

Akt oversigt:

RE: Letter regarding new legislation (23559214)

- RE Letter regarding new legislation (Nanoq - ID nr. 23548393)

Brevdato 27-10-2023

Afsender admin@gbbarnes.com.au Sendt af GB Barnes Admin:
admin@gbbarnes.com.au

Modtagere Bo Simmelsgaard (Sagsbehandler, Departementet for Råstoffer
og Justitsområdet)

Akttitel RE: Letter regarding new legislation

Aktnummer

Identifikationsnummer 23559214

Versionsnummer 1

Sagsnummer 2023 - 13241

Ansvarlig Bo Simmelsgaard

Vedlagte dokumenter RE Letter regarding new legislation (Nanoq - ID nr. 23548393)

**Dokumenter uden PDF-
version (ikke vedlagt)**

Udskrevet 17. nov 2023

Til: Bo Simmelsgaard (bosd@nanoq.gl)
Cc: greg.barnes@gbbarnes.com.au (greg.barnes@gbbarnes.com.au)
Fra: admin@gbbarnes.com.au (admin@gbbarnes.com.au)
Titel: RE: Letter regarding new legislation
E-mailtitel: RE: Letter regarding new legislation (Nanoq - ID nr.: 23548393)
Sendt: 27-10-2023 04:15

Dear Bo,

Thank you for your email, I agree anything to assist the small scale miners is helpful, but it possibly needs to work more in with the industry and both the miners and prospectors need to work in with the same rules.

For example:

1. In the Ilimaussaq intrusion there is gem quality blue, and rarely red sodalite.



Figure 1 -Blue sodalite, one brown (radioactive) steenstrupine

The red is not a problem as it loses its colour in a day when exposed to sun light.

The blue colour in sodalite can only come when the sodalite is exposed to intense radiation. In the photo above that comes from the brown mineral steenstrupine.

I have seen pendants of blue sodalite (and steenstrupine) which look spectacular with a polished blue, but I estimate they would assay at 10,000 ppm U3O8 and 100,000 ppm ThO2.

Should the same rules apply to both sets of miners?

The mineral tugtupite generally does not have this problem but I have seen pendants of tugtupite with pieces of this radioactive mineral, in that which would have exceeded the limit of 100 ppm U.

I have very few assayed samples of the mineral tugtupite, some of them do exceed the 100 ppm without steenstrupine (it's an area needing further work).

2. I would hope the prospectors have to submit similar forms on work completed during the year and I suggest that a copy of that worked be passed onto the mining company.
3. Which brings me to a major health and safety problem. Both sides need to know when the other is in the field. I have seen the prospectors' using explosives and more concerning are the live explosives I once found left on site. In short both mining groups need to tell the other when they are there for safety reasons.
4. The problem of lack of exclusivity of exploration licences is a major deterrent to fund raising as prospectors put a claim over the top of your main mine and then seek blackmail to raise money, this is a major concern to funders.

There is a way around that will work:

- a. Prospector applies to the government for the licence.
- b. Exploration licence holder has the right to say no.
- c. If no, the prospector applies to a committee composed of a different prospector, a representative from the mining company and an independent from the MLSA. This committee can decide:
 - i. If the mining company's objection is unwarranted i.e. their interest is 10km from the prospector.
 - ii. The prospector's application is detrimental to the exploration permit. I.e. over the top of their gold project.
 - iii. A compromise where the prospector can mine but under certain conditions.

What that does is it gives the exploration company a strong argument with the finance company.

Conclusion

My experience worldwide with such schemes of joint ownership is they do not work as they are open to abuse. On the other hand I have in Greenland a prospector on the licence which has been a tremendous aid. I know what they want, and they know what I want. They are the ideal person to employ, and we have an excellent working relationship where neither activity interferes with the other, and in fact considerably enhances it.

So the most important point should be to enable direct discussions with the company and the prospector without the need for interference from the government. This trust can only occur if both sides are being treated equally and both are expecting and can win, while still being treated equally by paying taxes, not mining uranium, and completing the many forms required in Greenland.

Kind regards

Greg Barnes

Anna Wingell

Office Manager

This email and any files transmitted with it are confidential and intended solely for the use of the individual or entity to whom they are addressed. This message contains confidential information and is intended only for the individual named. If you are not the named addressee you should not disseminate, distribute or copy this e-mail. If you have received this email in error please notify the sender immediately by email and delete this e-mail from your system. The recipient should check this email and any attachments for the presence of viruses. GB Barnes and Associates advises email recipients to carry out their own virus checks before opening any attachment.

From: Bo Simmelsgaard <bosd@nanoq.gl>
Sent: Thursday, October 26, 2023 1:59 AM
Subject: Letter regarding new legislation (Nanoq - ID nr.: 23548393)

Dear licensee,
Please see attached document.

Inussiarnersumik Inuulluaqqusillunga
Med venlig hilsen
Best regards

Bo Simmelsgaard
Inatsisileritoq

Jurist
Legal Advisor to the Deputy Minister



NAALAKKERSUISUT
GOVERNMENT OF GREENLAND

Inuussutissarsiornermut, Niuernermut, Aatsitassanut, Inatsisit Atuutsinneqarnerannut Naligiissitaanermullu
Naalakkersuisoqarfik
Departementet for Erhverv, Handel, Råstoffer, Justitsområdet og Ligestilling
Ministry of Business, Trade, Mineral Resources, Justice, and Gender Equality
P.O. Box 930
3900 Nuuk

Greenland

Oq./Tel.: +45 31 22 08 79

bosd@nanoq.gl

www.naalakkersuisut.gl

www.govmin.gl

Message protected by MailGuard: e-mail anti-virus, anti-spam and content filtering.

<https://www.mailguard.com.au>

[Report this message as spam](#)