group.
<i>Compounds used in research, testing and training activities</i>	Amend exemption description and conditions to replace the phrase “substance(s) or compound(s)” with the term “active ingredient”	The phrase “substance or compound” could mean an ingredient or a full formulation, but only active ingredients are of interest, not formulations. This change simplifies applicant obligations while still providing adequate information to the regulator.
<i>Sterilisers, sanitisers, and disinfectants</i>	Remove reference to “pest management”.	Referring to “pest management” in this context is confusing and misleading. Compounds relevant to this exemption (e.g. sterilisers, sanitisers and disinfectants) are not used for ‘pest management’ as the term is commonly understood. The change focuses the entry description unambiguously on hygiene.
<i>Compounded veterinary preparations</i>	Delete the words “used by veterinarians” from the description, and “or with the authorisation” from the first condition. Add a condition that it must not be advertised for sale for use on animals.	The changes clarify the intention of the exemption, which is to provide for specific situations where registered products are not suitable for the treatment proposed by the veterinarian. Removing “or with the authorisation” eliminates the interpretation that a compounding veterinarian could provide authority for use of the preparation on animals not under his/her direct care. The exemption is not to allow a veterinarian to supply the compounded preparation broadly.
<i>Homeopathic preparations used as veterinary medicines</i>	Amend entry description to specifically state that these are homeopathic oral and topical preparations and add an explanation to clarify dilution expected for “homeopathic preparation”.	The change adds “homeopathic” to the entry description, and clarifies the wording to indicate that serial dilution must continue until the active ingredients can no longer be detected. This change reinforces consistency with the definition of homeopathy.
<i>Oral and topical preparations used on animals</i>	Insert a definition of “unrefined extract”.	The lack of definition leaves the term open to interpretation by industry and makes it difficult for MPI to clearly assess class determinations. A formal definition provides certainty.

<i>Non-medicated anti-diarrhoeal preparations</i>	Add a qualifier to the description to the effect that the product must have only a local, surface-acting effect on the gastrointestinal tract.	The change reinforces the limited applicability and use for these preparations. The current conditions do not make it sufficiently clear that the only products included in this group are locally acting substances with no drug-like actions.
<i>Orally and rectally administered laxatives and lubricants used on animals</i>	Delete the words “orally and rectally administered” from description and add to the description that product must have only a local, surface-acting effect on the gastrointestinal tract, vulva, and vagina.	The change broadens the scope of the exemption to include vaginally administered lubricants, when used in small quantities. It is not intended that lubricants introduced into the uterus in large volumes during assisted calving would be included in the scope of this exemption.
<i>Oral nutritional compounds fed to animals</i>	Add clauses to the existing conditions regarding incorporating a registered veterinary medicine into animal feed that the mix is stable over a period of time, and must remain adequately distributed throughout the feed.	The amendments address concerns that the exemption conditions are insufficient with respect to the targeting, effectiveness and efficacy of the resulting animal feed/veterinary medicine mixture. The proposed amendment does not alter the exempt status of any oral nutritional compound.
<i>Reference to intra-ruminal device</i>	Amend description to clarify wording on the exclusion of intra-ruminal devices from exemption.	Clarifying the wording would distinguish between the device and the agricultural compound that is administered. The current description could imply that the intra-ruminal device is an agricultural compound rather than a release mechanism for agricultural compounds.
<i>Agricultural chemicals used on plants not to be used as food for human or animal consumption</i>	Add to the conditions that the compounds must not be used on plants intended to produce food for consumption by humans or animals, or applied to areas grazed by food-producing animals.	Adding to the conditions addresses the main risk with this group of products of detectable residues entering the food chain. The changes resolve problems with interpreting this exemption. If, after treatment, any plant material is to be used for human or food-producing animal consumption, the potential risk of residues needs to be assessed.
<i>Fertiliser and fertiliser additives</i>	Amend definition of fertiliser and description to read <i>fertilisers, plant biostimulants and soil conditioners</i> . Add a definition of soil conditioners. Amend condition so that label is to require specification of active ingredients.	This entry covers a broad group of compounds that directly or indirectly enhance plant productivity. New knowledge has become available on the range of substances and organisms that can have a positive impact on the growth and productivity of plants that historically are not covered by the term fertiliser. A potential gap was identified regarding products used to improve the soil and therefore a definition of soil conditioners was developed.