

From: Staffan Dahllöf
Sent: 29 October 2019 12:07 PM
To: ECE-Aarhus-Compliance <aarhus.compliance@un.org>
Subject: audioconference

Dear Secretariat,

This is to confirm that I like to take part by audio conference in the session 4 November regarding my communication PRE/ACCC/C/2019/173 and 174 (Sweden), and have taken note of the code provided to me.

In this respect I've got two questions.

- 1.) About the form: Being used to use conference platforms like Skype, Blue Jeans, [Jit.si](https://www.jit.si) and others I just want to make sure I can connect from my desktop computer and need not use my smart phone which usually means a lower sound quality.
- 2.) About the content: Am I supposed to present my case orally or restrict my presence to answer possible questions from the chair?

In similar appeal cases, although in other fora, I've learned that new facts and/or arguments should not be presented. I would never the less like to point to the following:

The documents requested by me and rejected by the Swedish authority Kemikalieinspektionen and the two Swedish courts (Kammarrätten and Högsta förvaltningsdomstolen) **have now be granted to me** by EFSA (the European Food Safety Authority). Following a lengthy communication with EFSA, executive director Bernhard Url stated 27 September, that EFSA had decided **in accordance with Regulation 1367/2006** (the Aarhus Convention made into binding EU-law for EU-institutions.) and concluded:

"Reassessing your request for public access to documents and taking account of recent statements published by EFSA on the two active substances in question identifying human health effects, EFSA is of the opinion that in this particular case the existence of an overriding public interest can be recognized."
(Paragraph 5 page 2 in attached letter from EFSA)

I find it striking that an EU-institution after considering the Aarhus convention reached a conclusion to grant access to documents the Swedish authority and courts did not, or even even cared to comment upon. On a personal note and given the Sweden's history and reputation for transparency, I as a Swedish citizens find it embarrassing to learn how a Swedish authority and two courts, show a neglectance in implementing the convention on access to environmental information, a convention Sweden has signed and ratified, but obviously not implemented .

Best regards,

Staffan Dahllöf