

9/2

Record of conversation with Chavello ~ 12:15 - 2:00pm  
Wednesday 8<sup>th</sup> February 2006

Chavello called to advise me that he had approved the proposal for NCCOM to provide the mineral entitlement at gradient of 2006/7. He stated that he would arrange that I be sent to NCCOM at the unsuccessful bidder W.D. Brown.

Chavello then asked if I was aware that he had bought Tatts, then corrected and said he was a shareholder. I did not raise the issue first. I responded by saying that I was thankful that he had raised the matter because I was aware of rumours in the local community and I had been approached by people that had concerned me because the Chavellos could be perceived as gaining an advantage in the purchase due to his role and involvement in the sale. He stated that there was no advantage because it was the Sovereign Gold that had made the decision to sell and had put it out on the market. He had no involvement and reminded me that he was the one who said the Gold should make the decision. He did not believe that there was much concern in the community and that a few people were stirring things up. These people were Greg Clark, Andrew Campbell, Col McCullum and Tony Green. He stated that he had had legal advice and was preparing a report to Audit or Conflicts Committee. I suggested that he ensure that the legal advice

9/2  
9/2

Covered two further points. Firstly, that he had access to the report by the Beechey Group containing Commercial - in confidence information including the Valuations of the property as that he had ~~not~~ influenced the decision to delay the sale of the property by not ~~not~~ agreeing with the Beechey Group's recommendation to sell it immediately but to leave it to the new board to decide. Secondly that he had not allowed the Beechey Group to ~~not~~ consider the offer of \$3m of the property. He ~~regard~~ regard to the fact he said that it needed to go through the affixed process. I informed him that the price may allow direct negotiation of the free offer is so much higher than the valuation. He then said that if people in particular the Crew were to continue to stir up trouble then he would be forced to sue.

The rest of the conversation covered the following points:

- he advised that he had asked the CFO to conduct a financial rationalisation of the Residential system. He stated that saving could be made by getting rid of the security Head of office and referring the work P/T academics to be involved in the Commercial tasks. The business operation could be run by a section with the University reports to most fully DVC/PVC Infrastructure services.

- he explained further that would be the head of finance a UWS/SA/ some UWS. I informed him that the H/W & CFO had taken the toll on as that I was no longer involved. He informed me that he had his ~~speaking~~ speaking to James Brown's son Richard Farley as that

9/2

9/2

his preference would be if Sue <sup>control</sup> ~~was~~ to be  
 removed and replaced with Stephen Guffell  
 He would like to see the Unity move on  
 and take control of UNKSW (part of the  
 agreement is not in place by Wednesday to do so  
 He also states that the new CEO would then  
 report to the Senior UNK Board at a semi  
 annual meeting with the Unity probably the PVC (Infrastructure  
 & Services).

The final comment was that we should get together  
 & discuss <sup>what</sup> I felt it would like to do (This  
 was a follow up to a conversation we had before  
 Christmas when I stated that I was unhappy  
 with the way things were being managed and that  
 I would spend ~~some~~ over my Spring break  
 (including my future) I said that it would  
 be a good idea but just to let him know  
 now I have had a very good break, I  
 feel refreshed, I am looking forward to the future  
 and at the first I will be and also be looking  
 forward to settling down with the new VC when  
 he starts late February.

9/2

9/2 Record of conversation with A/VC Prof Robin Pollard and  
 CEO Mr Adrian Roberts ~ 5:15 - 6:30 pm  
 Wednesday 8th February 2006

There is a file with the record that I prepared for the Acting  
 Vice-Chancellor of the ~~University~~ details of the conversation that  
 I had with the Chancellor in the presence of the CEO

10/2

8 247 782

- ~~• Referral to Keith Moore~~
- ~~• email to Nick Moore~~
- ~~• Campbell~~
- ~~• V's Book~~
- ~~• Carlton Card~~
- ~~• Referral to Nelson AUSA~~
- ~~170 Howard ② Jada ③ Challenge~~
- ~~• liquor license Sue~~

10/2 Board of A-C Committee discussion regarding sale of Tattle  
 Friday 10/2/06

(Chair)  
 • Churchill opened meeting & advised text to Def Churchill had a  
 firm commitment and he would advise meeting. He took  
 a paper outlining his involvement/non-involvement re  
 sale of Tattle. He emphasized that he had no intention  
 first to decide to invest on 19/1/06. He mentioned  
 that he was aware of people around town in particular Mrs Gre  
 who were openly nervous about his involvement and if she  
 became aware of any further reports of people speaking  
 he would "see the back of her".

File Note 17/2 W.r.t to sale of Tatts there is some notion that there was an agreement to allow the successful tender a second chance at first on a price of the purchase of Q

File Note 17/2

A/VC Robin Pollard walked into my office at about 5:30 pm to discuss a matter relating to the Federal Government's Franchise fund. At the conclusion of that discussion he made a comment about the Fatherson's hotel. We had a general discussion relating to the Chancellor's involvement in the property. During the discussion I raised the matter of the Challeghis he referred to Smith & Campbell and mentioned that he did not include the 3 matters but I suggested should be included in our telephone conversation of 9/2. After discussing the matter further Prof Pollard decided that he needed a report for me as the County lawyer. We went to his office where he showed the emails and sent them on.

Field Note 23/2

Chancellor called at 10.30 am. He enquired about my involvement in the exercise he whereby he will be asked further questions by the A/V C at the Unity lounge over his involvement in the sale of Tatts. I informed him that it came about as a result of a discussion that I had with the A/V C last Friday evening when the A/V C asked me about the Tatts Hotel sale. I informed the Chancellor that I reported to the A/V C the conversation that I had had with him on the 9/2 and said that he today up loose ends at the point the Chancellor at the Unity it would be appropriate to have the Chancellor declare this involvement in aspects relating to the sale. He stated a number of times that he was not involved. I reminded him of the matter in my office that was mentioned and seemed to stall Committee of Council. He said he would check with Helen. I emphasized that I was not making any accusation that he intended of buying the matter to the A/V C was to complete the record so that neither the Church or the Chancellor was at risk if accusations were made in future that the Chancellor had an advantage. He mentioned that if people are going to know he was the way then he would start a vendetta. I said to him that I was hoping that he wouldn't target me. He said no that it would be a strategic approach. I emphasized again that this was an exercise in complete transparency and the records are complete.

He then started to ask questions about the Peterson's wine deal where 500 cases were bought

and why go south. I said I was not aware of  
the detail as it was managed through the Darling  
office. He asked whether it went through a tender  
process. I said I didn't have the detail but there  
would be records. I felt that he brought this up  
because he knew that I had some dealings with  
Peterson in the early days and that there was a form  
of a vested threat.

Conversation ended ~ 11.00am.