

From: **David Brown** [REDACTED] >
Date: Wed, Jun 30, 2021 at 2:32 AM
Subject: RE: Request for Comment -- David Brown
To: Sentry Research [REDACTED] >

Please find below my comments to questions sent from the Daily Maverick and yours below – though there is some obvious repetition.

In it you are mentioned as a business partner of Mr Tagwirei “seemingly happy to turn a blind eye to accusations of corruption and cronyism.” The report also contains emails and legal documents that reflect your involvement in Tagwirei’s business empire and several of the companies he controls.

The statements are both inappropriate and inaccurate, and I am not aware of any such matters relating to corruption and cronyism. I believe it is imperative that you look at matters pre June 2020 and then post June 2020. Since June 2020 the company has been managed within approved and appropriate frameworks and before one concludes I am saying that it was not well run pre June – I am not in a position to comment pre June as it pre dates my real involvement. A lot has changed over the last year, driven by the desire to create a standalone mining business with the express purpose of creating value to as many Zimbabweans either as employees or shareholders as possible and in fact declared a maiden dividend for the benefit of many beneficiaries. In addition, we employ almost 4000 people and are actively looking for opportunities to continue growing.

Therefore it is important to provide some context with regard to the “source” of these allegations. These matters are largely driven by a disgruntled employee who is part of a history that might well have been involved in matters you raise but I cannot comment on any of claims relating to pre June 2020 as stated above. In fact my role since coming on board has been largely limited to the mining company and less to no involvement in any other companies. The original set up and how it was done all pre dates me. All I can say that apart from “hearsay” I have not seen any documentation that supports the claims regarding Mr Tagwirei’s alleged ownership in said assets. My own interaction with Mr Tagwirei is very infrequent and in fact have seen him once in the last 7 months so hardly “ a business” partner as you quote. Mr Tagwirei is a very prominent business man in Zimbabwe and in addition he is an official advisor to Government and being as Government are shareholders in the mining assets so it is hard not to occasionally cross paths. The mining company is run as an “autonomous” unit and therefore this generic accusation on involvement in corruption and cronyism is not correct and would encourage you to provide any such documentation of corruption and cronyism so that the board can investigate fully.

My “involvement” in the so called “group” concept was as a result of a strategy adopted to resolve an HR issue with Mr C Fourie, the group concept is not a “legal” one and as such even

though there might have been common directorships/relationships across various companies in the past it does not and never did imply that there was a common ownership structure in the conventional sense. In the last year any business dealings have been governed by a strict set of rules to ensure that we are adhering to good governance. A vital part of the approach has been to split up businesses into stand-alone with arm's length relationships and the example is the trading and mining businesses which were housed within SOTIC, the drive has been to create a standalone mining business with nothing but arm's length links with the trading business if at all and this has been completed.

In addition, relevant information not discussed was around a recent (last week) Bloomberg article:

“David Brown, chief executive officer of Zimbabwe’s Kuvimba Mining House Ltd, intends to step down, jeopardizing the future of the company the government hopes will spur an economic revival.”

‘it has always been my intention to transition from executive roles to non-executive roles’

“When I joined it was always understood that this was the process I wanted to follow”

Not in the article but details I did supply was to contextualize my role at Kuvimba as it was to develop the vision and strategic direction for the company, stabilisation the production at the operations, put in place the growth options for the group for the next 24 months and in addition to set up the organisational infrastructure. This has largely been completed. The reason I include this is as supporting evidence that calling me a “business partner” is false and misleading as the pre-determined stepping down demonstrates, my role was always going to be of a short term duration with express aims as discussed above.

1. Are you involved in business with Mr Tagwirei? **No we are not – Kuvimba is a standalone business, he is not a shareholder and does not direct any day to day aspects.**
2. Are you aware of the Sentry report and what is your response to these allegations? **No I am not aware of the Sentry report**
3. Can you confirm that you did not respond to questions concerning your role sent by lawyers acting for the authors of the Sentry report? **The questions were seeking back ground information from 2018 and 2019, as I said I am not in a position to answer those questions or be responsible for what happened prior to my joining.**

On Thu, Jun 10, 2021 at 6:58 AM Sentry Research <[REDACTED]> wrote:

To David Brown:

We write to seek comment from you regarding information we received in the course of research on Zimbabwe. We are a non-profit research organization based in the United States, and we plan to publish some of the results of our research. You can learn more about our organization at www.thesentry.org.

We are investigating a series of transactions and business activities related to Zimbabwean businessman Kudakwashe Tagwirei, and documents we have reviewed indicate that your company may have played a role in some of these transactions.

We would welcome the opportunity to speak with you or your representative. Please let us know when would be a convenient time for you or your representative to speak with us prior to 1200 Eastern Daylight Time in the United States on 12 June 2021.

A number of preliminary comments:

1. From an employment perspective there has to be a distinction drawn between a pre and post June 2020 for me.

2. Despite a Court document referring to a "group", it must be stressed that this was to address a Human Resources matter (Mr Fourie) and does not imply I had any involvement in many of the other companies listed in that court document. My main focus has been on ensuring the creation a standalone mining business with the express purpose of creating value to as many Zimbabweans either as employees or shareholders as possible and in fact declared a maiden dividend for the benefit of many beneficiaries. In addition, we employ almost 4000 people and are actively looking for opportunities to continue growing.

3. [REDACTED]

4.

- Documents reviewed by The Sentry indicate that you have served as a director or officer of Sotic International as well as Great Dyke Investments (Private) Limited, Kuvimba Mining House, and Quorus Management Services.
- Do you still hold these roles? I am an NED of Great Dyke Investments (GDI), an ED of Kuvimba and an NED of Quorus, the NED roles are linked to my continued CEO role at Kuvimba. My SOTIC role has ceased.
- How did you become affiliated with Sotic and Great Dyke? SOTIC is a company based in Mauritius that housed both trading and mining investment activities. I was hired to look after the mining assets but due to the structure of the company, it was necessary - for a short period – to look after both aspects which meant inheriting the “as was” SOTIC structure - a rather confusing fusion of businesses. Pre June 2020 I cannot comment on how/why certain transactions took place but over the last year all business dealings have been governed by a strict set of rules to ensure that we are adhering to good governance. A vital part of the approach was to split up the SOTIC business into stand-alone ventures with arm’s length relationships and an example of this was to create a standalone mining business with nothing but arm’s length links with the trading business if at all and this has been completed.
- What is the nature of your relationship with Kudakwashe Tagwirei? The original set up and how it was done all pre dates me. All I can say that apart from “hearsay” I have not seen any documentation that supports the claims regarding Mr Tagwirei’ s alleged ownership in said assets. My own interaction with Mr Tagwirei is very infrequent and in fact, I have seen him once in the last 7 months, so hardly “ a business” partner as you quote. Mr Tagwirei is a prominent business man in Zimbabwe and in addition he is an official advisor to Government and being as Government are shareholders in the mining assets, it is obvious we would occasionally cross paths. The mining company is run as an “autonomous” unit and therefore there is no day to day involvement by Mr Tagwirei. It is evident that there was a closer “association” with Mr Tagwirei in the past in terms of relationships but given the desire to create an autonomous mining company these links are managed on an arm’s length basis.
- What is the nature of Kudakwashe Tagwirei’s relationship to Sotic International? See above

Are there any other comments you would like to provide? It is important to provide some context with regard to the “source” of these allegations. These matters are largely driven by a disgruntled employee who is part of a history that might well have been involved in matters you raise but I cannot comment on any of claims relating to pre June 2020 as stated above. In fact my role since coming on board has been largely limited to the mining company and

less to no involvement in any other companies. The original set up and how it was done all pre dates me. My so called "involvement" in the a greater "group" stems from a strategy adopted to resolve an HR issue with Mr C Fourie, the group concept is not a "legal" one and even though there were some common directorships/relationships across various companies in the past it does not and never did imply that there was a common ownership structure in the conventional sense.