

02 July 2020

Mr Darrell Channing  
Director – Adjudication  
Australian Competition and Consumer Commission

By email to: [adjudicator@acc.gov.au](mailto:adjudicator@acc.gov.au)

Dear Mr Channing

Subject: NLNA Response dated 2 June 2020

---

We have been supplied with a copy of the NLNA response dated 22 June 2020 to submissions made by different organisations including our own in respect to their application for an authorisation.

We do not believe that the NLNA response has in any way established they are a membership organisation, either in fact or by some general application or understanding. Their response confirmed they have one member – VANA Ltd.


Without members who may form a class of businesses to be represented, NLNA cannot represent anyone, other than VANA Ltd. There is no proof supplied that VANA Ltd's membership of NLNA confers any representation rights on VANA Ltd members. VANA Ltd is already subject to an authorisation issued by the ACCC and the granting of an authorisation to NLNA will add nothing to the rights of VANA Ltd members.

To restate the issue emphatically, members of VANA Ltd are not members of NLNA.

For the reasons we expressed in our original submission and due to the inadequacy of NLNA's response, we are firmly of the view that NLNA has failed to establish a case for approval of an authorisation, especially as they cannot demonstrate a clear membership and representation nexus between NLNA and any newsagency or lotteries business. As a consequence, NLNA cannot demonstrate there is or is likely to be any public benefit achieved if their application is approved.

We oppose both the approval of an authorisation and the approval of an interim authorisation.

Yours faithfully



Ian Booth  
Chief Executive Officer