

**Madsen, Søren R. N.**

---

**Fra:** Reville, Barry [Barry.Reville@environment.gov.au]

**Sendt:** 8. oktober 2009 07:57

**Til:** Schou, Lone

**Cc:** Rothenfluh, Daniel; Hall, Damien; Jakobsen, Dorte Skjøtt; Hermansen, Dorte; Madsen, Søren R. N.

**Emne:** RE: Orican notification [SEC=UNCLASSIFIED]

Dear Lone

Would 8.45 am in Copenhagen be a good time for you? If so, we will call you then on +45 72 54 43 21.

With regard to the process, we have only one decision point in our legislation, that is the decision by the Minister (or his delegate). The process would look like:

1. DRR and the 3 notifications are sent by Australia
2. The DRR is assessed by the Danish EPA
3. The Danish EPA gives its decision on the assessment of the DRR
4. The Danish EPA assess and approve the notification and gives its written consent to the import
5. The Australian Government Minister for the Environment, Heritage and the Arts decides whether to grant the permit and approve the export.

We would be very happy to discuss.

Talk to you soon.

Best regards

Barry

Dr Barry Reville  
Assistant Secretary  
Environment Protection Branch  
Department of the Environment, Water, Heritage and the Arts  
GPO Box 787  
Canberra ACT 2601  
Australia  
Ph +61 (0)2 6274 1622  
Fax +61 (0)2 6274 1164  
barry.reville@environment.gov.au

---

**From:** Schou, Lone [mailto:LOS@MST.DK]

**Sent:** Thursday, 8 October 2009 12:22 AM

**To:** Reville, Barry

**Cc:** Rothenfluh, Daniel; Hall, Damien; Jakobsen, Dorte Skjøtt; Hermansen, Dorte; Madsen, Søren R. N.

**Subject:** SV: Orican notification [SEC=UNCLASSIFIED]

Dear Barry,

If possible, could we then have a telephone conference tomorrow morning/afternoon - I will be in from 8.45 Danish time and can be reached at +45 72 54 43 21.

I would very much like to discuss the way forward, which we believe can be in line with your proposal in

Damien's mail of September 11.

In that connection we have to make sure that we have the same understanding of the different steps which has to be taken in the decision process.

If we draw a timeline the process in our understanding will be as follow:

1. DRR and the 3 notifications are sending by Australia
2. The DRR is assessed by the Danish EPA
3. The Danish EPA give our decision on the assessment of the DRR
4. Your Minister decides whether to grant the permit and approve the export
5. The Danish EPA assess and approve the notification and give our written consent to the import
6. At the same time the department of the Environment, Water, Heritage and the Arts gives its written consent to the notification.

In other words - we first give our consent in relation to the DRR and second we give a written consent to the notification.

Best regards  
Lone

---

**Fra:** Reville, Barry [mailto:Barry.Reville@environment.gov.au]

**Sendt:** 1. oktober 2009 04:31

**Til:** Schou, Lone

**Cc:** Rothenfluh, Daniel; Hall, Damien; Jakobsen, Dorte Skjøtt; Hermansen, Dorte; Madsen, Søren R. N.

**Emne:** Response to GPCR Process Comments [SEC=UNCLASSIFIED]

Dear Lone

Sorry for the delay, we wished to make sure we had the details correct and to respond fully.

SIA did not respond further to Mr Bridle for two reasons. Firstly, his letter of 23 April provided no new information or issues. The issues he raised in this letter were the same ones he raised in previous letters (eg 26 February 2009) and which SIA addressed with evidence from the Nolan-ITU 2005 Report which we sent to you on 11 March 2009.

Secondly, Mr Bridle made clear in his 23 April letter that he considered there were "irreconcilable differences" between him and SIA and indicated that legal action would be forthcoming.

On this basis, there was little point in SIA continuing the correspondence.

Since then, SIA have not heard from Mr Bridle, nor has there been any sign of the legal action suggested by Mr Bridle. SIA stand by their conclusions as expressed in their 21 April letter.

The issues about the chlorine content and the HCB/CP content in the residues were amongst the issues addressed in our e-mail to you of 11 March 2009.

I have extracted the relevant material and it is in the attached file labelled "Responses to claims about the Gas Phase Chemical Reduction (GPCR) Process".

With the help of SIA, we also have provided responses specifically to your questions in your 25 September e-mail. These responses are in the attached file labelled "Response to Danish EPA 011009".

I hope this clarifies the matter for you. Please let me know if there is any more material that you need.

As indicated in an earlier e-mail from Damien, we would be happy to have a teleconference if that would be

helpful to talk through any outstanding issues.

I will be overseas for most of the period 17 October to 11 November (Mercury in Bangkok and Montreal Protocol in Egypt) so the next two weeks would be a good time for a teleconference if one were needed.

Best regards

Barry

<<Responses to claims about the Gas Phase Chemical Reduction.doc>>  
<<Response to Danish EPA 011009.doc>>

Dr Barry Reville  
Assistant Secretary  
Environment Protection Branch  
Department of the Environment, Water, Heritage and the Arts  
GPO Box 787  
Canberra ACT 2601  
Australia  
Ph +61 (0)2 6274 1622  
Fax +61 (0)2 6274 1164  
barry.reville@environment.gov.au

-----  
If you have received this transmission in error please notify us immediately by return e-mail and delete all copies. If this e-mail or any attachments have been sent to you in error, that error does not constitute waiver of any confidentiality, privilege or copyright in respect of information in the e-mail or attachments.

Please consider the environment before printing this email.  
-----

-----  
If you have received this transmission in error please notify us immediately by return e-mail and delete all copies. If this e-mail or any attachments have been sent to you in error, that error does not constitute waiver of any confidentiality, privilege or copyright in respect of information in the e-mail or attachments.

Please consider the environment before printing this email.  
-----