

**Halse, Kirsten**

**From:** Staltari, Danielle  
**Sent:** Thursday, 18 January 2007 4:24 PM  
**To:** Halse, Kirsten  
**Subject:** FW: Code of Conduct [SEC=UNCLASSIFIED]  
**Categories:** SEC=UNCLASSIFIED  
**ACCC Classification:** SEC=UNCLASSIFIED

Could this email please be placed on the pr and internet.

thank you

Danielle

**From:** Frances Cameron [mailto:frances.cameron@agsafe.com.au]  
**Sent:** Thursday, 18 January 2007 4:10 PM  
**To:** Staltari, Danielle  
**Cc:** Sam Ponder  
**Subject:** RE: Code of Conduct [SEC=UNCLASSIFIED]

Your assumption is correct in that it is only a percentage of the individuals/stores we know about that are accredited.

The annual report should be with you early next week when Sam returns from leave.

Regards,

Frances

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

**From:** Staltari, Danielle [mailto:danielle.staltari@ACCC.GOV.AU]  
**Sent:** Thursday, 18 January 2007 2:33 PM  
**To:** Frances Cameron  
**Cc:** Sam Ponder; Palisi, Joanne  
**Subject:** RE: Code of Conduct [SEC=UNCLASSIFIED]

Thank you Frances for your email.

I understand that it may be difficult to determine how many retailers/distributors there are in Australia. On this issue, I wanted to confirm the meaning of a sentence in the 2004/2005 Agsafe Annual Summary. On page 4 of the 2004/2005 Agsafe Annual Summary it states that '*Accreditation reported to the ACCC monitor that over 75% of all eligible personnel were currently accredited and 87% of premises were currently accredited at that time*'. Could you please explain the meaning of this sentence? Does this sentence mean that in 2004/2005 75% of the personnel that Agsafe is aware of and 87% of the premises which Agsafe has knowledge of is accredited under the Agsafe accreditation scheme?

It is not necessary to amend Agsafe's submission as a copy of this email will be placed on the ACCC's public register.

regards

Danielle

**From:** Frances Cameron [mailto:frances.cameron@agsafe.com.au]  
**Sent:** Thursday, 18 January 2007 1:40 PM  
**To:** Staltari, Danielle  
**Cc:** Sam Ponder  
**Subject:** RE: Code of Conduct

Hi Danielle,

Apologies for the delay – I just wanted to double check before I responded.

In answer to the first three bullet points below regarding the number of retailers/distributors and personnel in Australia, Agsafe only knows about those organisations that it is in contact with at any given time. This reinforces the self regulatory basis of the program in that we rely heavily on the industry itself to inform us if they are trading in AgVet chems or if they know of an entity or individual that is trading and requires accreditation.

In relation to the last bullet point – our opinion is that the majority of AgVet Chems are not Dangerous Goods, however I would need to do more research on this to give you a factual response – I will see if the APVMA can shed any more light. Over the past few years the number of products moving out of the DG category would likely have increased, and considering the implications of security sensitive concerns by the Government, may continue to do so as manufacturers look for ways to provide the same efficacy, without the risk.

It may be worth noting that DG's, Hazardous Substances and Scheduled Poisons each represent a different category and may be classified as either a DG, Poison or Haz Sub individually or could also be any combination i.e DG and Haz Sub. They are also each administered by different authorities.

The correct number of sanctions since 2002 is one. Do I need to amend the submission?

Regards,

Frances

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

**From:** Staltari, Danielle [mailto:danielle.staltari@ACCC.GOV.AU]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, 16 January 2007 4:53 PM  
**To:** Frances Cameron  
**Cc:** Sam Ponder; Palisi, Joanne  
**Subject:** RE: Code of Conduct

Thank you Frances for providing an updated version of the Code of Conduct, this version will be placed on the ACCC's public register.

I have a few additional questions in relation to the agricultural and veterinary chemical industry which I was hoping that Agsafe could address. I note that these questions may be able to be answered through the Annual Report and the attachments to the Monitoring Reports Agsafe is currently working on to provide to the ACCC - please let me know if they do.

- How many retailers and/or distributors of agricultural and veterinary chemicals are there in Australia?
- For those retailers / distributors who have obtained or currently obtaining Agsafe accreditation (currently 1658) what percentage do these businesses represent of all agricultural and veterinary chemical retailers / distributors in Australia?
- For those personnel that have obtained Agsafe accreditation what percentage do these personnel represent of all personnel in the agricultural and veterinary chemical industry who could be eligible to obtain Agsafe accreditation?
- Are the majority of agricultural and veterinary chemicals classified as dangerous and hazardous substances?

I also wanted to check some figures providing by Agsafe about the number of trading sanctions imposed. In the email sent on 15 January 2007, it is stated that one trading

sanction was imposed for the year 2005. On page 7 of the public interest statement, it states that since 2002 there has been two sanctions imposed. Could you please clarify which figure is correct?

Should you have any questions about the contents of this email please contact me on 02 6243 1362.

Regards

Danielle

**From:** Frances Cameron [mailto:frances.cameron@agsafe.com.au]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, 16 January 2007 4:21 PM  
**To:** Staltari, Danielle  
**Cc:** Sam Ponder  
**Subject:** Code of Conduct

Hi Danielle.

I had a look at the clauses you mentioned when we spoke yesterday. For some reason the details in the original code of practice do not seem to entirely match the process prior to the variation. The original document states 14 days as being the waiting period prior to imposing sanctions – the actual timeframes were: first warning 30 days after the original assessment, second warning additional 14 days, third warning 7 days – the total amount of days the store had to rectify any problems was 81 (including the first 30 days after the assessment).

Obviously, there has been some confusion in previous publications of the code, however I have changed the relevant clauses to now reflect the new sanctions process and have included all stages as per the new process.

Frances

**Frances Cameron**

Accreditation Coordinator

Mobile: 0400 124 799



~~The information contained in this e-mail is confidential and may contain legally privileged information. It is intended solely for the individual(s) and entity(s) addressed. The use, copying or distribution of this message or any information it contains, by anyone other than the addressee, is prohibited. If you received this e-mail in error, please notify us immediately by telephone on (02) 6230 4799 or e-mail and delete this e-mail from your system and server. Thank you.~~

KH