

----- Original Message -----

From: [Jorge Daniel Taillant](#)

To: '[Annala Kaisu \(Espoo\)](#)'

Cc: [Jorma.Immonen@ktm.fi](#) ; '[PUNTO NACIONAL CONTACTO](#)' ; '[David Barnden](#)' ; '[romina](#)'

Sent: Friday, June 02, 2006 11:52 AM

Subject: Possible Meeting CEDHA - Finnish NCP in OSLO or Paris

Hello Kaisu,

Thank you for your rapid response and for making an attempt to establish communication between CEDHA and Botnia about this project and its controversy, particularly since previous formal legal communications with Botnia through our legal filings in Argentine courts produced NO response from Botnia. Perhaps this might change in the future.

Thank you also for your offer to invite us to one of your mills in Finland. We are very much interested in seeing and visiting from within, a functioning pulp mill and comparable functioning site, similar to what we can expect in Fray Bentos Uruguay. And we would be especially interested in visiting a Botnia site. Perhaps a visit to one of your mills in Finland would be an interesting view for us into pulp paper production. We don't feel however, that visiting a mill in Finland would resolve our doubts about Botnia's proposed mill in Uruguay.

We believe that a more useful experience would be to visit:

1. A functioning Kraft pulp mill in the developing world using the Botnia or same Finnish technology to be used in Fray Bentos; this could be a mill by Botnia or by another company using THE SAME kraft/finnish technology Botnia plans to use. In this regard, and according to the IFC's contracted report by Hatfield, we recall to you that it is still unclear in the public domain, precisely what technology Botnia intends to use. Clarification of this technology is of course a first step. You will understand that since we already have several Kraft mills in Latin America (including Chile, Argentina, and Brazil), several of which are using Finnish technology, and in many cases whose communities are unhappy with the mills and their social and environmental impacts, we have not seen any favorable results, only empty promises. For this reason, Botnia is having the problems it faces in Uruguay, as local citizens have presently NO reason (except Botnia's promises) to assume that impacts would be different or any better than in these other sites. To visit a production plant in Finland, under entirely different circumstances, at small production scales, with no clarity as to the technology used, and with stronger environmental laws reigning in Finland, will likely not resolve our doubts, concerns, and distrust in supposed innocuousness of Botnia's proposed pulp mill production in Uruguay.

2. A mill which produces the same or similar quantity of production that we will have in Uruguay, that is, mill production amounting to approximately 2 million tons per year. In this case, of course, there are TWO mills, that of Botnia and ENCE which combined, will produce this colossal amount of pulp. It seems clear to us that to visit a mill significantly smaller than the combined production of ENCE and Botnia, would not suffice to see and experience the true extent of the eventual contamination to the immediate site. This could be resolved, either by visiting a large mega-plant with similar production volume, or a location where more than one plant operates to reach the expected 2million ton output. You will understand that the combined impact expected by Botnia and ENCE are a CENTRAL concern to local communities, and this cannot and should not be ignored by any of the actors, including Botnia and its supporters. For this reason, we stress the importance to examine and look at comparable production schemes.

3. A mill operating in a country where there are obviously less environmental controls than in Finland. This is also very critical as we can assume that both because of Finland's long time experience with pulp mills, this industry operates under more strict and informed control processes, as well as that general environmental control mechanisms are stronger, this results in a very determined context for pulp production. In the case of Uruguay, this operational

environment will be for these and other reasons, very different. We are very keen to see, (if there are any at all), operational environments of pulp mills in developing countries where the industry has achieved the safety and positive social and environmental conditions which Botnia claims will occur with its Uruguayan plant.

I will be very honest with you. We do not believe that you can provide us with the above mentioned conditions, and thus far, we are not convinced from the project documents available, and the way in which the IFC, Botnia and ENCE have handled these projects and how they are now advancing, that you will be able to show evidence of plant production and sites that show that these of these mills will not have the impacts which we and stakeholders fear. This is logically why we have filed complaints against Botnia and ENCE, against the banks, against the IFC, and against Uruguay.

However, we want to be fair to Botnia, so if you believe that these conditions CAN be met, and if you have examples of functioning mills in these conditions and of these qualifications (no less), we would be more than happy to visit them, as we would truly like to believe that Botnia's claims to the innocuousness of its proposed mills along that of ENCE in Fray Bentos are true.

We are open to discuss these issues at your convenience, and do look forward to at least having an information exchange of views about this case while we are in Europe.

We will be in Oslo June 12-16
and in France June 19-24.

Respectfully,

Jorge Daniel Taillant
Executive Director/Director Ejecutivo
Centro de Derechos Humanos y Ambiente (CEDHA)
General Paz 186, 10A
Cordoba 5000, Argentina
tel. 54 351 425 6278
jdtailant@cedha.org.ar
www.cedha.org.ar