



**ASSESSMENT REPORT  
FOR THE AMANGO  
GROUP PLC**

<b>REPORT PROXY</b>	
<b>Name of region</b>	
<b>Name of country</b>	
<b>Name of University/Institute</b>	
<b>Name of team</b>	

**Key regions**

1. South Africa
2. Rest of Africa
3. Asia
4. Oceania
5. EU & larger Europe
6. North America
7. South America
8. Middle East

### ASSESSMENT CRITERIA AND SUBMISSION FORMAT

We seek to highlight the centrality of teamwork, creativity, presentation skills, business acumen as well as the value of taking a holistic and strategic approach to management. The CharterQuest Competency Framework for *grooming financially qualified business leaders* has guided the report marking as below:

PROBLEM SOLVING ACUMEN	Finance & Technical	Diversity, Business, Entrepreneurial	Ethics & People	Presentation (incl. Question & Answers)	Innovation & Integration	Decisiveness & Leadership	Total
<b>Strategic analysis</b> ( <i>Prioritisation &amp; focus</i> )	5%	10%					<b>15%</b>
<b>Strategic choice</b> ( <i>Impact &amp; options evaluation</i> )	10%	10%	10%	10%	5%		<b>45%</b>
<b>Strategic implementation</b> ( <i>Recommendation &amp; Actions</i> )			5%	10%	5%	20%	<b>40%</b>
	15%	20%	15%	20%	10%	20%	<b>100%</b>

To better interpret the above marking grid and submit a good quality and competitive report, each team was advised to watch *The CFO Case Study Competition* 'Master Class Videos' published on our [You Tube Channel](#). These are labeled Master Class Video 1 of 2 Scene 1 of 3, Scene 2 of 3 and Scene 3 of 3 as well as Master Class Video 2 of 2.

PROBLEM SOLVING ACUMEN	Finance & Technical	Diversity, Business, Entrepreneurial	Ethics & People	Presentation (incl. Question & Answers)	Innovation & Integration	Decisiveness & Leadership	Total
<b>STRATEGIC ANALYSIS (PRIORITISATION AND FOCUS)</b>	<b>5%</b>	<b>10%</b>					<b>15%</b>
<b>FOCUS</b>							<b>5</b>
1. ONLY 5 issues as per the model answer reflected in the executive summary with a formal SWOT analysis performed and referred to explicitly; <b>AND</b> a closing paragraph introduced to explain that other issues are dealt with as ethics, or not as critical ( <i>less 1 if SWOT is done but not referred to and less 2 if no SWOT analysis is performed</i> )?	Max 5/5						
2. ONLY 4-5 issues as per the model answer reflected in the executive summary with a formal SWOT analysis performed, and referred to explicitly; <b>BUT NO</b> closing paragraph introduced to explain that other issues are dealt with as ethics, or not as critical ( <i>less 1 if SWOT is done but not referred to and less 2 if no SWOT analysis is performed</i> )?	Max 4/5						
3. All 6 issues reflected in the executive summary as 6 separate issues ( <i>less 1 if SWOT is done but not referred to and less 2 if no SWOT analysis is performed</i> )?	Max 3/5						
4. Others ( <i>less 1 if SWOT is done but not referred to and less 2 if no SWOT analysis is performed</i> )?	Max 2/5						
<b>PRIORITISATION</b>							<b>5</b>
5. ALL 5 issues in the correct order with suitable justification including <b>impact, urgency, SWOT/relative position</b> ?		Max 10/10					
6. ALL 5 issues in the correct order with <u>incorrect</u> justification (marker to exercise judgment but take into account extent to which report took into account <b>impact, urgency, SWOT and relative position in the rankings</b> )?		Max 8/10					
7. 2 marks-off for every ranking away from its correct position up to a maximum of 4 marks for the top 2 issues?		Max 7/10					
8. 1 mark off for every step displacement from bottom 2 issues?		Max 7/10					
9. Any others?		Max 5/10					
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>5/5</b>	<b>10/10</b>					<b>15</b>

<b>PROBLEM SOLVING ACUMEN</b>	<b>Finance &amp; Technical</b>	<b>Diversity, Business, Entrepreneurial</b>	<b>Ethics &amp; People</b>	<b>Presentation (incl. Q/A)</b>	<b>Innovation &amp; Integration</b>	<b>Decisiveness &amp; Leadership</b>	<b>Total</b>
<b>STRATEGIC CHOICE (IMPACT AND OPTIONS EVALUATION)</b>	<b>10%</b>	<b>10%</b>	<b>10%</b>	<b>10%</b>	<b>5%</b>		<b>45%</b>
10. For each issue -whether commercial or ethical, report has done a thorough impact assessment -pointing to calculations or technical models/analysis attached as appendix or otherwise?	Max 2 per issue max 10						10
11. For each issue -whether commercial or ethical, report has done a thorough impact assessment -pointing to at least 2 of the 7 Pillars of Value (labelled A-G) representing the Business Model/Strategic priorities/Direction of the AMANGO Group as provided in the case study?		1 per issue max 5					5
12. For each issue -whether commercial or ethical, good and credible examples in the business world was cited and adequately applied to the issue at hand; to enhance understanding or add value to the solutions proposed (real world example should be 'googled' to validate)?		1 mark per issue max 5					5
13. For each ethical issue that is well justified, with reference to the ethical construct violated, and with good recommendation plus justification including options -considered?			2.5 per issue max 5				5
14. For the 'JV Decision in Canada', 'Balance sheet de-leverage and Share Buy Back', issues, clear identification of the people dimension of the problem -including employees and other stakeholders and the behavioral implications well highlighted and justifiably so?			1 mark per issue max 3				3
15. Recognition of other people and stakeholder behavioral implications well justified outside of the above 2 issues –e.g. acute awareness of the 'people' dimensions evoked by the issues related to 'Corporate Reconstruction and Re-organisation' as well as Operational Risk and Industrial Action in Australia'?			1 mark per issue max 2				2
16. Cover page, table of contents, introduction, terms of reference, prioritisation/executive summary, detailed report, recommendations, conclusion, appendixes and others? (less 0.5 for each item that does not meet standard for that section)? (Please also remove maximum of 3 marks for calculations done in the body of the report instead of separately in an appendix).				1 mark for each max 10			10
17. Observation/taking account of linkages/integration between the different issues in the analysis of each issue?					1 mark each max 5.		5
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>10/10</b>	<b>10/10</b>	<b>10/10</b>	<b>10/10</b>	<b>5/5</b>		<b>45</b>

PROBLEM SOLVING ACUMEN	Finance & Technical	Diversity, Business, Entrepreneurial	Ethics & People	Presentation (incl. Q/A)	Innovation & Integration	Decisiveness & Leadership	Total
<b>STRATEGIC IMPLEMENTATION</b> ( <i>Recommendation &amp; Actions</i> )			5%	10%	5%	20%	40%
18. For each commercial issue, viable options were identified and assessed, and care taken to specifically link the assessments to the explicitly stated core or strategic decisions the Board must now make (See next section of this questionnaire to ensure the core issues as implied in the case study were addressed)?						2 per issue max 10	10
19. For each commercial issue, a clear and decisive recommendation is offered with clear, convincing and logical justification?						2 per issue max 10	10
20. Each recommendation is presented in a manner that clearly articulates the who/when/action plans and also finds expression in the executive summary i.e. the essence of the recommendation was also summarised as part of the prioritisation/executive summary section?				2 for each issue max 10			10
21. Care taken to show how the SWOT has informed the recommendations over and above the analysis undertaken under strategic choices, including thinking 'out-of-the-box' in search for adjacent solutions?					1 mark for each up to <u>max of 5</u>		5
22. Specific attention is drawn to where and how recommendations are influenced/impacted by people and key stakeholders by way of specific action to address these; further, people/stakeholder issues that may arise during implementation of each recommendation is balanced to address short-term and long-term considerations.			1 mark each <u>max of 5</u>				5
<b>TOTAL</b>	15%	20%	15%	20%	10%	20%	100%

## B. CORE ISSUE-BY-ISSUE QUESTIONNAIRE

**Managing Divisional Performance Group-wide** (Note -this issue was designed for ethics as the matters are too operational for the Board –see section C)

### Joint Venture Decision in Canada

		YES	NO	FOR ANY YES OR NO PLEASE BRIEFLY COMMENT
<b>A</b>	<b>GENERIC (APPLICABLE TO THIS AND ALL ISSUES)</b>			
0.	The report explicitly recognises this issue as an <b>Opportunity and/or a Threat</b> in AMANGO's SWOT analysis?			
1.	The report explained the impact of this issue using well attempted calculations and any technical models in appendix or otherwise?			
2.	The report explained/evaluated the impact of this issue in relation to at least 2 of AMANGO's 7 Pillars of Value?			
3.	The report clearly incorporate relevant diversity/industry examples for this issue?			
4.	The report made too many assumptions/speculations that ignored pertinent facts?			
5.	The report explicitly identify any ethical issue from this problem and addressed it appropriately?			
6.	Were there any other people issues explicitly identified and discussed as part of this issue?			
7.	Were there any links/connections picked up that impacts on other issues arising from this issue?			
8.	Were the recommendations in line with the SWOT analysis of AMANGO -well justified with clear action plans that addressed both short term and long term and any 'people' dimensions revealed?			
	<b>SPECIFIC (TO THIS ISSUE ONLY)</b>			
9.	The report explicitly identified and defined the main problem (i.e. <b>Core Board Decision/s</b> ) and explicitly formulated the issue as a <b>STRATEGIC CHOICE BETWEEN DESIGNS 1, 2 or 3?</b>			
10.	The report analysed the results of the detailed calculations in relation to the 3 design choices – fully applying <b>maximax, maximin and minimax regret rules</b> including expected value analysis?			
11.	The report considered the <b>different risk appetites</b> between AMANGO and their JV Partner –risk averse, risk seeking and risk neutral and applied that in reaching a decision?			
12.	The report identified the people dimension in terms of addressing <b>potential disagreements</b> that will stem from this JV decision?			
13.	Does report demonstrate <b>'professional skepticism'</b> in relation to the choice of JV partner from the USA instead of Native of Canada?			
14.	Does the report identify <b>weaknesses</b> in traditional Management Accounting systems in relation to AMANGO's business (i.e. <b>Environmental Reporting</b> ) and identified how modern management Accounting systems can address these?			
15.	The ultimate recommendation – <b>which must address itself to the Core Board Decision choices in 9 above</b> - is informed by the results of the calculation but taking into account the broader risk issues -including <b>financing</b> in relation to AMANGO's <b>over-leverage</b> concerns, <b>JV structuring</b> , and dealing with the <b>STRATEGIC THREATS</b> in this market especially if a 'proceed' decision/recommendation is reached? With clear action plans and timelines including who (responsibility to) should execute? Was there clear evidence of <b>short-term</b> and <b>long-term</b> actions incorporated into the recommendation and/or action plans?			

## Strategic Disposal in Brazil

		YES	NO	FOR ANY YES OR NO PLEASE BRIEFLY COMMENT
<b>A</b>	<b>GENERIC (APPLICABLE TO THIS AND ALL ISSUES)</b>			
0.	The report explicitly recognises this issue as an <b>Opportunity and/or a Threat</b> in AMANGO's SWOT analysis?			
1.	The report explained the impact of this issue using well attempted calculations and any technical models in appendix or otherwise?			
2.	The report explained/evaluated the impact of this issue in relation to at least 2 of AMANGO's 7 Pillars of Value?			
3.	The report clearly incorporates relevant diversity/industry examples for this issue?			
4.	The report made too many assumptions/speculations that ignored pertinent facts?			
5.	The report explicitly identifies any ethical issue from this problem and addressed it appropriately?			
6.	Where there any other people issues explicitly identified and discussed as part of this issue?			
7.	Where there any links/connections picked up that impacts on other issues arising from this issue?			
8.	Were the recommendations in line with the SWOT analysis of AMANGO -well justified with clear action plans that addressed both short term and long term and any 'people' dimensions revealed?			
	<b>SPECIFIC (TO THIS ISSUE ONLY)</b>			
9.	The report explicitly identified and defined the main problem (i.e. <b>Core Board Decision/s</b> ) and explicitly formulated the issue as a strategic choice of whether <b>To ACCEPT or TO REJECT</b> the offer of US\$1.5billion?			
10.	The report analysed the results of the detailed calculations by valuing AMA-NP using at least 3 valuation methods – <b>Net Assets Method, Earnings Method and Discounted/Free Cash Flow Method</b> in the Appendix? Did Valuations take account of <b>IAS21</b> –in translating the financial statement figures of AMA NP from Brazilian Real to US\$? Did valuations take into account the <b>synergies</b> and included same in all the valuation methods?			
11.	Did the report acknowledge the <b>limitations of the valuation techniques</b> available and <b>applied</b> that to the context of AMANGO in guiding a decision?			
12.	Did the report attempt to benchmark the performance say <b>ROCE of AMA NP</b> in relation to the overall division –Nobium and Phosphates?			
13.	Did the report consider the broader issue of changes in <b>dividend repatriation laws</b> and offered suitable ideas for repatriating dividends out of Brazil if such political risk issues were to translate into law? Was this done in relation to recognition of the <b>AMANGO's other businesses</b> in Brazil?			
14.	Was there a broader strategic evaluation of the offer taking into account its <b>connection</b> with the ' <b>Corporate Re-organisation and Reconstruction</b> ' issue and the issue of ' <b>Balance Sheet De-leverage or Share buy Back</b> '? Was a model such as Johnson and Scholes Suitability, Acceptability and Feasibility applied?			
15.	Was a suitable recommendation reached <b>-which must address itself to the Core Board Decisions Choices in 9 above</b> -justified by the numbers, balanced against the other interconnected issues especially -'Corporate Re-organisation and Reconstruction,' and the issue of 'Balance Sheet De-leverage or Share buy Back'? With clear action plans and timelines including who (responsibility to) should execute? Did action plans address issue of <b>which bank account to nominate</b> –in the event of a <b>go decision</b> ? Was there clear evidence of <b>short-term and long-term</b> actions incorporated into the recommendation and/or action plans?			

## Balance Sheet De-leverage and Share Buy Back.

		YES	NO	FOR ANY YES OR NO PLEASE BRIEFLY COMMENT
<b>A</b>	<b>GENERIC (APPLICABLE TO THIS AND ALL ISSUES)</b>			
0.	The report explicitly recognises this issue as a <b>Threat, Opportunity and/or Weakness</b> in AMANGO's SWOT analysis?			
1.	The report explained the impact of this issue using well attempted calculations and any technical models in appendix or otherwise?			
2.	The report explained/evaluated the impact of this issue in relation to at least 2 of AMANGO's 7 Pillars of Value?			
3.	The report clearly incorporate relevant diversity/industry examples for this issue?			
4.	The report made too many assumptions/speculations that ignored pertinent facts?			
5.	The report explicitly identify any ethical issue from this problem and addressed it appropriately?			
6.	Were there any other people issues explicitly identified and discussed as part of this issue?			
7.	Were there any links/connections picked up that impacts on other issues arising from this issue?			
8.	Were the recommendations in line with the SWOT analysis of AMANGO -well justified with clear action plans that addressed both short term and long term and any 'people' dimensions revealed?			
	<b>SPECIFIC (TO THIS ISSUE ONLY)</b>			
9.	The report explicitly identified and defined the main problem (i.e. <b>Core Board Decision(s)</b> ), and explicitly formulated the issue as a strategic choice of whether <b>TO SELL or NOT to SELL?</b> And if to sell, how to use the proceeds – <b>DE-LEVER BALANCE SHEET (OPTION 1) OR BUY BACK SHARES (OPTION 2)?</b>			
10.	The report, ideally in the Appendix, did meaningful calculations for the projected <b>2017 financial performance –income statement and balance sheet for Option 1 and Option 2</b> taking into account all the data provided?			
11.	The report, ideally in the same Appendix as above or separately, recognized the need to <b>de-construct AMANGO and attempted to de-gear and re-gear its equity beta</b> to take account of part of the residential property in its overall portfolio?			
12.	The report, ideally in the same Appendix as above or separately, recognized the need to calculate -right now, and after the sale, and in relation to Option 1 and Option 2, calculate and discuss the impact of the decision on four key performance variables: <b>(1) Earnings Per Share (EPS) or some other suitable return Metric; (2) Financial gearing – Debt to Equity or Debt Ratio; (3) the Cost of Finance/Weighted Average Cost of Capital –WACC (4) Market value</b>			
13.	The report spotted the <b>interconnection or tension</b> between the <b>number of employees</b> who could be laid off in South Africa in the light of Corporate Restructuring and Re-organisation issue and the <b>possible shortage of houses</b> if this was to proceed? Was there evidence of <b>professional skepticism</b> about the way the <b>BEE deal is structured</b> as to whether it will address the underlying Mining Charter intentions?			
14.	The report assessed the challenges of executing a <b>successful share buy back</b> in such a low price environment and took into account <b>PIC threats</b> in a serious way? The report identified the <b>people dimension –possible industrial relations/strikes</b> problems if these houses are sold out when employees had long considered it as their eventual property and issues of their family dependence in the locality –including to the risk of possible industrial action being <b>compounded by connected issues with protected strike ongoing already</b> in the 'Operational and Safety Risk issue in Australia'?			
15.	Was a suitable recommendation reached - <b>which must address itself to the Core Board Decision Choices in 9 above</b> – justified by the numbers, balanced against the other interconnected issues especially -'Corporate Re-organisation'? With clear action plans and timelines including who (responsibility to) should execute? <b>Specifically, if a decision was reached to sell – Did action plans address how then to address the PIC concerns about dis-investments and its seriousness to meet the intent of the mining charter regulations?</b>			

## Operational Risk and Industrial Action in Australia

		YES	NO	FOR ANY YES OR NO PLEASE BRIEFLY COMMENT
<b>A</b>	<b>GENERIC (APPLICABLE TO THIS AND ALL ISSUES)</b>			
0.	The report explicitly recognises this issue as a <b>Weakness and/or Threat</b> in AMANGO's SWOT analysis?			
1.	The report explained the impact of this issue using well attempted calculations and any technical models in appendix or otherwise?			
2.	The report explained/evaluated the impact of this issue in relation to at least 2 of AMANGO's 7 Pillars of Value?			
3.	The report clearly incorporate relevant diversity/industry examples for this issue?			
4.	The report made too many assumptions/speculations that ignored pertinent facts?			
5.	The report explicitly identify any ethical issue from this problem and addressed it appropriately?			
6.	Were there any other people issues explicitly identified and discussed as part of this issue?			
7.	Were there any links/connections picked up that impacts on other issues arising from this issue?			
8.	Were the recommendations in line with the SWOT analysis of AMANGO -well justified with clear action plans that addressed both short term and long term and any 'people' dimensions revealed?			
	<b>SPECIFIC (TO THIS ISSUE ONLY)</b>			
9.	The report explicitly identified and defined the main problem (i.e. <b>Core Board Decision/s</b> ), and explicitly formulated the issue as a strategic choice on 1 –the Mineshaft decision in terms of 3 mutually exclusive options: (1) <b>RE-START PRODUCTION (2) CLOSE DOWN AND SINK A NEW SHAFT; or (3) CLOSE DOWN THE SHAFT PERMANENTLY?</b> And to deal with the strike in 2 parts (1) The Notice to Strike –with at least 2 options: 1) <b>DO NOTHING; or 2) CAPITULATE TO UNION DEMANDS</b> and 2) The Protected Strike unfolding -with at least 2 Options e.g. 1) <b>DO NOTHING; 2) THREATEN DISMISSALS; or 3) CAPITULATE TO UNION DEMANDS; or 4) SECURE ALTERNATIVE WORKFORCE TO BREAK THE STRIKE?</b>			
10.	The report, ideally in the Appendix, did <b>meaningful NPV</b> calculations for the Option to close down and operate from a new Mineshaft?			
11.	The report carefully evaluated each option and explicitly recognized <b>safety as an existential threat</b> and/or in relation to AMANGO's <b>safety risk appetite</b> ? Did report demonstrate any evidence of ' <b>professional skepticism</b> ' by questioning the <b>supply chain process</b> for awarding the Mine Shaft Contractor in the first place?			
12.	Did report recognise the strong <b>link/tension</b> between <b>yielding to the protected strike</b> demands in this issue and the key viability objective of reducing <b>operating costs by US\$5.8billion?</b> -Made worse by the broader danger of active union <b>collaboration across the group</b> will the danger if we yield in Australia this could be taken as weaknesses in other parts of the group/in other countries or endanger the <b>cost reduction drive?</b>			
13.	Did report recognize the danger of under-performing <b>AMANGO's prior safety statistics</b> , need to investigation and <b>improve the safety management system</b> but recognized the <b>ethical issues</b> which was dealt with separately in the ethics section.			
14.	Was a suitable recommendation reached - <b>which must address itself to the Core Board Decision Choices in 9 above</b> - justified by the numbers, balanced against the other interconnected issues especially? With clear action plans and timelines including who (responsibility to) should execute? Was there evidence of <b>urgency in the timelines?</b> Was there clear evidence of short-term and long-term actions to regain its reputation for safety?			



## Corporate Reconstruction and Re-organisation

		YES	NO	FOR ANY YES OR NO PLEASE BRIEFLY COMMENT
<b>A</b>	<b>GENERIC (APPLICABLE TO THIS AND ALL ISSUES)</b>			
0.	The report formerly recognises this issue as an <b>Opportunity and/or Weakness or even a Threat</b> in AMANGO's SWOT analysis?			
1.	The report explained the impact of this issue using well attempted calculations and any technical models in appendix or otherwise?			
2.	The report explained/evaluated the impact of this issue in relation to at least 2 of AMANGO's 7 Pillars of Value?			
3.	The report clearly incorporate relevant diversity/industry examples for this issue?			
4.	The report made too many assumptions/speculations that ignored pertinent facts?			
5.	The report explicitly identify any ethical issue from this problem and addressed it appropriately?			
6.	Were there any other people issues explicitly identified and discussed as part of this issue?			
7.	Were there any links/connections picked up that impacts on other issues arising from this issue?			
8.	Were the recommendations in line with the SWOT analysis of AMANGO -well justified with clear action plans that addressed both short term and long term and any 'people' dimensions revealed?			
	<b>SPECIFIC (TO THIS ISSUE ONLY)</b>			
9.	The report explicitly identified and defined the main problem (i.e. <b>Core Board Decision/s</b> ) and explicitly formulated the issue as a strategic choice between: <b>SBU's to SELL vs. SBU's to RETAIN?</b> OR: <b>CEO's view or Board Chair's View??</b>			
10.	The report, ideally in the Appendix, did meaningful calculations and presented a graph in relation to <b>BCG, Ashridge Display</b> or other relevant strategic portfolio models?			
11.	The report recognizes and addresses the <b>link</b> between this issue and the "Strategic Disposal in Brazil"			
12.	Was there a systematic grouping a discussions of the <b>ROCE</b> and strategic matters of the SBU's using concepts like <b>STAR, DOG, QUESTION MARK, VALUE TRAP, HEARTLAND</b> etc, taking account of their policy prescriptions but balancing that with an insightful understanding of the AMANGO's strategic context?			
13.	Did the analysis consider <b>people</b> issues like <b>job losses, and industrial action</b> arising from the decision to sell? Did it recognize need to <b>value what is to be sold in relation</b> to the goal to de-lever the balance sheet but also sensitive to the <b>PIC threats to sell off</b> if certain subsidiaries or SBU's were sold off?			
14.	Was a suitable recommendation reached - <b>which must address itself to the Core Board Decision Choices in 9 above</b> – justified by the numbers, balanced against the other interconnected <b>especially the people dimension</b> ? With clear action plans and timelines including who (responsibility to) should execute? Was there clear evidence of short-term and long-term actions to regain its reputation for safety?			

## C. ETHICAL SECTION QUESTIONNAIRE

### Managing Divisional Performance Group-Wide

		YES	NO	FOR ANY YES OR NO PLEASE BRIEFLY COMMENT
<b>A</b>				
0.	The report formerly recognises this issue as a <b>Weakness</b> in AMANGO's SWOT analysis?			
1.	Cutting back on training seen as <u>unethical</u> re <b>self-interest/lack of due care or fairness issue?</b>			
2.	Postponing servicing of safety critical equipment seen as <u>unethical</u> re <b>self-interest or putting profits before people?</b>			
3.	Ramping up production seen as <u>unethical</u> re <b>manipulation of earnings or misrepresentation -integrity?</b>			
4.	Excessive internal charges seen as <u>unethical</u> –re <b>dishonest practice?</b>			
5.	Did recommendation apply principles relevant to <b>EVA</b> to the 1 <sup>st</sup> and 2 <sup>nd</sup> , then <b>Marginal Costing</b> away from <b>Absorption Costing</b> in the issue of production ramp ups and <b>transfer pricing</b> in the issue of excessive internal charges?			

### Operational Risk and Industrial Action in Australia

		YES	NO	FOR ANY YES OR NO PLEASE BRIEFLY COMMENT
1.	The report identified <b>self-interest (profit before people), duty of care</b> or <b>integrity</b> in relation to <u>false safety reports</u> as <u>the ethical construct</u> in question? Also recognized it is <b>dishonest</b> to tell investors it is a minor problem without doing any investigation or at best <b>negligent</b> ?			
2.	The report recognised the need to not execute CEO's instructions but rather that the CEO be reprimanded for ordering that production should resume despite risks to life? Does report recognize need to investigate the false safety reports and the broader safety reporting system and take firm action?			