

Summary of key issues arising within the December 12 Kabi meeting to vote on the Cooloola ILUA.

These matters directly and significantly affect the progress of the Cooloola Great Walk development plan. They are not esoteric or remote Native Title issues.

The listed events are drawn directly from accounts given by a number of attendees.

- The Meeting chair and one of the prominent Applicant members officiating maintained aggressive behaviour and communication toward NO vote advocates throughout the meeting.
- Meeting facilitators made efforts to eject 'No' vote advocates from the meeting ahead of the vote but the objects of their action refused to leave.
- A prominent Applicant member swung a punch at one of Witbooka's family and knocked his glasses off.
- An officiating Applicant member (one of the 7 'authorised to do business on behalf of the Claim Group) made repeated assertion to the meeting that if it returned a NO vote the development would proceed anyway and they'd all get nothing.
This is highly coercive. It is also not correct given the proposal's heavy political reliance on Kabi 'support' to gain social licence. This reliance is affirmed by the failure of the equivalent Hinchinbrook plan to proceed following rejection by 1st Nations.
- Ahead of the vote 20 people were bussed in to the meeting from Cherbourg.
- One elder present (not affiliated with Wit-boooka) says he did not recognise about 80% of attendees.
- Votes were counted individually by show of hands of all attendees instead of from just 2 delegates per family, which is the meeting precedent for voting on Substantive motions. This variation directly enables vote stacking with persons of in-authentic descent and a disproportionate vote by some families.
- The printed sheet with 8 wordy and detailed resolutions was distributed to attendees only a few minutes ahead of the votes being taken. The departure from the standard voting rules also enabled this to occur. The correct rules have procedural requirements for discussion within and between the Claim Group families.
- The meeting occurred subsequent to a 4-year period of ILUA development wherein the Applicant has abjectly failed to uphold the Claim Group consultation standards that are clearly specified in the formal Terms and Condition governing The Applicant's function.
This failure has left the Claim Group grossly under-informed and disconnected on the issue. This defective baseline is consistent with, and greatly compounds the impact of, the events facilitated within the course of the ILUA decision meeting.