

ANNUAL GENERAL MEETING 26/11/15

CHERYL (CHAIR), EVAN BROWN (MINUTES)

MINUTES ARISING READ AND PASSED BY CONSENSUS.

SCOUSE

WELCOME / APOLOGIES

LUKE J. PABLO, LINDSAY + MIKE KENNEDY.

THANKYOU TO: SIMON FOR FINANCIALS

- IAN FOR CHECKING REPORT.
- KRISTEN FROM GYPSY GREAT PAPER WORK.
- SUE FROM BLISS FOLLOWED UP BEAUTIFULLY.
- BERNIE RAINBOW VILLAGE
- PETER C ARTS.

• CHERYL TALKS ABOUT RE PURCHASING SOME STUFF

• KATE WANTS TO THANK ALL OF THE VOLUNTEERS

NOT JUST COMMITTEE BUT OTHERS AT FESTIVAL.

• NEGATIVITY CULTURE PEOPLE WILL DO 9 THINGS WELL + 1 THING BADLY MISTAKES HAPPEN. THINK TWICE ABOUT EMAILS TO OTHERS. SENDING OUT NEGATIVITY / PROBLEM SOLVING RATHER.

• DAVID C:

8 MOTIONS

~~VOLUNTEER REPORT~~

#1

~~RTE DEVELOPS + IMPLEMENT AN AZURE~~

SEE FOLLOWING PAGE FOR DETAILS OF MOTIONS

~~DTE AGM~~ DTE DETAILS OF MOTIONS FOR 27/01/15 AGM

Motions moved by the Down To Earth Co-operative Board

① That DTE develops and implements an agreement for all volunteers which is to include guiding principles, a code of conduct, and a complaints review panel with procedures for disciplinary sanctions and appeals processes.

(2) That DTE develops and implements a mental health policy with procedures the organisation can follow to help volunteers experiencing behavioural problems relating to emotional distress, mental illness or substance abuse, and if possible and appropriate, assist in their recovery. The goal of this policy is to produce an inclusive, fair and safe working environment for all volunteers. This policy should be reviewed by the Victorian Mental Illness Awareness Council to ensure it follows best practice and is free from unhelpful discrimination.

(3) That DTE members approve expenditure of up to \$7,000 to have its rules reviewed by a solicitor in light of changes on 3 March 2014 to (Victorian State Legislation) Co-operatives Act 1996 by the Co-operatives National Law (CNL) initiative and recommend amendments necessary to fix any inconsistencies or rules conflicting with current legislation.

(4) That up to \$13000 be allocated to engage Ecotide bush fire consultants to prepare a bush fire management plan to facilitate the permit to enable a Summer 2016 ConFest

(5) Motion, moved by David Cruise, seconded by Troy Reid, that DTE board of directors plan, cost and evaluate the acquisition of a property in or around Brunswick (VIC) for use as warehouse storage, meeting rooms, community kitchen, workshop for infrastructure and art projects, tool/skill sharing, and where possible partnering with other Not-For-Profit volunteer organisations to deliver such facilities, with a report and proposal to be presented to members at a subsequent General Meeting.

(6) Motion, moved by Troy Reid, seconded by Steve Poynton, that DTE members approve expenditure of up to \$40,000 for an arts grant program to commemorate ConFest 40th anniversary gathering in Easter 2016. Applicants would be invited to tender proposals for full or partial funding up to a maximum of \$10,000 for any one project with preference granted to permanent installations over temporary exhibits. The program shall implement standard anti-corruption and abuse safeguards and require detailed written proposals with budgets and references, and may implement partial withholding of funds until projects are completed or provide progressive payments. Grant applications are to be assessed and recommended for selection by an independent panel of 3 or more people chosen by DTE board of directors.

(7) Motion, moved by David Cruise, seconded by Steve Poynton, That a sum of \$600,000 be available to the Board for the purchase of property suitable for the Co-operatives purposes. The property to be approved by a postal ballot of Active Members

(8) Request from Ian Hales

That there is a discussion on the removal of shareholders who have acted against the interests of the co-operative.

#1 DOES DTE BELIEVE THAT WE SHOULD TAKE ONE?
SEE DETAILS.

STEVE P: AS SOMEONE WHO HAS BEEN DRAWN INTO BEING A MEDIATOR IS A GOOD IDEA.

- MOVED BY BOARD.

CHRYL: RULES DO STIPULATE A CODE OF CONDUCT ALIGNED TO RULES

- STEVE P: EZ. RULES ARE GENERAL & CODES ARE SPECIFIC

- CHAIR: MEMBERS ONLY TO VOTE

- SSCOUSE: ~~ANTI~~ - SEMI-TIC? ATHEISTS

- OBJECTIONS - NONE

- PASSED BY CONSENSUS.

#2 SEE PAGE OPPOSITE

BRUCE P: BROUGHT WITH DANGER IF SOMEONE STEPS FORWARD.

KATE S: AGREES WITH SIMILAR CONCERNS

CHERYL: IN THE PAST WE APPROACHED THIS

DAVID C: INTRODUCE MENTAL HEALTH

TRAINING TO HOW MANY.

MOVED BY BOARD.

IAN: NEED A QUALIFIED ASSESSMENTS ON THAT PERSON.

TRAY: STANDARD PRACTICE FOR ORGS TO INTRODUCE THESE POLICIES

WORK WITH EXPERTS TO DEVELOP PROCEDURES ON HOW TO RESPOND.

KATE S: PROPOSE THAT CODE OF CONDUCT IS FIRST. & PUT MENTAL HEALTH POLICY DEFERRED TIL GM

JOHN GRAY ORG NO BRAINER BUT WITH DTE ~~WE~~ IS PART OF OUR ETHOS TO BE INCLUSIVE OF MENTAL HEALTH.

MAT INGLISH IN FAVOUR BUT NEEDS INVESTIGATION

KATE: CLARIFICATION THAT CODES OF CONDUCT IS NOT SAME BUT NEED TO ESTABLISH THIS POLICY FIRST

#2

CONT.

MATT INGLISH: "INVESTIGATE" AS AN AMMENDMENT

SPETER OSH: FIRST AID UMBRELLA

AMMENDMENT: REMOVE WORD "IMPLEMENT" AND ADD INVESTIGATE

BEV: CONCERNS FROM SOME THAT QUALIFIED PEOPLE SHOULD BE LEADING THIS

OBJECTIONS TO AMMEND.

DAVID C: REMOVE WORD "WORKING"

KATE S: PAPER PUT TO FUTURE MEETING TO BE RATIFIED

BOTH AMMENDMENTS APPROVED.

#13

SEED PAPER

DAVID C: TRAY HAS LOCATED A SOLICITOR THAT SPECIALISES IN COOPERATIVE LAW

CHERYL: WE SHOULD GIVE OUT RULES & CURRENTLY WE CAN'T IF NOT ALIGNED WITH STATE RULES

TO VERIFY IF CURRENT RULES ARE IN ERROR TO ADD ANYTHING ~~WHICH~~ WILL BE A CONSULTATIVE PROCESS.

TRAY: WE CAN MAKE

MATT INGLISH: WHAT HAPPENS IF LAWYER LOOKS AT RULES AND DETERMINES THAT A LOT OF THEM NEED TO BE REDONE...

DAVID C: CHANGING RULES

CHERYL: CHANGING RULES IS A LONG PROCESS WITH ~~CERTAIN~~ ^{CONSUMERS} AFFAIRS

SCOUSE: READ ACT + NOTHING IN IT THAT MENTIONS ORGANISING COMMITTEE

RICHARD C: WHY DO WE NEED A THIRD PART TO MAKE A DECISION

STEVE P: WHEN THIS HAPPENS IT BECOMES POLITICAL / PERSONAL

RICHARD C: DO WE EVER HAVE A CONSENSUS

STEVE P:

CHERYL:

MALCOLM M: 35 REFERENCES TO LEGISLATION IN THE ACT THAT NO LONGER CORRESPOND.

ROBERT H.: IS THE LAWYER GOING THROUGH TO SEE WHAT'S PROBLEMATIC.

GRANT W: WE CAN IT BE THE ONLY ORG THAT HAS A PROBLEM?

MICHAEL H.: INTERMS OF OUR RULES THEY ARE DTE RULES CONSUMER AFFAIRS HAS GONE THROUGH THEM INTERMS OF CORRECTNESS / ~~APPROPRIATE~~ APPROPRIATENESS

ROBERT H.: BULLYING IN THE ACT.

#4

ECLOTIDE SEE DETAILS ON PAGE.

PETER C: SPENDING MONEY IS A WASTE

CHERYL: WHO IS ECLOTIDE

EMMA B: ECLOTIDE IS CONSULTING FIRM TO DETERMINE SAFETY OF PEOPLE GOING TO FESTIVAL WOULDNT SUPPORT SPENDING THIS MONEY I WOULD LIKE TO OFFER MY EXPERTISE TOWARDS

MOTION BY BOARD SECONDED BY BOARD.

STEVE: IF BOARD MOVED MOTION WHY DONT THEY KNOW ANYTHING ABOUT IT

~~STEVE~~ STEVE P: WE HAVE ATTEMPTED ^{FURTHER} THIS & FAILED AND WOULD NEED TO TAKE 7 STEPS.

EMMA B: I WANT TO GO OVER THIS PROCESS IT WILL HIGHLIGHT RISKS. REPORTS WON IT TELL US WHETHER WE CAN HAVE A FESTIVAL.

RICHARD C: MAKE NO FUNDAMENTAL ~~IMPACT~~ ^{IMPACT} TO US BUT RATHER OUR NEIGHBOURS WHO WE CANT ^{CONTROL}

JOHN A: TRAGEDY WE MISSED 3 SUMMER FESTIVALS, WE REALLY NEED TO GET CREATIVE HIRE A SITE OR MOVE SOMEONE ELSE. NOT AN ACTIVE APPROACH. LETS JUST HAVE THE FESTIVAL.

PETER C: I'M NOT A FIRE FLY, BUT COULD DO IT BETTER THAN ECLOTIDE FOR 13K.

MURRAY R: I HAVE LISTENED TO ALL THE
MOANING & NOW WE ARE TRYING OUR BEST
TO GET ONE WHETHER WE GET EMMA OR
ECOTIDE MAYBE THEY WILL GET IT FOR US.
EMMA IS BLOODY BRILLIANT PERSON.

CHERYL: THANK YOU FOR PASSION MURRAY.

KATE S: BK IS PEANUTS FOR COMMUNITY
IS OUR DUTY OF CARE. ITS ABOUT KEEPING THE
COOPERATIVE SAFE. GIVING IT OUR BEST SHOT

YIELIMA
FARM
PUNGALA
LAND ON
MURRAY

GAYLE: ~~YIELIMA~~ FARM IS A GOOD PLACE TO ASK
WHERE THEY GOT ~~THE~~ 'BARMATH FOREST ON
MURRAY' THEIR PERMIT, MAYBE WE NEED
TO CONSULT PEOPLE WHO HAVE
MATT INGLISH CIRCUIT BREAKER FOR A GROUP
THINK. IN FAVOUR OF THIS REPORT.

DONE THIS WITH FALLS + MEREDITH
MARTIN S: WHAT ABOUT BYLANDS.

CARLY: ① DO WE 100% WANT IT AT
WOOMOORA ② THEN DECIDE ON ECOTIDE

PETER C: WE HAVE NEVER SUBMITTED PLAN
THEREFORE WE ARE NOT GOING IN CIRCLES.

PETER T: BK IS CHICKEN FEED. WE NEED
THE ANSWER OF "IS THIS SITE SUITABLE"
ECOTIDE WOULD GIVE US THIS ANSWER

RICHARD C: WE WOULDN'T BE INSURED IF
NOT APPROPRIATE. WE HAVEN'T HAD PROBLEMS
IN PAST. FIRE RISK NEEDS TO BE SORTED

CAROL: IN ENOUR RISK WOULDN'T CHANGE
BE WHERE EVER FESTIVAL IS POSITIONED

KATE S: UPTO BK.

MALCOLM M: RISK ASSESSMENT HAS NEVER BEEN
LOOKED AT. WE HAVE BEEN BUILDING OUR
FIRE FIGHTING SERVICES TO STANDARD CURRENT
RFS IS HAPPY WITH ALL OUR IMPROVEMENTS.
BIGGER ISSUES IS WHETHER WE SHOULD LIMIT
NUM NUMBERS.

JOHN G: BK IS NOT MUCH IN COMPARISON
TO WHAT WE HAVE LOST IN \$\$ OVER MISSED
FESTIVAL

BRUCE P: NOT SURE WHAT ARGUMENT IS THERE?
GETTING SOMEONE IN? OR SPENDING \$3K?
WHY WE SHOULD LIMIT NUMBERS TO WHAT WE
CITY MANAGES.

DAVID C: ECHO CARRY WE GOT TO POINT WHERE
HAVEN'T MOVED. 14/15 CONTAINERS SO EMBEDDED
WE USED TO PUT UP FESTIVALS IN 30 DAYS

LOOK AT OTHER PROPERTIES. WE CAN MANAGE
OUR SITE BUT OUR SITE IS SURROUNDED BY FOREST
WE GOT TO CONVINCE SHIRE THEY WON'T BE
THE ONES CARRYING A CATASTROPHE

CAN WE FIND A SITE WHERE WE SAFELY
CORINNE: CANNOT BELIEVE WITH ALL ASSETS
DTE OWNS THAT RISK ASSESSMENT HASN'T
ALREADY BE DONE. FIRE & PROPERTY.

OTHERWISE WE DOING A PIECEMEAL APPROACH.
CARRY: IF THIS DOES AHEAD I WOULD LIKE
IT TO INCLUDE BYLANDS & SEPT AT WOOROOMA

PETER T: QUOTE \$1000 SO TO DO BYLANDS
AS WELL WOULD COST ANOTHER \$1000

EMMA B: IN FAVOUR BUT ALSO WE HAVE BEEN
RELATIONSHIP WITH COUNCIL IS NOT IDEAL
POLICE STAYED ON OUR FESTIVAL WITH
DRUG BUSTS ETC TO GET OUR ATTENTION

SAME QUALIFICATIONS AS OWNER OF ECLOTIDE
BUT STILL RECOMMENDS WE GO AHEAD WITH
THEM FOR RISK ASSESSMENT BUT RECOMMEND
SITE "B" ON WOOROOMA.

AMMENDMENT: ~~LEAVE "ECLOTIDE" TO ENGAGE~~
~~EXTERNAL ^{PROFESSIONAL} DUST/POSSIBLE MANAGEMENT & RISK~~
~~MANAGEMENT ASSESSMENT / RISK MITIGATION~~
~~BUSINESS/REVENUE MANAGEMENT PLAN.~~

AMMENDMENTS: THAT UP TO \$13000 BE
ALLOCATED TO EXTERNAL CONSULTANTS TO PREPARE
RISK ASSESSMENT & MITIGATION PLAN FOR MOULE MERR
PROPERTY.

OBJECTIONS (4).

MOTIONS PUT BY CORINNE
VOTED ON MAJORITY

#5 SEE DETAILED PAGE

- DAVID C. CONCERNED THAT RECORDS ARE KEPT AT HIS PLACE.
- 40 YEARS OF RECORDS.
- FRIENDS OF EARTH EDITOR THREW OUT RECORDS OVER A YEAR.
- HERITAGE VALUE
- PLACE TO OWN CONTROL FORENSICK RESEARCH.
- COMMUNITY BASED GROUPS TO SHARE.
- NOT ASKING TO DO IT BUT ASKING TO SPEND TIME & HAVE MONEY AVAILABLE

CARLY : WHY BRUNSWICK?

DAVID C. SOME OF THE FIRST MEETINGS ~~WERE~~ WERE NORTH CO BURN, ROSS HOUSE CITY. THEN FOE FITZROY.

KATE S : NEED TO ENSURE OUR RECORDS ARE SAFE.

GAYLE : FORGETTING ABOUT CONFAB.

BRUNSWICK IS EXPENSIVE, PRICE RANGE? SITE SIZE? IS REALLY LIMITED STATEMENT.

CORINNE : AGREE WITH KATE & 2 OTHER PROPERTIES & PERMA CROFT WHICH NOBODY KNOWS ABOUT. IS FRIGHTENING.

PETER O BRUNSWICK. PUBLIC TRANSPORT?

MURRAY : WHY DON'T WE RENT/ ~~FIRST~~ LEASE FIRST AND SEE IF IDEA WORKS. RATHER THAN COMMITTING TO PURCHASE.

JOHN G : EFFICIENCY & LOCKABLE ROOMS AT MOMENT ITS IN A LOOSE MESS.

MAYBE NEXT CONFEST WE SHOULD CONFERENCE THIS AT NEXT FESTIVAL. LETS MAKE OUR DREAM.

PETER T INTEREST ON FINANCE & SOME MEETINGS ONLY HAVE 6 PEOPLE SO A PROPERTY OF THIS COST IS EXCESSIVE

DOCUMENT STORAGE → STATE LIBRARY / MITCHAM LIBRARY WHY NOT EXPAND THIS COLLECTION & ALSO ONLINE STORAGE. WE COULD EXPAND DISTRACTION FROM A LOT OF OTHER WORK.
MATT INGLISH.

AMMENDMENT: TAKE OUT BRUNSWICK DON'T NEED TO SPECIFY USES "COULD BE USED" AND ALSO NOT SPECIFY WHO WE PARTNER WITH.

TROY: AGAINST AMMENDMENT AS THIS IS A BUSINESS PLAN

BRUNSWICK? EARLY INVESTIGATION INC WORKSHOP TOOL LIBRARY IDEA → BRUNSWICK TOOL LIBRARY AIM → CLEAR THAT TOOL LIBRARIES ARE SOPHISTICATED SET UP. ↓ CURRENTLY COHABIT WITH NORM ↓ WANT TO CONTINUE

- BOOSTING VOLUNTEERS BASE.
- COST ECONOMICS IS NOT FAIR CART BEFORE HORSE
- PROPERTIES ABOUT 1.2m.
- RENT 80-100K IN RENT IS DEAD MONEY.
- IF IT DOESN'T WORK OUT THEN WE COULD SELL.
- IF WE ARE CONTEMPLATE A COHABITATION MODEL WE NEED TO CONSIDER THEIR REQUIREMENTS

10.30? DO WE HAVE PERMISSION TO CONTINUE.

BILL: LEASE AT KENSINGTON

EMMA B: WE SHOULD SUPPORT THIS MOTION

ELLEN B: SUPPORT TROY'S BACKGROUND &

INITIATIVE

WYLE: CONTRAS NEEDS SUPPORT FOR SPA. POOL SPA. PROPERTY CAN BE SOLD

ROBERT: DOCUMENT STORAGE COULD BE SHED AT WOOMOORA / BYLANDS.

STEVE P: I CAN SAY THAT HAVING TO ACCESS DOCUMENTS

CHERYL: WE DO NEED TO ATTEND TO STORAGE! STORING OUR RECORDS.

→ CARLY: POINT OF ORDER TO CHERYL TO STEP
MOTION ON HOLD 10:40. SIDE AS OTHER
SPEAKING TO NOT

INTERUPTION TO ANNOUNCE BALLOT

MICHAEL HILL

3 PEOPLE FOR 2 YEAR TERMS.

- ① SIMON BYERS
- ② TROY REID
- ③ DAVID CRUISE

MICHAEL HILL: I'M HAPPY TO SPEAK TO ACCOUNT

KATE S: WE NEED THIS REPORT SENT TO ALL

DIRECTORS

DO WE NEED THIS TO BE A MOTION OR IS IT A
REQUIREMENTS

DAVID C: POINT IS NOTED.

IAN H: CASH MANAGEMENT ACCOUNTS? SPAN:

LOW

CHERYL: FINANCE COMMITTEE

#15

CONT MOTION DISCUSSION

IAN H: INCOME ONLY FROM ONE FESTIVAL

ALTHOUGH IS GOOD IDEA BUT PARTNERS
ARE NOT GOOD CHOICE FOR TENANTS.

IDEA OF WORKSHOP IS FINE BUT IS NOT A
CONTINUOUS ACTIVITY

ONLINE COSTS FAR CHEAPER TO PLACE A
PURPOSE BUILT SHED ON PROPERTY.

CASH RESERVES SAFETY NET.

DISTANT US FROM CONFEST.

DIE SHOULD NOT GO AHEAD WITH DISTRACTION
OF THIS MOTION

LOOKING FOR PROPERTY FOR SUMMER
CONFEST

10-20 YEAR MASTER PLAN & NOT ADHOC
DECISIONS

MARY S: PARTY SUPPORTIVE TOOLS,
BUT COMMERCIAL KITCHEN IS EXPENSIVE

ONLINE SYSTEM IS WHAT WE SHOULD BE BUILDING BUT WITH PAPER STORED SAFELY AS BACKUP.

MOTION (5) IS WITHDRAWN BY DAVID C + TRAY R.

#6 SEE DETAILED PAGE - TROY

Troy: Recently made aware of \$20,000 proposal discussion, no details yet decided on assessment board.

David C: Ammendment to remove the word 'grant' implies gift.

Carrie: Term 'art' is arbitrary, would like to see criteria before voting - defer back to Troy for outline.

Troy: ~~happy~~ 2nd removal of word 'grant' - No objections ammendment approved.

Paul: likes to encourage something new & creative.

Marty: supports motion but \$40,000 is too much - also like to see portion for specified purposes to ie: front gate.

Elle: Beautification exciting for 40th but amount too high - Good installations can be done for \$1,000. 'Temporary' & 'permanant' undefined - we've leave no trace festival - need to minimise rubbish.

Peter C: Need good board to make sure money isn't wasted.

Ian: Good motion but money = all village's budget - we need to be prudent with money with only 1 festival. Need stringent requirements for grants so money isn't misused.

Murray: Argued about \$13,000 - priorities are backward.

Troy: \$40,000 is for multiple grants of different amounts - not one. Can use city of melbourne art grant guidelines. Panel of reviews would be briefed on criteria.

Emma: line ~~is~~ that each applicant can only apply for a grant up to \$5,000 and only 75% of approved amount is paid upfront.

Carol: Is art only visual art or music etc.. Would even support \$50,000.

Emma: proposed ~~grant~~ ammendment - seconded by Marty.

Troy Elle: Against ammendment - \$5,000 too high - if tem is temporary is a waste & if permanant need to be stored - if we own them - massive clean up or storage.

Mary: possibility of permanent structure re ticket booth / front gate being \$5,000 and valuable - must be site specific.

Kate: support amendment - also wants to rid specific amounts,

Mary: add to amendment - "with preference to ~~site~~ ^{site} specific permanent structures".

Carol: concerned about money limitation - leave it open for thing like open stage.

Peter: let's simplify the motion & set on a figure rather than add to fluff.

Ian: concerned with 'permanent structures' against philosophy of Confest.

Steve E: ~~do~~ object to amendment - capping amount drops ^{quality} ~~price~~.

Vote on ~~amendment~~ amendment 10 for 6 against.

Amendment approved: adding ² Each applicant can only apply up to \$5,000 with only 75% of approved amount paid upfront. Preference would be given to supporting site specific permanent structures.

Mark: would like to see \$40,000 reduced as other worthwhile things to spend money on on site - reduced to \$20,000.

David: motion implies there's no art at Confest but instead everyone at Confest is an artist - let's encourage participation - one of the conditions - re: Mudfrabe - low cost & participatory & installation around campsite, white gums etc. ~~Make art~~.

~~Steve~~ Peter: agrees with David - but supports \$40,000 & with details worked out later.

Kate: motion says 'up to' \$40,000

Murray: money could be spent better elsewhere

Corinne: would like it to specify 'commemorate 40 years' ^{projects to} ⁴

Proposal 2nd Emma.

Elle: amendment to limit it to ³ \$20,000. Would the arts spending be reflect needs of other departments - artists reuse & recycle & get more creative with a lower budget.

Carol: against \$20,000 - if lots of applicants could become exclusive.

Peter: Only a few months to Confest and will increase artist creativity.

Ian: more money = more frivolous - stringent can = quality.

Carol: Peter: up to \$40,000 just gives us options - doesn't mean it'll be spent.

Richard ~~was an objector~~ & in favour: 15 against: 4.

Amendment passes to reduce motion to \$20,000.

Corinne: Amendment to rename 'arts program' to projects.

seconded Emma - approved by consensus

Vote: For: 15: Against 2

#7 ~~David~~ Motion: Troy Reid, and Steve Roynton that DTE members approve expenditure of upto \$20,000 for projects to commemorate ConFest 40th anniversary gathering in Easter 2016. Applicants would be invited to tender proposals for full or partial funding up to a maximum of \$5,000 for any one project, with preference given to site specific permanent structures over temporary exhibits. The program shall implement standard anti-corruption and abuse safeguards and require detailed written proposals with budgets & references and ~~75%~~ withholding of 75% of funds until projects are completed. Grant applications are to be assessed and recommended for selection by an independent panel of 3 or more people chosen by DTE board of directors.

#7 See detailed page

David C: permacraft is planning to sell ~ \$300,000 - 80 acres with river frontage ~~is~~ broadford. This would give us approved to bid.

Steve: speeds up process

Peter T: discussed in motion #5 - ~~is~~ + permacraft is conflict of interest possibly bailing Cheryl out of a bad investment as she does the books.

Peter C: permacraft isn't mentioned in the motion.

~~APRIL~~ Carly: before any possibility there would need to be a site visit.

Steve P: there would be a postal vote if its understood that no one would vote for it unless they've seen the property - this is the process.

David: with all properties purchased there was due process to visit property.

Carrie: ~~asking~~ why voting now if its not specific - is arbitrary.

Erin: we have no projection - we have not decided whether to or where to buy a property or what type - this motion is therefore redundant. Its not a decision that should be made ~~is~~ by directors & then put to members for a vote - ~~is~~ we dont want time savers.

Ian: our main goal is to put on ConFest. Strongly supports purchases supporting this.

Daryl: summer ConFest may require a new site - we may not have time for another general meeting.

Rob: agrees with Daryl appropriate to buy a UK property.

Emma: Full confidence we can get a Summer Contest. Amendment wants feasibility & plan on why directors feel we should buy another property - remove allocate funding & change to feasibility proposal just like #5. Not having summer contest is a cop out because not everything has been done - we have properties we could run summer contest on.

Marty: we had this last year & no property was bought unnecessarily. This is not a new proposal - against amendment.

* Amendment doesn't pass.

Comme: 2 properties may not be useful for the properties they were brought - shows ~~disrespect~~ incompetence of board.

David C: They have been successful, run multiple studies.

Motion to vote: For: 14 Against: 4. Motion Passes.

#8 SEE DETAILED PAGE - 10n.

lan: member applied & paid to take contest trademark with no reasoning given. Has been our trade name for almost 40 years - need to reapply every 10 years & we were late. This action by a member is reprehensible & this action should be taken. - We should proceed to ban member for co-op as his actions are intolerable.

Corine: if this is about a member specifically he should be present. Well contravened rules & we are within our ~~rights~~ rights to proceed.

lan: we should be seen as strong & confident enough to take action otherwise we appear negligent.

Kate: In a previous board meeting it was decided he would be contacted - this member said that it was to "protect" from co-op but unsure from what - B

Simon: was part of this phone call - no intention to give name back to OTE.

Emma: comes under code of conduct.

Troy: already there under theft.

Ravi: This member is a hard working volunteer - needs to be considered in addition to this incident.

Gayle: Brought up in the past that trademark hadn't been ~~relected~~ paid - had even considered doing something to protect it - don't know intent. Doubt this name could be taken from us. We are Contest, but these things bother people when there's not transparency.

Peter T: Need to know motivation - appealing isn't possible until it's approved.

Simon: already had come to clarify intent. Did not want to give it

that to do with it.

Steve: process to remove member is tough. 28 days for process after letter given including ^{2x} GMS & registers - do we want to go through this process? ~~the~~

Emma: Could we invite to m to speak before that process. There's a difference b/w malicious intent & shitting.

Ian: we can't wait till a member comes because he may never come - nothing to do with how much work has done - no reason why he specifically put it in his name - much greater than standard code of conduct - one of ~~the~~ most serious breaches.

Mark: Need to deal with reality of it - it is serious & offensive but also quite cheeky - we should initially give them the opportunity to ask them to hand it over and otherwise engage with full procedure.

Murray: Discussion is about 'people' in general. We need a process in place to have people get removed if done something dangerous so no one gets hurt. Lucky that most of these people aren't members.

Comme: Hopes for investigation into directors for letting tradename go unregistered & putting co-op in jeopardy. There's many other instances like confest.org.au that ~~is~~ is in someone's personal name.

Ian: An oversight by directors is not in the same category as a deliberate act - a serious offence.

David: It is ~~the~~ trademark - not trade name.

Ron: good to look at broad issue of responsibility on director. ~~the~~ This member was wrong but he has a small right as a member.

Carol: We were weak before by not being prepared - we are weak not recognising threats without a SWAT analysis, risk assessment etc.

DTE needs to get up to date starting with a mission statement.

Meeting closed 12:40 pm