

**To:** Matthew Freedman[mfreedman@globalimpact-inc.com]  
**Cc:** Chmielewski, Kevin[chmielewski.kevin@epa.gov]; McMurray, Forrest[mcmurray.forrest@epa.gov]; Greenwalt, Sarah[greenwalt.sarah@epa.gov]; Rick Smotkin[Rick\_Smotkin@Comcast.com]  
**From:** Hupp, Millan  
**Sent:** Mon 7/10/2017 10:09:17 AM  
**Subject:** Re: Australia meeting

Thank you, Matthew. Will review these items with our team this morning and report back. Very much appreciate your efforts and look forward to catching up on next steps.

Millan

Sent from my iPhone

On Jul 10, 2017, at 5:36 AM, Matthew Freedman <mfreedman@globalimpact-inc.com> wrote:

Millan:  
Wanted to followup my previous communication.

1. Having thought thru various ideas I like the idea of going to Melbourne and meeting with the Labor Government of the Victorian Government. It allows the Administrator to say that he met both sides, and discussed issues. And they are doing very creative things and the Vic government is 'open for business' so many US companies in the high tech arena are making Melbourne their new corporate HQ home. Maybe we can identify a few of them to connect with the EPA Administrator.

While climate change will not be on the agenda expect it come up and we need to be able to say that we 'agree to disagree' as good friends. I suggested to the Embassy that the Victorian Minister for Innovation and Trade (Philip Dalidakis) be included on their side since having him at the table would be good.

2. Had a long conversation with James Shea, the Embassy lead. He, Cosi (Minister Frydenberg office) and your Advance lead in the International Affairs office will be speaking Tuesday morning to coordinate. The Embassy was not aware of some of the potential requests for meetings so this next call (which is weekly between the parties) should clarify that you, indeed, want to move forward with a formal request to see the Foreign Minister, Minister of Trade and Investment (Steven Chiobo), Prime Minister, and others.

3. The trip might have a theme related to environmental cooperation focused on the topic of innovation - one that both sides can rally around - since both countries are focused on innovation at a national level. And doing more with less requires being smarter and more strategic. Hence, it is useful for the EPA Adm and the Aus counterparts to learn about how each country thinks about protecting the environment in the context of smaller staffs and budgets. The US press has made it sound like less money equals less commitment so

changing the dynamic would be useful. Using innovation is a bridge in this regard, and having several EPA activities in this area to put on the table would be useful. Some of the past EPA/NASA activities might qualify but my information is a little dated.

4. Great Barrier Reef and Tasmania I would agree at this point is a bridge too far for this visit.

Rick and I will attend and will be present but will not be listed as members of the delegation. Also, I will make all arrangements for us; we do not want to utilize any USG assets for our involvement. Friday/Sat/Sun when we arrive will be easy, but we will not likely participate in the official meetings.

Matthew

On Jul 6, 2017, at 9:49 AM, Matthew Freedman wrote:

Millan:

Greetings from Marrakech. Sorry for the delay in followup. I am still collecting inputs from friends but wanted to give you some additional thoughts on scheduling.

I think it is important to play both offense and defense. Offense to move forward the Agenda from the Administrator and defense in terms of a 'risk mitigation' strategy to address in a proactive manner critics from whatever perspective. That is why I urge consideration of some type of deliverable - a Communique, Statement of Principles, Memorandum of Understanding - something that codifies the goals and objectives of the trip but also the larger issues. This will blunt any criticism in the future and allows the Administrator for focus on the positive outcomes.

The trip will undoubtedly turn to issues where the Administration differs from the current Aus government - climate change is but one issue, but there is no reason not to have an informed and thoughtful discussion. It allows both parties to address critics, and to move on. With a document that can be readied - several paragraphs only - it would frame the meetings and the agenda that is being put together. That would, by definition, make some meetings more important and others less. For example, State of Victoria meetings might be more important if part of a Communique talked about future discussions on Federal vs State environment issues/deregulation etc. and the Administrator wanted to have a parallel dialogue between EPA and the States in the US.

You also asked about the initial days. Here is an update

Arrival Friday.