

EXCLUDED FROM  
PUBLIC REGISTER

**From:** [redacted]  
**Sent:** Thursday, 22 September 2011 10:09 AM  
**To:** Adjudication  
**Subject:** FOOTBALL QUEENSLAND (N93402)

**Restriction of Publication Claimed**

[redacted] would like to make this submission to the ACCC [redacted]  
[redacted]  
[redacted] we have already received general information threatening that club affiliation fees will dramatically increase as a result of the ACCC actions.

These threats are scare mongering and are designed to prevent clubs from putting forward a submission.

EXCLUDED FROM  
PUBLIC REGISTER

In actual fact, we had witnessed firsthand the issues that have been raised by other respondents with respect to limited supply and actually resulting in higher costs. Under the previous scheme there was a very limited number of suppliers and the majority of suppliers source their equipment and apparel from China. We were dealing through one of the companies that is pushing to protect this scheme and when the GFC came about this was used as a screen to price gouge and our prices were going through the roof. They operated on the protection that we had to purchase items with the Q logo and that whilst we could source the same product cheaper (many of these suppliers use the same brands and then put their own logo on them), all items were \$2-5 more expensive and we were having to buy quantities to get those so called discount prices. Yet I could walk into the local embroidery shop [redacted] and buy a single item (sometimes we only needed 1-2 items and did not want to purchase large quantities) and we would be purchasing at a lesser cost.

The additional markup as a result of the Q logo and limited supply meant that prices were artificially inflated.

The issue of quality is not a concern, because a club like [redacted] we are typically buying items that are not manufactured by the licensed supplier. We will select provides from the Jonny Bobbin, Australian Spirit or DNC ranges and then purchase them through a licensed supplier. The reason we do this is so that if we need to swap from one licensed supplier to another, we can still source the products. The argument of lower quality does not apply as they all source from the same base of manufacturing – the only difference is whether we can buy on an open market where there is competition (does need a lot – as stated above), I can walk into a store and buy the same product off the shelf \$2-5 cheaper than through a licensed supplier who apart from paying a licensing fee to FQ, are given a licence to print money – I would not be surprised if there was not collusion happening in that restricted market place. Most certainly the GFC was offered as an excuse to excessively markup prices when the rest of the market was not being affected.

We support the ACCC's action to remove immunity for that FQ scheme.

EXCLUDED FROM  
PUBLIC REGISTER

On behalf of the [REDACTED]. I wish to inform the ACCC that we fully agree and support the draft notice, and encourage the ACCC to issue a Final Notice.

Regards,

**EXCLUDED FROM  
PUBLIC REGISTER**

Approved for Release  
Date: 11/11/2001  
Approved for Release  
Date: 11/11/2001