

CLIENT Taylor Woodrow  
 MATTER Senate Inquiry  
 FILE NO  
 AUTHOR LMS

DATE 10/9/12  
 TIME (start) 11 am/pm  
 TIME (end) 11:30 am/pm  
 PAGE 1 OF 3

Circle activity				With whom
TO	TI	CW	AT	BankWest
				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>David Gilbert</li> <li>David Nolan</li> <li>Les Walker</li> <li>Mark Englebert</li> <li>Jeremy Nipp</li> <li>LOA</li> <li>LMS</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Mark spoke to letter received from Senate Com.</li> <li>Mark spoke to <del>the</del> communications in the S.C. to date.</li> <li>Dates → possible attendance on 12/10 → TBC.</li> <li>M/E costs, Bradman costs &amp; T/U costs spoken to.</li> <li>Better was one of the last witnesses on the 1st day in Canberra → Bob's immediate reaction → Sean has got stuff wrong → "let's set straight" (initial reaction) → decision then made to deal with in camera S/C:                     <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>more relaxed &amp; open setting (less drama &amp; performance)</li> <li>avoid "head biding" perception by coming out all guns blazing</li> <li>media issue → suppress issue by not "feeding" the media.</li> </ol> </li> </ul>				

} all BankWest

NOTE BankWest scored of MEDIA

Reminders Who agreed to do what? By when? Without prejudice stipulated?

Want it done in secret!

CLIENT

DATE

/ /

MATTER

TIME (start)

am/pm

FILE NO

TIME (end)

am/pm

AUTHOR

PAGE

2 OF 3

Circle activity				With whom
TO	TI	CW	AT	
				<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Can't say what was said "in camera" → but free to say the Bank took issue with some of Sean's memoranda etc.</li></ul>
				<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• No f/upp questions a battle (there have been on other matters)</li></ul>
				<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Bank supports "in camera" evidence if that is what recipients wish to do.</li></ul>
☆				<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• David Nolan said T/W should consider whether any written response is to be published → CDA said that was likely unavoidable → possible appeal to confidentiality issues &amp; privacy issues.</li></ul>
☆				<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• David Nolan → happy to share preparatory work → idea for various Senators &amp; their backgrounds, approaches etc.</li></ul>
				<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Invoices from ME to go to T/W → then to go to the Bank.</li></ul>
☆				<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Confidentiality of "practice" memo for Mark E. etc.</li></ul>
				<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Fisher/fitting issue discussed → all agreed S/B on a holding to nothing with his arguments.</li></ul>
				<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Short opening S/memo → 2 to 3 mins advisable.</li></ul>

Reminders

Who agreed to do what?

By when?

Without prejudice stipulated?

CLIENT \_\_\_\_\_ DATE / /  
MATTER \_\_\_\_\_ TIME (start) \_\_\_\_\_ am/pm  
FILE NO \_\_\_\_\_ TIME (end) \_\_\_\_\_ am/pm  
AUTHOR \_\_\_\_\_ PAGE 3 OF 3

Circle activity				With whom
TO	TI	CW	AT	
				• <u>Demands?</u> → 30 day demands?
				→ w/p invitation to meet to discuss during 30 day period.
				→ 3 <sup>rd</sup> party "umpire"? might have meet.
				• Above discussion led by David Nolan.
				↳ devote thought to who might be an umpire, eg. Michael Holleydale.
				<i>RMS</i>
				<i>Bankwells David Nolan discussed with a 3<sup>rd</sup> party umpire I requested this but they never agreed WHY?</i>