

## EMAIL OF 2 OCTOBER 2019 TO DEFENCE REGARDING FOI 124/19/20

[REDACTED]

Many thanks.

My submission requested *any associated correspondence to and from him with regard to this matter, and any document setting out his consideration of the matter and his decision.*

The C of N scribbled a note in the right margin ' *Not Agreed. Not of the same scale, duration or intensity of others.*'

Surely for him to do that and reject the submission from the RAN History Section, he (Vice Admiral Shalders) must have relied on some other documentation/analysis.

Given the response to the FOI, which does not include any *associated correspondence*, can I accept that Defence/RAN is saying that Shalders merely made up his own mind in the absence of any other documentation/analysis?

Sincerely  
William Blunt

## EXTRACT OF EMAIL RESPONSE FROM DEFENCE OF 8 OCTOBER 2019

Good morning Mr Blunt

Thank you for your email. In response to your question regarding Vice Admiral Shalders, Navy has provided the following advice:

*"As the professional head of the Royal Australian Navy, the Chief of Navy is well qualified to analyse, deliberate and make decisions in connection with administrative briefs placed before him.*

*The 2007 brief concerning Battle Honours and Campaign Awards was comprehensive, reflecting many months of research and analysis by members of the Sea Power Centre – Australia. It contained sufficient historical background information for the then Chief of Navy to make an informed decision on matters concerning which Campaign Awards and Battle Honours to approve and which not to."*

If you wish to seek a review of the decision you received for FOI 124/19/20 you may submit a request for review to [FOIReview@defence.gov.au](mailto:FOIReview@defence.gov.au).

Kind regards

[REDACTED]

FOI Case Manager

Information Management and Access

Governance and Reform Division

Department of Defence | Building D0066 | Camp Kerr, Wide Bay Training Area, Tin Can Bay QLD 4580 | [REDACTED]