

"Ian Rae"  
<iandrae@big  
pond.com>

09/04/2010  
17:42

To "Matthew Gredley" <Matthew.Gredley@nicnas.gov.au>

cc

bcc

Subject: Full public reports [No Protective Marking]

History:

**DOCUMENT NOT YET CLASSIFIED**

Dear matt

I read in the Chemical gazette about the proposal to do away with summaries and just notify when the full report is available on the NICNAS website.

I think this is a good idea and I'd like to indicate my support for it. People like me might be able to arrange automatic delivery (or at least notification of publication) of each gazette.

The reports currently mention the MSDS for most chemicals, and it would help if the URL for the MSDS was included, so we don't have to go hunting for it.

Also, while NICNAS is about it, is there any intention to tackle the nonsense of Exempt Information, which is mostly the stuff I'd like to know?

Kind regards

Ian

**DOCUMENT NOT YET CLASSIFIED**

"Ian Rae"  
<iandrae@big  
pond.com>

09/04/2010  
17:45

To "Matthew Gredley" <Matthew.Gredley@nicnas.gov.au>

cc

bcc

Subject: Schedule [No Protective Marking]

History:

**DOCUMENT NOT YET CLASSIFIED**

Something else from the latest Chemical Gazette, Matt. In connection with proposed changes to the Schedule, it is stated at the top of page 13 that 'Australian criteria for persistence, bioaccumulation and toxicity' will need to be addressed. How are the Australian criteria different from those of the Stockholm Convention, and if they are the same, why not say 'Stockholm', at this point?

Secondly, the preceding paragraph (near the foot on page 12) includes all four Stockholm criteria, but the bit I have just quoted deals with three and omits long-range transport. Why is that?

Kind regards

Ian

**DOCUMENT NOT YET CLASSIFIED**