

Staltari, Danielle

From: Frances Cameron [frances.cameron@agsafe.com.au]
Sent: Tuesday, 27 February 2007 12:16 PM
To: Staltari, Danielle
Cc: Sam Ponder; Palisi, Joanne
Subject: RE: Comments on submissions lodged by interested parties for Agsafe's application for revocation and substitution A91027 - A91030 [SEC=UNCLASSIFIED]

Hello Danielle,

With regards to your email concerning the confidential submission, please find following Agsafe's response:

The process involved in obtaining a dangerous goods licence is a stringent one and is similar to the process involved in obtaining accreditation through Agsafe.

Agsafe Guardian is a program implemented by an Industry that has imposed a "standard of compliance" for those that distribute their products regardless of licensing requirements. Licensing or notification is dependent on State by State requirements and is often dependent on amounts stored and the type of chemical being stored.

The party states that it has satisfied the Workcover authority in their State that its premises and procedures are safe and has been granted a dangerous goods license. The party submits that they are legally entitled to use and store dangerous goods and should not be required to be accredited through Agsafe.

If Dangerous Goods are supplied by participating manufacturers i.e. CropLife members, then there is an Industry requirement to gain accreditation regardless of the licensing scheme in place. As per the previous response, all States have varying requirements based on amount and type of chemical.

The party submits that Agsafe's accreditation scheme should be optional for agricultural and veterinary chemical businesses like other accreditation programs in other industries. If the Agsafe accreditation program has benefits to the agricultural and veterinary chemical industries then its uptake by businesses will increase.

The Guardian program can demonstrate that businesses are regularly requested by Agsafe facilitators to improve storage standards to levels that meet legislation. Over the course of the past year, 69 premises (across all States) were asked by Agsafe to fix licensing or certification requirements, whilst many more than this number were asked to fix items such as Emergency Services Manifests, site plans & product registers. These are just an indication of the types of corrective actions that Agsafe advises on. If Guardian were truly optional, the scheme would only be taken up by those operators who would see it as a point of difference which would dissipate the industry wide benefits of improved safety across the board.

Kind regards,
Frances Cameron

-----Original Message-----

From: Staltari, Danielle [mailto:danielle.staltari@ACCC.GOV.AU]
Sent: Monday, 12 February 2007 4:44 PM
To: Frances Cameron
Cc: Sam Ponder; Palisi, Joanne
Subject: Comments on submissions lodged by interested parties for Agsafe's application for revocation and substitution A91027 - A91030 [SEC=UNCLASSIFIED]

Dear Frances

As you may be aware, the closing date for submissions on Agsafe's application for revocation and substitution was 8 February 2007. I have enclosed a link to the ACCC's website which lists all publicly available submissions the ACCC has received to date regarding Agsafe's application. The link is:

27/02/2007

<http://www.accc.gov.au/content/index.phtml/itemId/776732/fromItemId/278039/display/submission>

I anticipate that there may be some additional submissions lodged this week. I will inform you of any additional submissions received from interested parties.

The ACCC has also received a confidential submission from an interested party. The issues raised in the submission are:

- o The process involved in obtaining a dangerous goods licence is a stringent one and is similar to the process involved in obtaining accreditation through Agsafe.
- o The party states that it has satisfied the Workcover authority in their State that its premises and procedures are safe and has been granted a dangerous goods license. The party submits that they are legally entitled to use and store dangerous goods and should not be required to be accredited through Agsafe.
- o The party submits that Agsafe's accreditation scheme should be optional for agricultural and veterinary chemical businesses like other accreditation programs in other industries. If the Agsafe accreditation program has benefits to the agricultural and veterinary chemical industries then its uptake by businesses will increase.

Should Agsafe wish to provide comments on the issues raised in submissions from any of the interested parties, I would be grateful if Agsafe could please provide a response by **Thursday 1 March 2006**.

If you have any questions please contact me on 02 6243 1362.

Regards

Danielle

Danielle Staltari
Assistant Director
ACCC
Ph: 02 6243 1362
Fax: 02 6243 1211

This e-mail message has been scanned by MailMarshal from Marshal Software, an email content filter.

IMPORTANT: This email from the Australian Competition and Consumer Commission (ACCC), and any attachments to it, contain information that is confidential and may also be the subject of legal, professional or other privilege. If you are not the intended recipient, you must not review, copy, disseminate, disclose to others or take action in reliance of, any material contained within this email. If you have received this email in error, please let the ACCC know by reply email to the sender informing them of the mistake and delete all copies from your computer system. For the purposes of the Spam Act 2003, this email is authorised by the ACCC www.accc.gov.au