



## WHAT AUV MEMBERS SHOULD KNOW

12 April 2016

- The unacceptable operation of the Building Committee
- Smear campaign by Chairman of Building Committee
- AUV non-compliance with AGM resolutions
- Russell Street, Development Projects and Financial Benefits
- Ukrainian Community Centre – possible relocation to North Melbourne
- Lack of Communication with Members
- Reasonable expectation from the Association of Ukrainians in Victoria, its President, the Board and Controlling Commissioners.

This Newsletter addresses my personal experience and, in my opinion, speaks volumes of the unacceptable operation of individuals on the Association of Ukrainians in Victoria Building Committee.

I found it extraordinary that, prior to my being appointed to the Building Committee, the Committee deliberately chose to ignore the previous detailed design development work undertaken by Victor Rudewych and chose to re-invent the wheel with an unqualified and inexperienced developer.

*Mr. Rudewych's original proposal would have been an ideal launching platform for the Committee to start from.*

Mr. Rudewych, is highly qualified with decades of experience in the property development and building and construction sector, in his own right. His original proposal was well developed and financially sound. Furthermore, he has been a crucial benefactor to the AUV when its viability was threatened to an extent that renders his community credentials beyond question.

Prior to being appointed onto the Building Committee, I received preliminary information on the project. I as a professional Property, Building and Construction Cost Engineer (Quantity Surveyor), in an email dated 25 June 2013, stated to Michael Moravski and Stefan Romaniw:

*"To safeguard the Ukrainian Community, I would STRONGLY recommend that an independent Quantity Surveyor (not me) be engaged to provide assistance to the Russell Street Development Committee.*

*Anyone proceeding on this project without an independent Quantity Surveyor advice would be very foolish."*

## Independent Quantity Surveyor

The role a Quantity Surveyor (otherwise known as a Property and Building and Construction Cost Engineer) plays in Construction projects, be they Civil, Infrastructure or Building project, is they are specialists in the overall feasibility studies, cost planning, design and construction cost due diligence from the inception to completion of projects including assessing rental and lease options to achieve the highest rate of return on investment.

In Ukraine, Quantity Surveyors have, for all intents and purposes, totally eliminated corruption from the Civil, Infrastructure or Building sector on private and government projects. This topic will be addressed in a future СВІЙ ДО СВОГО Newsletter.

## Appointment to Committee

After approaching Michael Moravski a couple of months earlier, in an email dated 1<sup>st</sup> August 2013, I was advised that I was appointed by the AUV Board as a member of the Building Committee and the first meeting would be held on 7 August 2013. This meeting was a joint AUV Board and Building Committee meeting.

*Building Committee Membership was Mykola Dobrotwir, Ross Merunovich, Roman Rozek, Marusia Jarockyj, Michael Tkaczuk, Stefan Romaniw, Andrew Petryshyn, Oleh Bulka and myself. Miroslav (Ross) Merunovich as Chairman.*

*However, Marusia Jarockyj did not attend meetings and Michael Tkaczuk only attended one meeting.*

The purpose of the joint meeting was that a Development Proposal was to be presented from IntraPac developers.

## Examination of IntraPac development proposal

Upon detailed inspection of the proposal, I reported to the Building Committee the following:

### Land Valuation Component

- The Land Value for 13 – 21 Russell Street, Essendon  
Council Rates Notice dated 11 Aug 2011 was \$1,815,000
  - Council Rates Notices are not a true Market Valuations. Councils prepare Valuation for rating purposes for their municipality budgeting purposes.
- The Chairman, Miroslav (Ross) Merunovich stated they have an independent valuation stating the value of the land being \$2,200,000
  - However, when I requested to examine the valuation, Miroslav (Ross) Merunovich stated he would produce it at the next meeting.
  - No such valuation was ever shown to the Committee.
  - I have been told by others that, a local Real Estate Agent provided this information.
    - Allow me to state categorically, Real Estate Agents are NOT qualified to provide valuations and it is illegal for them to do so.

- For Development Sites such as this property project, there is a whole different set of rules that apply:
  - The site should have been valued as one consolidated lot and not small individual parcels of land.
  - The Valuation should have considered “What is it worth to a Developer” for the opportunity to develop the site given the length, width and height restrictions (6 floors at the time).
- My professional assessment (and I am professionally qualified and experienced to make such a call) of the Valuation of this parcel of land was between \$5 – 6 million.

I provided this information to the Building Committee, which the Chairman rejected and insisted that they proceed on an acceptable valuation offer of \$3,000,000 which he considered generous - while still not providing the Committee with the original valuation.

### **Building Cost Estimates and “Rate of Return” to AUV**

As the only Registered Building Practitioner on the Committee, I assessed the proposals professionally and found a number of concerns, which I reported to the Committee, based on the following:

- In an email dated 11 September 2013, I advised Miroslav (Ross) Merunovich as Chairman and the Committee that there were several financial issues of concern and inconsistencies. A prime concern was the construction costs and sale prices of the apartments and I stated:

*“The figures that are presented do not give me any sense of comfort. They are detailed, but not detailed enough where it really counts.*

*I would need to sit down with their Quantity Surveyors and talk turkey, including them presenting additional information as is NORMALLY required at this early (Indicative) stage – these should be very easy to establish.”*

- Oleh Bulka and I, conducted our own independent investigations and inspections of similar developments locally.
- Both Oleh Bulka and I reported our findings to the Committee which showed that the figures provided by IntraPac were not in line with their financial statement and costs estimated.

- It is interesting to note that in an email dated 15 September 2013 Miroslav (Ross) Merunovich as Chairman stated that:

*if we “Do nothing. This would led to bankruptcy within a year”.*

*This indicates that AUV was so close to bankruptcy that it’s horrifying to think off. This clearly indicated the total underperformance of the AUV Chairman, Michael Moravski and his Board Members.*

*It is my opinion, if Mr. Victor Rudewych did not loan a substantial amount to AUV, the bank would have foreclosed on them, leaving the Community in a precariously desperate position.*

It is clear that the AUV were in panic mode and as such were desperate to sign up any developer to pull AUV out of its financial dilemma. Hence the constant pressure on the Committee to rubber stamp IntraPac’s proposal.

## Michael Karaszewycz meeting with IntraPac

- Despite Miroslav (Ross) Merunovich's objections, the joint meeting of the AUV Board and the Building Committee approved my meeting with Hamish Macdonald of IntraPac as to my Cost Plan requirements for this development. This meeting was scheduled on 24 Sept 2013. Unfortunately Glen Corke, IntraPac's Quantity Surveyor was unable to attend.

In an email dated 2 October 2013 to the Building Committee addressed also to Miroslav (Ross) Merunovich, I stated:

*"Can you please insist on IntraPac to produce the Cost Plan by close of business on Friday".*

*They have more than ample time since our meeting on 24 Sept 13.*

*This is standard and basic Quantity Surveying (Cost Engineering) principles – so what's the delay"*

- In an email dated 3 October 2013, I attached a confidential detailed Cost Plan report on all the options proposed by IntraPac. This document was to be confidential, to the Committee only, as it was a "Control" Cost Plan to check against IntraPac's Cost Plan when they presented their Cost Plan for the Development.
- Upon receipt of the IntraPac Cost Plan, in an email dated 6 October 2013 to the Building Committee, I stated:

*"This would be the worst and most ineffective and non-convincing Cost Planning I have seen in decades.*

*It looks like a group of amateurs have got together – trying this and then that, hit and miss exercise, hoping to reach their target at our risk."*

- Given the serious discrepancy between IntraPac's costs proposals and my professional opinion, in an email dated 10 October 2013 I stated:

*"I wish to call a joint meeting of the Board and the Building Committee for the purpose of a serious discussion on this whole project.*

*I believe that Victor Rudewych should be invited (in writing) to express his experience as a Property Developer of many years, especially given his in depth knowledge and experience with the previous proposal which led to the Town Planning Permit which we hold on the land."*

## Rumours – Undermining the Committee

In an email dated 11 October 2013, which I sent to everyone on the AUV Board and the Building Committee I stated (in part) the following:

*"It has been brought to my attention, by a prominent member of the Ukrainian Community, that there is a person or persons that are spreading rumours that both myself and Mr. Oleh Bulka are undermining the AUV Russell St, Essendon property redevelopment process.*

*I will NOT allow this form of bullying to undermine my genuine efforts to assist the AUV and the Ukrainian Community.*

*Let me assure you all, that the two major papers I presented to both the Board and the Building Committee as well as the discussion we have had at the Joint Meeting and at Committee Meeting have been purely based on my professional qualifications and experience over 35 plus years as Quantity Surveyor, Construction Cost Engineer and Building Economist."*

*I further stated:*

*"Given my qualification, experience and expertise in Construction Contracts and being an expert witness in Legal Cases, I fully support Mr. Bulka's concerns and the changes he proposes.*

*To date, given the lack of professionalism by the developer, I do not believe they are sufficiently experienced to undertake this project. I firmly believe that we cease any further discussion with them and advertise widely for "Expression of Interest". I am more that well aware of the current Building and Construction climate where builders are "buying" projects and failing during construction. We should be seeking a developer who has had vast previous experience in High Rise Multi-use developments and knows what they are doing."*

In an email from Oleh Bulka dated 15 October 2013, he stated (in part) the following:

*"I fully agree with the contents of your email of 11<sup>th</sup> October. Congratulations for expressing your views so clearly. My chief motivation in becoming a member of the Building Committee was to ensure that the interests of AUV would be protected, because I didn't think that the Building Committee (as then constituted) knew what it was in for."*

### **Michael Karaszewycz suspension from the Building Committee**

In an email from the Chairman, Miroslav (Ross) Merunovich dated 20 October 2013, titled "Unilateral Action not sanctioned by the Building Committee" he stated the following:

*"It has come to our notice that you have taken certain actions outside the Building Committee claiming that they are on Building Committee authority.*

*As the committee has never given you that authority after the QS investigations allowed by Hamish I am forced to suspend you from the building committee until further notice and effective immediately."*

#### **NOTE:**

- Miroslav (Ross) Merunovich says "certain action".
- To this day, I have NEVER been advised what was meant by:
  - "Certain Action"
  - "Unilateral Action not sanctioned by the Building Committee"
  - Or what I have done to be suspended.
- I was appointed by the AUV Board and only the AUV Board has the right to suspend me.
- As Chairman, Miroslav (Ross) Merunovich, role is to chair the Building Committee and is not the supreme commander.
- Under normal management practices, the accuser discusses the issues with the accused. The principle of "Innocent until proven Guilty" apparently does not apply as far as Miroslav (Ross) Merunovich is concerned.

In an email dated 21 October 2013, I lodged a complaint to the AUV board, including the President, Michael Moravski and the Vice President Stefan Romaniw, which detailed out my grievance.

To this day I have not received a reply or any response. This raises serious concerns about the methodology and motivation of the AUV Chairman and the Board.

## Annual General Meeting Resolution

At the Annual General Meeting of the 27 October 2013, I moved the following motion and was seconded by Oleh Bulka:

*"I MOVE A Motion that this AGM should resolve to authorize the Executive Committee to appoint a Commission of Enquiry consisting of four (4) AUV members (two (2) to be appointed by me and 2 to be appointed by Ross Merunovich) and the Chair to be the President of AUV, Mr. Michael Moravski to hear and determine my complaint that I WAS WRONGLY SUSPENDED FROM THE MEMBERSHIP OF AUV Building Committee by its Chairman on 20<sup>th</sup> October 2013 and to confirm my reinstatement to the membership of AUV Building Committee. Motion Seconded by Oleh Bulka. Dated 27<sup>th</sup> October 2013. Michael Karaszewycz. AAIQS."*

***The motion was passed by the members at the AGM***

*It was my clear understanding that the Commission of Enquiry was to be held within two weeks.*

*Despite my numerous email messages and telephone calls to the President, Michael Moravski, no action was ever taken.*

*To this day the AUV President, Michael Moravski, the Vice President, Stefan Romaniw and the whole Board did not act in accordance with AGM Ruling and to this day I am still not aware of the Charges against me. Total silence.*

*The AUV management clearly considers themselves as above the membership and their decisions and had no intension of carrying out the wishes of the membership or being answerable to them.*

## Protest by Oleh Bulka

In an email to Marko Misko, legal advisor to the Building Committee, dated 13 November 2013, Oleh Bulka stated:

*"Hello Marko, By way of protest against the wrongful suspension of Michael Karaszewycz from the AUV Building Committee, I don't intend to attend the next meeting of the Committee at which Clayton Utz's .....Regards, Oleh."*

Further, Oleh Bulka, on 15 November 2013, emailed me the following:

*"Hello Michael, When I receive notification from Ross advising me of the next AUV Building Committee meeting, I intend to email Ross (and cc all other members of the Building Committee) about my non-attendance in protest against your unfair suspension from the Building Committee. I don't think it would be appropriate to cc the members of the Executive Committee as well. Regards, Oleh."*

## Michael Karaszewycz Suspension Rescinded

In an email from the AUV President, Michael Moravski, dated 20 November 2013 stating (in part):

*"I have been informed today by Ross Merunovich that the suspension has been rescinded"*

Miroslav (Ross) Merunovich had no authority to suspend me in the first instance as I was a Board appointee, acting for and on behalf of the Board and the Ukrainian community and secondly he has no authority to rescind the suspension.

I reiterate my comments above:

To this day, I have NEVER been advised what was meant by:

- "Certain Action"
  - "Unilateral Action not sanctioned by the Building Committee"
- Or what I have done to be suspended.

Page 6/13

**СВІЙ ДО СВОГО**  
**Ukrainian International Directory**

Ukrainian Issues

W: [www.UkrainianDirectory.org](http://www.UkrainianDirectory.org) E: [Enquiry@UkrainianDirectory.org](mailto:Enquiry@UkrainianDirectory.org)  
T: +61 3 83901412 F: +61 3 8677 9020 M: +61 438 33 66 03

## Resumption of Building Committee

Following the announcement of my membership of the Building Committee was rescinded on 20 November 2013, a meeting was called for 22 April 2014 by email dated 14 April 2014.

This email was sent to: Miroslav (Ross) Merunovich, Nicholas Dobrotwir, Stefan Romaniw, Michael Tkaczuk, Roman Rozek, Michael Karaszewycz, Andrew Petryshyn and Victor Rudewych by Michael Moravski.

**Note:** the Building Committee did not hold any official meetings since my suspension 20 October 2013. **A total of 7 months.**

## Building Committee meeting of 22 April 2014

At the 20 October 2013 AGM, a resolution was passed by the membership to ratify IntraPac and or its wholly owned Special Purpose Company as AUV's Development Partner.

This was the last action that the Building Committee knew of prior to the 22 April 2014 meeting.

At this meeting the Chairman, Miroslav (Ross) Merunovich presented a total new proposal from another developer which he expected the Building Committee to "Rubber Stamp" and approve.

- It was quite obvious that Chairman, Miroslav (Ross) Merunovich, without advising or consulting the Committee, unilaterally proceeded to act for and on behalf of the committee without approval.
- Chairman, Miroslav (Ross) Merunovich believed he had supreme power to do as he wished without any reference to the AUV Board appointed committee members.
- It was quite obvious that he came to the committee meeting expecting the other committee members to "Rubber Stamp" his findings.
- The IntraPac proposal that was approved by the 2013 AGM, for reason unknown to the majority of members, was discarded without notifying the Building Committee. To this day, I for one, have not been given any reason for discarding the IntraPac proposal.
- It was quite obvious he sourced other developers in lieu of IntraPac without consulting the Building Committee.
- This, in effect, acknowledges that Oleh Bulka's and my submissions to the 2013 AGM were correct.

Members of the Committee, questioned the Chairman, Miroslav (Ross) Merunovich's unauthorized, unilateral and behind the scenes negotiations that were undertaken without referral, consultation and authority of the committee.

- I and others on the committee asked, "What is going on", to which he was totally oblivious to our questions and proceeded to present his preferred new developer proposal.
- It was quite obvious that he insisted that we approve their proposal. He and others, who one could assume colluded with him, even stated that they would walk out of the meeting if we would not accept his proposal.

Victor Rudewych, Member of the AUV Board, upon witnessing the unilateral and unauthorised action of the Chairman, Miroslav (Ross) Merunovich, he (in my personal opinion which others can verify or otherwise) went into a prolonged statement and in no uncertain terms criticized and chastised him for this selfish unilateral actions without reference to or consultation with the committee.

- Miroslav (Ross) Merunovich, Nicholas Dobrotwir, Michael Tkaczuk and Andrew Petryshyn walked out of the meeting.
- Michael Tkaczuk, turned to me, with a fierce expression on his face, leant over the table and stretched out his arm, pointed to me and called me a “trouble maker”. Remember, this was the only meeting that he attended since my original appointment and was not aware of the true historical issues.

Michael Moravski, President of AUV, sat quietly at this meeting, did and said absolutely NOTHING. I was absolutely astonished that the President allowed these proceeding to get to this stage.

More importantly, the President knew full well that the Chairman, Miroslav (Ross) Merunovich was acting unilaterally and said NOTHING and allowed him to proceed without consultation with the Building Committee.

It would seem that the AUVs practice of democracy has reached the point where it simply manoeuvres to shut out anyone with opinions that do not conform to the executive view and who is not subservient to backroom strategies that are presented to be rubber stamped by the committee that is supposed to be evaluating them.

### **New Building Committee**

Shortly after, I received a letter, signed by Michael Moravski, President of AUV, stating that the Building Committee has been dissolved and a new Committee appointed.

The new Committee excluded Oleh Bulka and me.

### **Stages 1 & 2 – Russell Street, Essendon**

The original proposals were to either:

- Develop the whole site including, 3 to 21 Russell Street, Essendon as one complex or
- Develop:
  - 3 – 11 Russell Street, Essendon and
  - 13 -21 Russell Street, Essendon as two separate developments. These developments comprised underground carpark, street retail precinct and apartment development. Total of 6 storeys above ground level.
- It was unanimously decided, that for strategic purposes, it was preferable to develop the two sites separately, as there were important community issues at stake.

#### **Stage 1 Development. 13 – 21 Russell Street, Essendon**

- The new Building Committee, selected and signed up a new developer for the six (6) storey above ground development.
- Through VCAT the developer received approval for a 10 storey development.

I find it absolutely extraordinary, that the original negotiations for the benefits to the AUV community were based on a 6 storey development and yet when the developer received approval for a 10 storey development, there was no pro-rata benefit extended to the AUV.

Conventional commercial principle and wisdom dictate that there should have been up to 40% increase of benefit to the AUV. I am advised by a “respected” member of the new Committee that no increase in benefits would be negotiated.



### **Stage 2 Development. 3 – 11 Russell Street – Ukrainian Hall**

During joint AUV Board and Building Committee discussions it was strongly stated, by all, that the presence of the Ukrainian Community Centre for Victoria, should remain at Russell Street, Essendon.

The redevelopment of this site should incorporate the Ukrainian Community Centre with identical facilities of Function Hall, Offices, Meeting Rooms and Club Facilities. It was even mooted to incorporate the first Ukrainian Restaurant which would incorporate the current kitchen facilities.

At the 2015 AGM, a “respected” member of the new Building Committee reiterated that this was still the intent and the broader community still to this day believe that this is the intent.

When the 10 storey plan was approved Stefan Romaniw was even quoted in the Herald-Sun saying that with this development Russell Street would become to the Ukrainians what Victoria Street is to the Vietnamese or Lonsdale St is to the Greeks.

**HOWEVER**, I have received information from 4 different “reliable” sources, which strongly suggests that the Ukrainian Hall, 3 – 11 Russell Street, Essendon will be sold and the new Ukrainian Community Centre relocated on Ukrainian Catholic Church property in North Melbourne.

**I am also led to believe that the building plans for this relocation are well developed.**

**Confirmation** is URGENTLY required from the President of the Association of Ukrainians in Victoria, Michael Moravski.

**If this is the case, it is obvious that there has not been any COMMUNITY CONSULTATION.**

**If this is the case, it is TOTALLY UNACCEPTABLE.**

## 2013 Annual General Meeting - Building Debate

The Chairman, Miroslav (Ross) Merunovich presented to the meeting the proposal to accept IntraPac developers as the preferred partner in the development.

Oleh Bulka, also outlined the legal aspect of the proposal and pointed out the legal holes that were possibly detrimental.

In my presentation, as a professional Property and Building and Construction Cost Engineer, I stated that:

- the construction costing presented were incomplete and I detailed the major shortcomings.
- the apartment sales costs and predictions were not feasible compared with other similar local projects that I and Oleh Bulka had investigated.
- IntraPac did not have the expertise or experience to undertake this development as:
  - I pointed out that IntraPac were only a “Broad Acre” developer; developing land for residential and industrial estates.
  - I also pointed out that IntraPac admitted to me that the Russell Street development would have been their “Pilot” project to get a foot hold into the high rise building and construction sector.
- As a professional in the Building Construction arena, my responsibilities also lay in the efficiency of building design as it relates to costs. As such I pointed out that the building design that was preferred was inefficient as it only occupied half a basement for a carpark as well as having a carpark in a rental premium location.

Miroslav (Ross) Merunovich rebuffed my presentation by saying:

- the reason for partial carpark basement was that there was basalt (rock) that would be expensive to remove.
  - Miroslav (Ross) Merunovich, whether intentionally or unknowingly mislead the member at the AGM on this point.
  - Miroslav (Ross) Merunovich, if he conducted his role effectively as Chairman, he would have examined the previous proposal that Victor Rudewych prepared and would have found that “Bore Hole” tests were conducted on the site which found that the ground was stable, free of water and NO BASALT (Rock).
- He further told the meeting that **“Michael Karaszewycz thinks he is the fountain of knowledge”**, which I thought was quite insulting. Being humble about my experience I said nothing, because I felt it would have been pointless in the circumstances.

## Michael Karaszewycz – Fountain of Knowledge smear

To address Miroslav (Ross) Merunovich's comment at the AGM:

- sarcastically stating "Michael Karaszewycz thinks he is the fountain of knowledge" as well,
- I was not been given an opportunity to defend myself in accordance with the AGM "suspension" resolution by a Commission of Enquiry,

I will take this opportunity to state my qualifications and experience.

- As a member of the Building Committee, I was the only:
  - Registered Building Practitioner. (I will add I am also Registered Taxation Practitioner),
  - Property and Building and Construction Cost Engineer.
  - professional having Building Design education, training and experience,
  - professional having Building Construction education, training and experience
- I have three (3) international recognitions to my name:
  - Antarctic – saving \$300 million at Casey, Mawson and Davis Bases
  - Schools – saving construction cost by 64%
  - Property, Buildings and Facilities Management System – A World first
- In the early 1990's, I incorporated all my knowledge, experience, expertise and methodologies onto a computer based software system known as "Property and Assets Management System" under my company name "Macrosoft Australia".

In 1994, I won the contract to implement my software system for the facilities under construction for the Sydney 2000 Olympics.

This system controlled every aspect of:

- Conducting Feasibility Studies of the facilities,
  - Facility design and associated cost control,
  - Construction of the Infrastructure and Buildings and the associated Cost Control during this construction phase.
  - Maintenance Management of all the facilities used for the Olympics.
  - Lease Management of all the facilities post Olympics.
  - The only aspect of the Sydney 2000 Olympics the system did not control are the events and the sporting equipment used.
- Since, the software system and its algorithms are being used, under license, across a number of platforms, in 32 major corporations around the world.
  - Should anyone have any doubt of my qualifications or experience, may I suggest refer to my website at:  
<http://www.emeraldproperty.com.au/Experience.htm>  
and see for yourselves some of the 5000 projects, I personally work on.

## WHAT'S REASONABLE TO EXPECT FROM THE AUV

- **The unacceptable operation of the Building Committee**
  - It is reasonable to expect that the AUV and other Ukrainian organisations implement Democratic Constitutions, appropriate Meeting and Committee procedures.
  - It is reasonable to expect that elected Presidents, Boards and Controlling Commissioners and nominated Committees are persons who are the “Best of Breed’ to ensure proper advice is received enabling informed decision making.
  - It is reasonable that elected and nominated persons comply with “Fit and Proper” rules.
  - It is reasonable to expect that any person who is elected to a position or nominated to a Committee has the available time and resources to carry out their responsibilities within a reasonable timeframe.
- **Smear campaigns**
  - It is reasonable to expect that by implementing proper procedures, as detailed above, each and every member of Boards, Controlling Commissioners and Committees will have an equal opportunity to express their ideas, points of view and opinions without being ridiculed, harassed, bullied or excluded in any way.
  - It is reasonable to expect that the Chairman of the Building Committee together with the President of AUV and the Chairman of the Controlling Commission publish in both the Ukrainian newspapers a retraction statement and apology to Michael Karaszewycz for the treatment he received whilst a member of the Building Committee. The statement text and the size of the publication shall be to Michael Karaszewycz approval.
- **AUV non-compliance with AGM resolution**
  - It is reasonable to expect that the President, Board members and Controlling Commissioners of the AUV and other Ukrainian organisations must accept they have been elected by the membership to perform their role in the interest of the community.
  - It is reasonably expected that all AGM Resolutions by the members are required to be carried out in the interests of the community irrespective of personal views, allegiance, loyalties and other agendas.
- **Russell Street, Development Projects**
  - It is reasonably expected that the President, the Board and the Building Committee re-negotiate their terms of agreement for the redevelopment of Stage 1 of Russell Street, so as it reflects the added benefits of the increase in size of the redevelopment project.
  - It is reasonable to expect that a full and complete report detailing the costing of the project together with the expected benefits be made available to the Community.
  - It is reasonable to expect that each and every project, activity and decision be transparent to the membership.

- **Ukrainian Community Centre – possible relocation to North Melbourne**
  - It is reasonably expected that the President and the Board clarify to the community whether there is a proposal or consideration for Ukrainian Community Centre’s relocation to North Melbourne.
  - It is reasonably expected that all such plans be available to the membership immediately as a matter of priority.
  - It is reasonably expected that all plans, decisions, resolutions and activities by the President, Boards and Controlling Commissioner be communicated to the membership immediately as a priority.
  - It is reasonably expected that all discussion and consideration be transparent to the membership through wide consultation across the whole Ukrainian community and not just the membership.
- **Lack of Communication with Members**
  - It is reasonable to expect that the AUV and other Ukrainian organisations to have:
    - Websites communicating their activities to members
    - Facebook pages allowing members to express their comments and points of view,
    - Newspaper columns in both Ukrainian newspapers advising the community of their decisions and activities.

Michael Karaszkewycz  
Member of AUV Central, Member Sunshine Hromada, Member St. Albans Hromada  
Editor, Ukrainian International Directory