



**JUST CONSULTING**

ROSEMARY HUDSON MILLER

**GFS Governance, Restoration and Constitution  
Report**

**November 2017**

# JUST CONSULTING

## GFS Governance, Restoration and Constitution

### Report

#### Executive Summary

Following a resolution of the Anglican Synod in October 2016, Just Consulting was employed to conduct a governance review of the Girls Friendly Society (GFS) and reflect on past areas of conflict between the Girls Friendly Society and Perth Diocesan Trustees (PDT), Perth Diocesan Council (PDC) and Synod, seeking restoration of relationships, and to provide recommendations regarding Constitutional amendments.

Primary concern seems to emanate from the decision of GFS to invest in *iCapisce Pty Ltd*. There are other areas of disagreement including property holdings, administrative matters and communication misunderstandings. They appear to stem from differences in interpretation of historical ownership and/or beneficial ownership of property and in interpretation of authority to act by both parties. In the past there was a failure to listen respectfully and a lack of coherence on the part of the Diocese as well as failure to seek and take advice on the part of GFS.

This review has found, as a small to medium NGO with considerable assets, GFS lacks basic good governance foundations. The absence of these foundations has lead GFS to make a risky investment without prior advice from the PDT or performing adequate due diligence. An attempt was made to seek advice but the nature of the break down in relationships between the parties meant this was not followed up. While the GFS Executive has not acted outside their authority, the GFS Constitution currently provides little assistance in acting as a guide and framework for actions of both the GFS Executive Committee and Trustees as it contains internal conflicts on matters of authority. It also fails to adequately define conflict of interest parameters beyond pecuniary interest.

It is noted that no member of the GFS Executive or their families have invested in or personally benefitted from the *iCapisce Pty Ltd* investment.

The way forward for resolving current disputes and mitigating future conflict lies in implementing good governance principles and amending the Constitution to redefine roles, responsibilities and delegations of authority. This should be done as a negotiation between the GFS and the PDT with legal assistance external to both parties. Necessary changes should also be made to make the GFS Constitution conform to the Model Rules of the *Associations Incorporation Act (2015)*. It is recommended that the GFS Executive Committee initiate the Governance recommendations made in this report and undertake further training on good governance principles and guidelines.

## Background

Following a resolution of the Anglican Synod in October 2016, Just Consulting has been requested to: conduct a review of the governance of the Girls Friendly Society Inc.; propose steps towards rebuilding relationships between GFS and the Diocesan Council and Trustees; and provide recommendations to assist with the revision of the GFS Constitution. This review has been requested by two parties, Girls Friendly Society Inc. and Perth Diocesan Trustees.

## Methodology

- Document review
- Group interview with current GFS Executive Committee: Reverend Josie Steytler (Chair), Carole Lovejoy, Reverend Des Smit, Noeleen Stewart, Lauren Stewart, Paul Langstaff, Lorna Hilton, Rayleen Hindle, Alexandra Taylor, Emma Langstaff and Glenys Pickford
- One-on-one interviews Bishop Jeremy James, Rev Bruce Hyde and Julie Ward
- Draft recommendations presented for discussion with each party
- Convened a meeting with representatives from involved parties
- Provide final recommendations in a report

## Documentation

We have reviewed all documents provided by the GFS Chairperson, including: Synod 2016 resolution; past minutes (May 2015 till August 2017); *iCapisce Pty Ltd* documents; BDO report; GFS current and previous Constitution; Perth Diocesan Trustees Statute; and extensive correspondence and reports. We understand we have seen the most relevant documentation.

## Observations

This section addresses areas of confusion and historical grievances that have continued to play a role in the breakdown of relationships between the parties involved.

## **Incorporation**

GFS was separately incorporated in 1914 and again under the Associations Incorporation Act (WA) 1987. Girls Friendly Society Inc. has continued to be incorporated in this way since 1914, as noted above. Nevertheless, it appears that the Diocese, with little question from GFS, was operating as if GFS was constituted under the *Anglican Church of Australia (Diocesan Trustees) Act, 1888*, in which section 5A states the Anglican Church has the authority to incorporate missions and institutions. This confusion continues under the current Constitution (2011). A review of the Constitution should seek to clarify powers and authorities under the model Constitution rules.

## **The Trustees**

The relationship of the PDT to GFS is similarly unclear. The Perth Diocesan Trustees powers in the GFS Constitution are to act as the Trustees of the GFS. In the PDT Statute 2016 they are to administer any property, as defined, 'for the use of the Church, as the Synod of the Diocese shall direct'<sup>1</sup>. These two powers are in conflict as trustees of a separately incorporated body would normally act for the sole benefit of that body, and in any case the board (Executive) of the association would normally have unfettered responsibility for all property, real and personal. It is unclear when the Diocese is acting as the Synod i.e. PDC (the Synod between Synod meetings) and when the trustee is acting.

## **Historical Grievances**

### *Townsend House Ownership /Beneficial Ownership*

GFS asserts it has beneficial ownership of Townsend House. Diocesan officers have asserted PDT has ownership of the land. A caveat obtained by GFS has been re- applied to the title. The title is said from the records<sup>2</sup> to have been able to have been registered in the name of GFS, although this appears to not have been done. The copy of the Deed of Trust provided to GFS in 2016 states that the property is being held in trust by The Diocesan Trustees for the sole use and benefit of Girls Friendly Society. GFS were advised on several occasions by officers of the Diocese that this was not the case; in a recent discussion with the Diocesan Secretary an undertaking was given to follow this up to clarify the matter.

### *Bank accounts*

The refusal of the Anglican Community Fund (ACF) to act on instruction from GFS on accounts held in its name could be a matter of further exploration, but a clear understanding of authorities to act, and limitations of authorities, would likely resolve any further conflicts in this area. Clarity about the role of the ACF and its authority to do other than act on the instructions of the account holder was provided by the administrator in a letter dated 13 August 2015 which acknowledges that the ACF is obliged to allow any investor to withdraw funds held by it.

---

<sup>1</sup> Diocesan Trustees Statute 2016 Part 5 14.1.

<sup>2</sup> Letter from Diocesan Registrar to Secretary GFS dated 28/05/1956

### *Workers Compensation*

In reviewing the correspondence, it is apparent that Workers Compensation became a matter of contention due to the breakdown of relationships. The role of the Diocese, to act for the common good of the whole Anglican Group seeking the best workers compensation cover for agencies of the Church in this matter, was compromised in relation to GFS. This was due in part to The Workers Compensation account for GFS being used in error by the Diocese to lodge a claim for a parish priest who had nothing to do with GFS. A lack of timely remedy by the Diocesan officers of this error increased the tension between GFS and the Diocese. The situation was eventually remedied by an officer of the court.

### *Communications*

Some communications have been perceived to be less than respectful. Contradictory statements were made by senior officers of the Diocese. Allegations of bullying have been made. This is clearly unsatisfactory and it is recommended that a mechanism which provides clarity about who is speaking with the authority of the PDT/PDC and who speaks for GFS would prove helpful. Such an agreement could form part of a Letter of Agreement and could be added to revised GFS By-laws.

## Section 1 – Governance

In reviewing the 2015, 2016 and current year minutes of the executive, and special and annual general meeting minutes, a range of matters have been noted and listed for reflection against *Ten Principles that Promote Good Governance*<sup>3</sup>. We provide this as a benchmark to assist in evaluating GFS against best practice.

### 1. Roles and Responsibilities

***Are the roles and responsibilities of the board (Executive Committee), both collectively and as individual members, clearly defined within the organisations Constitution?*** The Constitution is helpful in defining specific roles for the Executive Committee regarding the method of election of the Chairperson, Deputy Chairperson, Secretary and Treasurer, and members of the Executive Committee but is less clear on the role's limits of authority. Reference is made to the Act in relation to the treasurer, and the Secretary role is mentioned specifically at 18. (7)<sup>4</sup>.

***Are new Executive Committee members given an orientation and/or a letter of engagement specifying their duties and provided with a definition of conflict of interest?*** Interviews with executive committee members revealed that this is not the case.

***Is there a charter and protocols that define the Executive Committee role and show clear delegations of authority?*** There is no evidence of a charter and protocols or a formal delegation of authority.

#### Recommendations:

1. Establish Guidance Principles to enable routinely high standards of practice for the Executive Committee. Several models available
2. Provide role descriptions for the whole Executive Committee and all office bearers with more definition than the current Constitution via revised By-laws

### 2. Board Composition

***Is there an appropriate process for board recruitment and does it include consideration for skills and experience?*** In the documents reviewed there is reference to the need to recruit a suitable person to take up the role of treasurer. There is reference to the roles of other members of the executive in the Policies and Guidelines document. Little attention appears

<sup>3</sup> AICD Good Governance and Principles for Not-for-Profit Organisations © 2013

<sup>4</sup> Constitution of Girls Friendly Society Inc. May 2011

to be paid to a strategic process for recruitment. For instance there is no review of current skills of members and therefore active recruitment of others to complement the gifts and skill of continuing members of the Executive Committee. This may, of course, have been done on an informal basis and in discussion with the current executive. It would be open to the GFS to amend the by-laws or adopt a policy that encompassed sound principles for a diversity of expertise on the executive.

**Recommendation:**

3. Develop a 3-year rolling recruitment and succession plan for the Executive Committee, recruiting people with expertise and experience required by a small to medium NGO

### 3. Purpose and Strategy

***Is there a clear vision and mission statement or strategic plan?*** There is a clear purpose of the society as laid out in the Constitution at 1. (5)<sup>5</sup>. There seems to be no clear objectives or strategic plan. Mention was made of adopting a five year plan '20/20 vision' in both the Synod Report (2016) and on the GFS website. However the detail does not go beyond headings and limited subtext. There is no clear plan, rationale or budget for carrying out this vision in the materials provided or evidence of it being operationalized as a strategic plan.

***Does the Executive Committee think they have a shared understanding of where they are heading as an organisation?*** Discussions about the vision and mission of GFS are recorded in minutes from May 2015 but seem to have been quickly overcome by *iCapisce* matters. This became the only articulated vision/mission although many other activities are routinely reported on and it is clear other work is being carried out.

**Recommendations:**

4. Building on the Vision 2020 document, develop a comprehensive strategic and business plan to assist GFS to meet the mission and vision of the organisation
5. Executive Committee to review achievements and progress of strategic plan timeline goals as a fixed agenda item at each regular meeting

---

<sup>5</sup> Constitution of Girls Friendly Society Inc. May 2011

## 4. Risk – Recognition and Management

***Is there a risk management policy/procedure?*** There is no specific risk management policy or procedures discussed in the Constitution or minutes except in relation to *iCapisce*. A risk management plan and policy would normally form part of a comprehensive strategic plan.

***Has the Executive Committee discussed risk and risk appetite?*** Risk management does not seem to have been a topic discussed generally. However risks were discussed in relation to the *iCapisce* investment during the special meeting (21<sup>st</sup> June minutes). It was acknowledged the investment presented was high risk. A contingency plan was discussed as far as being able to generate an equal amount of money; this was to be through the management of Townsend Lodge. It was acknowledged if the investment failed, there would be no ability to recoup the money invested and no personal liability of committee members. The quantum of the investment was compared to the cash held in GFS bank account. It was reported to represent one third of the cash holdings. A chartered accountant reviewed the numbers provided and declared them realistic in an email, however no formal report is noted. Prior to the investment with *iCapisce* risk appetite was apparently not discussed. Third party investment was recorded for the first time in the minutes of the meeting of 12<sup>th</sup> May 2015, with no discussion about risk appetite. When the *iCapisce* proposal was discussed on the 21<sup>st</sup> June it was acknowledged the investment was high risk and GFS could receive no return.

***Do the Executive Committee conduct risk management reviews and/or review risk policy?***

There seems to have been no risk governance reviews and no systems in place for managing or effectively monitoring risk until the BDO Corporate Finance (WA) Pty Ltd. (BDO) report following the investment in *iCapisce*. This report remains confidential but members of the Executive Committee at the time were provided with a copy and current members are able to read a copy.

Boards and Executive Committees such as GFS often require external advice in risk management, as it is difficult to recruit people with such expertise to small boards and committees. There are a number of organisations which provide such services, and board members can participate in ongoing education run by organisations such as WASCROSS and AICD in their NGO stream.

### **Recommendations:**

6. Develop a detailed risk management plan closely integrated with the strategic plan.
7. Report on risk at least quarterly to the regular Executive Committee meeting
8. Consider the establishment of a risk management sub-committee and consider obtaining expert risk management advice

## 5. Organisational Performance

**Financial and non-financial objectives:** The minutes reflect some financial objectives in regards to diversifying assets with third party investment. However, there were no other specified objectives for the organisation found in the documentation provided. Having clearly defined and measurable financial and non-financial objectives would enable consideration of the level of progress and success of the organisation.

**Does GFS keep records of volunteer and staff hours and participation in offered programs and services?** We have not been provided with this specific data, and note that some information is provided in the Annual Report to Synod. This information should be before the Executive Committee on a regular basis as it forms the reason for the organisation.

**Does the Executive Committee manage GFS resources adequately?** Audits available from 2013 to 2016 found GFS financial reports presents fairly and within mandatory reporting requirements. Questions arise as to the probity and wisdom of investment decisions relating to the *iCapisce* investment, as discussed earlier in the document.

### Recommendation:

9. Develop financial objectives/plans which reflect the strategic goals of GFS. The significant assets which GFS holds need careful and prudent plans in order to grow the assets to achieve the vision and mission of GFS

## 6. Effectiveness

**Does the board evaluate and review either its performance or overall quality of governance?** There has been no evidence found in the materials given, that the board evaluates and reviews either its performance, overall quality of governance or that of the individual board members. There is also nothing indicative of ongoing professional development or training for board members.

Such measures of effectiveness would be:

- a calendar for important and recurring governance matters
- a scheduled discussion pattern on strategy throughout the year
- discussion items for consideration and approval tabled in good time
- agendas focussed and time allocations appropriate

- discussion constructive, comments sought from all members of executive
- respectful interactions and collegiality maintained between and throughout meetings
- disagreement is handled respectfully
- sense of community enhanced

**Recommendation:**

10. Conduct an annual effectiveness evaluation (some proforma tools which can be adapted are available to assist) of the Executive Committee and report this in the annual report to the general meeting

## 7. Integrity and Accountability

The GFS formally report to members at their AGM and Synod annually as well as conducting an annual financial audit. Listed below are some questions for consideration around integrity and accountability as a not-for-profit organisation.

- *Does the Executive Committee measure itself against the key performance indicators and general objectives?*
- *How are contrary views received at the Executive Committee?*
- *Are the Executive Committee provided with full briefing papers about new matters prior to the meeting?*
- *Are issues adequately ventilated at board meetings?*
- *Does the Executive Committee have enough information to assess the financial and non-financial position of the organisation?*
- *Do field workers report against key indicators in their role descriptions?*
- *Who provides updates on risk issues and compliance?*
- *Are there others on the Executive Committee who have sufficient financial and board experience in order to ensure the Executive Committee is well resourced in understanding financial reporting and able to question the reports?*

**Recommendation:**

11. Use key performance indicators to regularly self evaluate eg. AICD standards
12. Offer each member of the executive the opportunity to undertake an education program/s on governance each year through WACOSS, AICD, ACNC or similar. Consider undertaking a governance mini tutorial at each meeting, subscribe to publications such as *Board Matters* or *Pro-bono Australia* and provide to each member of the Executive Committee

## 8. Organisational Building

There was no evidence found in the documentation provided that any organisational building was taking place within GFS. Below is a set of questions for consideration around organisational building.

- *Does the GFS have a mix of skills on the Executive Committee that enhance the vision and mission of the organisation?*
- *Does it have theological reflectors; does it have people with expertise in ministry with children and young people?*
- *Are there members who have training in child protection practice and laws?*
- *How are members of the Executive Committee thanked? How are staff members achievements celebrated?*

### Recommendations:

13. Develop the habit of evaluating each executive meeting by means of appointing one member to be the active reflector at each meeting
14. Develop a skills matrix for members of the Executive Committee
15. Actively recruit for skills gaps (if any)

## 9. Culture and Ethics

***Are there policies to deal with conflict of interest? How are these currently managed and reported?*** There is evidence of conflict of interest being raised in correspondence but Executive Committee meetings do not record any formal consideration of these. There are proforma available, which assist with declaration of conflicts of interest for each meeting. It is a standard agenda.

### Recommendation:

16. Develop and adopt, as a matter of urgency, a code of conduct, suitable for a board managing significant financial assets. As an interim measure adopt (with appropriate adjustments for name of committee etc.) the Diocesan Council Code of Conduct.

## 10. Engagement

**Who are GFS's key stakeholders?** Stakeholders are; members, young people and children with whom the Anglican community interacts, GFS staff, the Anglican Diocese of Perth and its Council and Trustees, and members of the Executive Committee. The Executive Committee assists GFS to have meaningful relationships with the stakeholders. These relationships are two way, and involve listening carefully to all and sharing the vision and progress of the organisation. It is also helpful to have a clear idea of the nature of each relationship, i.e. reporting body, strategic body, funder, fundee etc. It is critical to foster and nurture these relationships to build a healthy and thriving organisation. Policies are needed by most organisations in order to keep engagement at the top of mind. It is helpful to use the annual report to regularly review engagement.

### **Recommendation:**

17. Develop policies to enable consistent engagement with GFS's stakeholders and members

## Section 3 - Constitutional Amendment Recommendations

The following recommendations are made to assist with the revision of the GFS Constitution prior to it being amended as required by the *Associations Incorporation Act (2015)*<sup>6</sup> (the Act) and Model Rules<sup>7</sup>.

### Roles and Responsibilities

The GFS would benefit significantly from having clearly defined roles and responsibilities outlined within their Constitution. This should include specifically the role of the Chairperson, Treasurer and Secretary as exemplified in Part 5 of the Model Rules.

### Conflict of Interest

This is a critical matter to be addressed. The section in the current Constitution that discusses pecuniary interest is not broad enough to cover all potential conflict of interest issues. This needs to be explored and elaborated within the Constitution. It should also closely align with the code of conduct to be added to the by-laws. ACNC and AICD provide excellent principles for conflict of interest policies.

### The Visitor

The term visitor is not defined in the Constitution or any other relevant Anglican statute. It has its roots in the traditional Church practice of canonical visitation. The Visitor's role is more in the nature of a moral influence with the ability to make recommendations to other parties, if concerns are raised. Consistent with good practice and the model rules it seems reasonable that the visitor should intervene at the most immediate point and that this be reflected in changes to the Constitution. We suggest clause 3. (b)<sup>8</sup> be reworded to say 'make recommendations to the Executive Committee or Synod'. One of the current reference points for the Visitor (clause 3) is the President. Assuming that the President referred to is the President of GFS Australia, we note that there is no structural relationship to the national office of the GFS and is only by association. Therefore it is recommended that President be excluded and the clause refer only to the Executive Committee and Synod.

---

<sup>6</sup> Associating Incorporation Act (2015)

[https://www.slp.wa.gov.au/legislation/statutes.nsf/main\\_mrtitle\\_13715\\_homepage.html](https://www.slp.wa.gov.au/legislation/statutes.nsf/main_mrtitle_13715_homepage.html)

<sup>7</sup> Model Rules (Associations) 2016 <https://www.commerce.wa.gov.au/publications/model-rules-associations-2016>

<sup>8</sup> Constitution of Girls Friendly Society Inc. May 2011

## Role of the Trustees

The Perth Diocesan Trustees powers in the GFS Constitution are to act as the Trustees of the GFS. In the PDT Statute 2016 they are to administer any property, as defined, 'for the use of the Church, as the Synod of the Diocese shall direct'<sup>9</sup>. These two powers are in conflict as trustees of a separately incorporated body would normally act for the sole benefit of that body, and in any case the board (Executive) of the association would normally have unfettered responsibility for all property real and personal.

On the other hand if the PDT are acting as trustees of property which may or may not be the responsibility of the Anglican Synod how are they able to act as trustees of a separately incorporated association, as well as act in the best interests of the Church whole. There is an apparent conflict of duties here. In addition, the GFS Constitution provides for the PDT to be an ex officio member of the GFS. It is not appropriate for a trustee to also be a member of the association. A trustee is required to maintain independence from its beneficiaries in order to carry out its functions.

It is recommended that the Constitution be amended to remove the PDT as an ex officio member and to clarify that their powers as trustees of GFS property are to be exercised for the sole benefit of the GFS. This matter should be discussed within the context of the negotiation of Constitutional amendments as recommended further in Section 4.

## Transition to New Model Rules

In order to comply with the new model rules for *the Act* certain Constitutional amendments need to take place in addition to the recommendations made above. It is recommended that a detailed negotiation be entered into between the GFS and the PDT in amending these rules. It is strongly recommended the Constitution amendments be written by a legal advisor external to both parties.

---

<sup>9</sup> Diocesan Trustees Statute 2016 Part 5 14.1.

## Section 4 – Proposed Steps Forward

### 1. Governance Recommendations

#### Roles and Responsibilities

1. Establish Guidance Principles to enable routinely high standards of practice for the Executive Committee. Several models available
2. Provide role descriptions for the whole Executive Committee and all office bearers with more definition than the current Constitution via revised By-laws

#### Board Composition

3. Develop a 3-year rolling recruitment and succession plan for the Executive Committee recruiting people with expertise and experience required by a small to medium NGO

#### Purpose and Strategy

4. Building on the Vision 2020 document, develop a comprehensive strategic and business plan to assist GFS to meet the mission and vision of the organisation
5. Executive Committee to review achievements and progress of strategic plan timeline goals as a fixed agenda item at each regular meeting

#### Risk – Recognition and Management

6. Develop a detailed risk management plan closely integrated with the strategic plan.
7. Report on risk at least quarterly to the regular Executive Committee meeting
8. Consider the establishment of a risk management sub-committee and consider obtaining expert risk management advice

## Organisational Performance

9. Develop financial objectives/plans which reflect the strategic goals of GFS. The significant assets which GFS holds need careful and prudent plans in order to grow the assets to achieve the vision and mission of GFS

## Effectiveness

10. Conduct an annual effectiveness evaluation (some proforma tools which can be adapted are available to assist) of the Executive Committee and report this in the annual report to the general meeting

## Integrity and Accountability

11. Use key performance indicators to regularly self evaluate eg. AICD standards
12. Offer each member of the executive the opportunity to undertake an education program/s on governance each year through WACOSS or AICD or similar. Consider undertaking a governance mini tutorial at each meeting, subscribe to publications such as *Board Matters* or *Pro-bono Australia* and provide to each member of the Executive Committee

## Organisational Building

13. Develop the habit of evaluating each executive meeting by means of appointing one member to be the active reflector at each meeting
14. Develop a skills matrix for members of the Executive Committee
15. Actively recruit for skills gaps (if any)

## Culture and Ethics

16. Develop and adopt, as a matter of urgency, a code of conduct, suitable for a board managing significant financial assets. As an interim measure adopt (with appropriate adjustments for name of committee etc.) the Diocesan Council Code of Conduct

## Engagement

17. Develop policies to enable consistent engagement with GFS's stakeholders and members

## 2. Recommendations for Mitigating Areas of Confusion and Historical Grievances

### Townsend House Ownership/Beneficial Ownership

18. Expert legal opinion, from external legal advisors, be obtained on property matters of ownership and/or beneficial ownership and that this advice form the basis of an agreement to ensure misunderstandings do not arise in the future

### Bank Accounts

19. Letter of agreement/MOU be entered into which defines authorities to act or control any and all accounts held

### Communications

20. A communication protocol be embedded in a Letter of Agreement/MOU agreed by GFS, PDT and PDC
21. By-laws be clarified to clearly state partnership agreements noting how areas of previous contention will be addressed in the future
22. Consider how possible Constitutional amendments would offer clarity (see further proposals in this document, Section 3)
23. Consideration be given to a Letter of Agreement (similar to a MOU) between GFS and PDT/PDC regarding matters of authority to act in property and other assets of GFS

### 3. Constitutional Amendment Recommendations

Engage in negotiations with all involved parties to amend Constitution to:

1. Clearly define roles and responsibilities
2. Broaden pecuniary interest section to include all potential conflict of interest matters
3. Clause 3. (b)<sup>1</sup> be reworded to say 'make recommendations to the Executive Committee or Synod'
4. Remove 'President' as a reference for 'Visitor' in clause 3, so the clause refers only to Executive Committee and Synod
5. Clearly define the role of the PDT
6. Remove PDT as ex officio member and to clarify that their powers as trustees of GFS property are to be exercised for the sole benefit of the GFS (as opposed to the broader 'Church' or at the direction of the Synod)
7. Make all necessary changes to comply with the new model rules for the Associations Incorporation Act 2015
8. Employ a legal advisor external to both parties for all Constitutional amendments

## 4. Helpful Resources

Australia Charities and Not-for-profits Commission (ACNC)  
[www.acnc.gov.au](http://www.acnc.gov.au)

Australian Institute of Company Directors (AICD)  
<http://aicd.companydirectors.com.au>

Probono Australia  
<https://probonoaustralia.com.au>

Board Matters  
<https://boardmatters.com.au>

Western Australian Council of Social Services (WACOSS)  
<http://www.wacoss.org.au>