



INDIVIDUAL

Types of directors

There are a number of different types of directors, known by a variety of names. All directors generally have the same duties and responsibilities regardless of their title. The following types of directors will be discussed: alternate director, chair, de facto director, executive director, non-executive director, independent director, lead director, managing director, nominee director and shadow director.

A good starting point to understand the different types of directors is the definition of a director in s 9 of the *Corporations Act 2001* (Cth) (the Act), which states:

'director' of a company or other body means:

- a) *a person who:

 - i. is appointed to the position of a director; or
 - ii. is appointed to the position of an alternate director and is acting in that capacity;
 regardless of the name that is given to their position; and*
- b) *unless the contrary intention appears, a person who is not validly appointed as a director if:

 - i. they act in the position of a director; or
 - ii. the directors of the company or body are accustomed to act in accordance with the person's instructions or wishes.*

Subparagraph (b) (ii) does not apply merely because the directors act on advice given by the person in the proper performance of functions attaching to the person's professional capacity, or the person's business relationship with the directors or the company or body.

In short, a director is definitely a person who is registered with the Australian Securities and Investments Commission (ASIC), but also may include people who act as a director while not registered or who instruct the registered directors to make particular decisions for the company.

What is an alternate director?

An alternate director is appointed by a director to exercise some or all of the appointing director's powers for a specified period. Appointing an alternate is the most useful way that directors can fulfil their duties and responsibilities if they know they will be absent for one or more board meetings, for example due to illness, jury duty, long holiday, etc.

Section 201K of the Act, a replaceable rule, covers alternate directors. This section may be replaced by specific provisions in the company's constitution. Some organisations do not allow alternate directors in their constitutions.

Appointment of an alternate director is subject to the board's approval and must be given in writing.

ASIC be notified within 28 days of the appointment¹ in accordance with s 205B (2) of the Act.

At law, alternate directors have the same rights, powers, duties and responsibilities as other directors. Specific roles, duties and responsibilities of an alternate director will usually be specified in the constitution or other formal company documentation. If the appointor requests it, the alternate must be given notice of meetings (s 201K (2) of the Act). Alternate directors may, if appointed to do so, act in their own right and do not have to act on the wishes of the appointor.

Where the appointing director has a conflict of interest, the alternate director is still able to vote if appointed to act in their own right. Where the alternate director has a conflict of interest, they are unable to vote regardless of whether acting as an agent or in their own right.

The appointor may terminate the appointment of an alternate director at any time provided it is done in writing (s 201K (5) of the Act). However, if the appointing director resigns or if either the appointing director or the alternate director is disqualified from managing a company, the alternate director's appointment ceases automatically. ASIC must be notified within 28 days of the alternate director ceasing their appointment for any reason.

Alternate directors are often used where directors hold their position on the board as a 'representative' of another organisation or person. For example, in an incorporated joint venture comprising two organisations, each organisation might have a right to appoint three directors to the joint venture board. Alternates are important in this circumstance to ensure that both parties are fully represented at joint venture board meetings and neither party gains a voting advantage if one or more of their directors is absent for any reason.

What is the role of the chair?

A chair is a director appointed to chair the meetings of directors. Often, they will also chair meetings of members.

The position of chair is covered by s 248E of the Act, which is a replaceable rule. Section 248E states:

- 1) *The directors may elect a director to chair their meetings. The directors may determine the period for which the director is to be the chair.*
- 2) *The directors must elect a director present to chair a meeting, or part of it, if:*
 - a. *a director has not already been elected to chair the meeting; or*
 - b. *a previously elected chair is not available or declines to act, for the meeting or the part of the meeting.*

Consequently, under this replaceable rule, a chair is only technically required on a meeting by meeting basis, but a more permanent chair can be appointed. Consequently, to understand how chairs are appointed and whether they have any special powers or responsibilities it is necessary to refer to the company's constitution.

In some companies, especially those with only one or very few shareholders, the constitution may give the owner the power to appoint the chair. This is common in many government-owned corporations, wholly-owned subsidiaries and is sometimes observed in organisations owned by religious based entities. Having a chair who is not elected by the other directors can, at times, lead to friction in the boardroom.

The more common situation is for the constitution to allow the existing directors to elect one of their number as the chair. The period for which a person is appointed chair can be set out in the constitution; however, this is not advised. A common practice is for the directors, as the first item of business at the first board meeting following the annual general meeting, which is when any new directors are usually appointed, to elect a chair for the year. In this way, any new directors get to have a say in who is chair. As this is a resolution of directors, if the chair loses the support of the board, they can be replaced by resolution at any time throughout the year.

1. Refer to AISC website *Changes to your company*, <https://asic.gov.au/for-business/changes-to-your-company>, (accessed 12 August 2019).

The Act is virtually silent on any powers or expectations of chairs outside of chairing board meetings. However, contemporary thinking on corporate governance suggests that chairs play a very important role in ensuring the organisation functions effectively. In summary, the chair:

- chairs board meetings;
- has final say on the agenda for each board meeting, guiding the board to address each item on the agenda and building a consensus so that decisive action can be taken;
- undertakes the initial review of the draft minutes of board and member meetings;
- arranges with management to provide the information the board needs;
- leads the board in creating the governance structure for the company, often acting as chair of a governance or nomination committee;
- acts as the board's primary channel of communication with the CEO between board meetings;
- often leads the process by which the board motivates and evaluates the CEO and potentially decides to replace him or her;
- chairs general meetings of shareholders; and
- in some circumstances, such as communications with shareholders, is the principal spokesperson of the company.

A director who is a chair currently owes the same duties as other directors, although this is being challenged by recent court decisions, which suggest that a chair may carry additional responsibilities.²

The chair acts as the link between the board, the organisation and the CEO. Governance codes including Recommendation 2.5 of ASX Corporate Governance Council's *Corporate Governance Principles and Recommendations*³ (ASX Principles) recommend the chair to be independent.

What is a de facto director?

A de facto director is usually a person who has not been formally or properly appointed as a director, but who acts as a director, for example a person may call themselves a consultant, but be carrying out tasks associated with being a director. The term can also

refer to a person formally appointed to the position of a director regardless of the position, title or job description they use in practice.

Where a person is not formally appointed as a director, whether a person is a de facto director depends on the nature of the activities or work they perform in a context of the operations and circumstances of the company concerned. There is no general test to determine whether a person has acted as a director. Factors that are considered relevant in this determination include: size of the company; internal practices and structure of the company, and the perception of outsiders. In *Grimaldi v Chameleon Mining NL (No 2)* (2012), the Full Court of the Federal Court found that a consultant was a de facto director, saying:

We accept that the Board members seem only to have allowed Mr Grimaldi's attendance at Board meetings by invitation and did not appear to regard him as a director as such. However, while they did not hold him out as a director eo nomine [by that name], they clearly authorised him on occasion to perform functions such as would lead a reasonable third party dealing with him to believe he was acting as a director of Chameleon. His authorisations to negotiate the acquisitions of the Fijian mining interests and of the Chilean copper mine, instance this and demonstrate that in these matters he stood on an equal footing with them in directing the affairs of the company. More, generally, Mr Grimaldi was allowed either to perform functions, for example fund raising and share placements, or to arrogate to himself functions in which at least either or both of the executive directors acquiesced with knowledge...Mr Grimaldi was obviously a resourceful and experienced person and the extent of his participation and intrusion into Chameleon's affairs could hardly have gone unnoticed. There is little room for doubt that the executive directors knowingly and willingly utilised his skills and experience over a diverse range of matters, acquiescing in, if not always authorising, what he did.

De facto directors have the same duties and responsibilities as other directors, as has been demonstrated in case law.⁴

2. *ASIC v Rich* (2003) 44 ACSR 341; 21 ACLC 450.

3. ASX Corporate Governance Council, 2019, *Corporate Governance Principles and Recommendations*, 4th Edition, February, <https://www.asx.com.au/documents/asx-compliance/cgc-principles-and-recommendations-fourth-edn.pdf>, (accessed 7 August 2019).

4. Relevant cases include *Grimaldi v Chameleon Mining NL (No 2)* (2012) FCAFC 6; *Deputy Commissioner of Taxation v Austin* (1998) 16 ACLC 1,555; *Forkserve Pty Ltd v Jack and Aussie Forklift Repairs* (2001) 19 ACLC 299; *Re Canadian Land Reclaiming and Colonizing Co* (1880) 14 Ch D 660, 670; *Ultraframe UK Ltd v Fielding* [2004] RPC 24 at 39.

What is an executive director?

Executive directors wear two hats – that of senior executive in a company, that is an employee, and that of a director. In the US they are usually referred to as ‘inside directors’. Today’s governance codes in Australia and overseas emphasise the importance of having a majority of independent directors as well as any executive directors. This is usually only possible in larger organisations.

The value of executive directors to a board lies with their depth of knowledge of the business and with their technical business skills.

Some court decisions suggest that executive directors might have a greater responsibility than other directors because of their inside knowledge and other specific qualifications (in which case a greater standard of care applies).⁵ This distinction is not reflected in the Act.

What is a non-executive director?

A non-executive director, by definition, is any director who is not an executive of the company. They are sometimes referred to as ‘outside directors’ or as an ‘NED’. As explained below, a director may be a non-executive director, but not necessarily an independent director.

Non-executive directors, like all directors, are appointed to act on their behalf of the members/shareholders in overseeing and governing an organisation. However, as distinct from executive directors, non-executive directors are not employees of the organisation. The advantage of non-executive directors is that they bring objectivity and independence to act in the best interests of the organisation.

They rely on information from management to guide their decision making. Therefore, they have a responsibility to ensure they receive appropriate and necessary information from the executive team.

What is an independent director?

An independent director can be broadly defined as a non-executive director who is not a member of management and who is free from any business or other relationship that could materially interfere (or could reasonably be perceived to materially interfere) with the independent exercise of that director’s judgment. Recommendation 2.4 of the ASX Principles states that there should be a majority of independent directors on a board.

The ASX Corporate Governance Council provides the following guidance on the factors relevant to assessing director independence:

Examples of interests, positions and relationships that might raise issues about the independence of a director of an entity include if the director:

- *is, or has been, employed in an executive capacity by the entity or any of its child entities and there has not been a period of at least three years between ceasing such employment and serving on the board;*
- *receives performance-based remuneration (including options or performance rights) from, or participates in an employee incentive scheme of, the entity;*
- *is, or has been within the last three years, in a material business relationship (for example, as a supplier, professional adviser, consultant or customer) with the entity or any of its child entities, or is an officer of, or otherwise associated with, someone with such a relationship;*
- *is, represents, or is or has been within the last three years an officer or employee of, or professional adviser to, a substantial holder;*
- *has close personal ties with any person who falls within any of the categories described above; or*
- *has been a director of the entity for such a period that their independence from management and substantial holders may have been compromised.*

In each case, the materiality of the interest, position or relationship needs to be assessed by the board to determine whether it might interfere, or might reasonably be seen to interfere, with the director’s capacity to bring an independent judgement to bear on issues before the board and to act in the best interests of the entity as a whole rather than in the interests of an individual security holder or other party.⁶

Family ties and cross-directorships may be relevant in considering interests and relationships that may affect independence and should be disclosed by directors to the board.

The term independent director is often used interchangeably with non-executive director, although this is not correct. A director can be a non-executive director, but not an independent director. An executive director can never be independent.

5. *Geoffrey William Vines v Australian Securities & Investments Commission* [2007] NSWCA 75.

6. ASX Corporate Governance Council, *op cit*, Box 2.3, p 14.

What is a lead director?

This is a term mainly used in the US, but also in a handful of Australian companies. In the US, the roles of chair and CEO are often combined and held by the one person. A lead director is a non-executive director, and preferably an independent director, who undertakes some of the roles of the chair which the chair is unable to perform given that they are an executive of the company. Appointing a lead director allows more independent oversight and assessment of the CEO and senior executives.

The lead director should be chosen by other non-executive directors. The role includes presiding over meetings of non-executive directors, assisting in the preparation of the board agenda, acting as the contact point for other directors to raise concerns about the management, liaising between the board and management, ensuring a CEO succession plan is in place and leading the evaluation of the chair/CEO and senior management.

What is the role of a managing director?

A managing director (MD) is an executive director who sits on the board, but also has the ultimate authority to manage the organisation on a day-to-day basis. Often the terms chief executive officer (CEO) and MD are used interchangeably, but a person may be CEO but not a director. It is not compulsory to have a managing director. However, it is a usual practice for larger profit companies and for listed companies. There may be joint MDs, but normally there are no more than two.

The MD is the most senior executive in the organisation. They manage the day-to-day operations of the organisation, its people and resources. They supervise the work of other executives, implement strategy and create an appropriate corporate culture.

Section 198C of the Act, a replaceable rule, covers the MD. This section may be replaced by specific provisions in the company's constitution. Under this section, the board is given the power to confer to an MD any of the powers the directors can exercise and to revoke or vary any such conferral.

While for public companies, s 203E of the Act prohibits the directors from dismissing a director, it is usual for the contract of employment of a managing director to state that if the person ceases to be the CEO they also cease to be a director.

What is a nominee director?

A nominee director is a director who is appointed by a shareholder, creditor or interest group and who has a continuing loyalty to the nominator or some interest other than the interest of the company.

Nominee directors should act in the best interests of the company to which they are appointed and not in the interests of the nominator. Nominee directors should be aware of conflicts of interests they have towards the company and the loyalties they hold towards their nominators. In Australia, the nominee directors can, however, pay regard to the interests of the nominator if they genuinely believe they are acting in the best interests of the company.⁷

If an actual conflict of interest occurs, the nominee must either obey their duty to the company, not to the nominator, or resign from the company's board.

A company may in its constitution allow nominee directors to have different duties (apart from statutory ones) to other directors that may otherwise be considered to be a conflict of interests for that nominee director (for example, a duty for a nominee appointed by a creditor to secure a loan facility for the company).⁸ Any such provisions must be subject to limitation imposed by section 199A of the Act, which states the situations in which the company will not exempt or indemnify or reimburse the costs incurred by a director.

Under s 187 of the Act, directors appointed to the board of a wholly-owned subsidiary may take the interests of the holding company into consideration if:

- the company constitution allows the director to do so;
- the director acts in good faith in the best interests of the holding company; and
- the subsidiary is not insolvent at the time the director acts and does not become insolvent because of the director's act.

What is a shadow director?

A shadow director is a person not formally appointed as a director, but on whose instructions or wishes a company's board members are accustomed to act. Those who appoint nominee directors may be considered shadow directors in certain circumstances. Shadow directors owe the same duties to the company and may face the same penalties and fines as validly appointed directors.

7. *Re Broadcasting Station 2GB Pty Ltd* [1964-65] NSWL 1648.

8. *Levin v Clark* [1962] NSW 686.

A body corporate can be a shadow director, despite s 201B of the Act, which provides that only an individual is eligible to be appointed a director of a company. For example, in New Zealand, the Privy Council held in the context of a corporate group, a parent became a shadow director of a subsidiary.⁹ In Australia, similarly, a parent company was held by the Supreme Court to be a shadow director of another company due to the parent company:¹⁰

- a) having effective control of its subsidiary;
- b) exercising management and financial control over its subsidiary; and
- c) imposing on its subsidiary requirements for financial reporting consistent with its own financial reporting requirements.

This may expose holding companies and other corporate shareholders to additional liabilities under the provisions of the Act dealing with insolvent trading and breaches of directors' duties, as well, of course, as liability for breaches of fiduciary duties.

Shadow directors were dealt with in detail in *Buzzle Operations Pty Ltd (in liq) v Apple Computer Australia Pty Ltd* (2011) NSWCA 109 where Justice Young said that the following principles emerge from the leading cases:¹¹

- *Not every person whose advice is in fact heeded as a general rule by the board is to be classed as a de facto or shadow director*
- *If a person has a genuine interest of his or her or its own in giving advice to the board, such as a bank or mortgagee, the mere fact that the board will tend to take that advice to preserve it from the mortgagee's wrath will not make the mortgagee, etc. a shadow director*
- *The vital factor is that the shadow director has the potentiality to control. The fact that he or she does not seek to control every facet of the company or the fact that from time to time the board disregards advice is of little moment*
- *Millett J's proposition that the evidence must show 'something more' than just being in a position of control must be shown. The whole of the facts of the case must be shown to see whether that power to control was put into practice. The emphasis that one must judge on the whole of facts and circumstances is made many times over in the leading cases...*
- *Although there are problems with cases where the board of the company splits into a majority and minority faction, so long as the influence controls the real decision makers, the person providing the influence may be a shadow director.*

9. *Kuwait Asia Bank EC v National Mutual Life Nominees Ltd* [1991] AC 187; [1990] BCLC 868.

10. *Standard Chartered Bank v Antico* (1995) 13 ACLC 1, 381.

11. Relevant case law in relation to shadow directors includes: *Australian Securities Commission v AS Nominees Ltd & Ors* (1995) 13 ACLC 1,822; *David Hill v David Hill Electrical Discounts* (2001) 19 ACLC 1,000; *Forge & Ors v ASIC* (2005) 23 ACLC 1,010; *Australian Securities Commission v AS Nominees Ltd & Ors* (1995) 13 ACLC 1,822; *Harris v S* (1976-1977) 2 ACLR 51; *Ho v Akai Pty Ltd* (2006) 24 ACLC 1, 526; *Standard Chartered Bank v Antico* (1995) 13 ACLC 1,381; *Kuwait Asia Bank EC v National Mutual Life Nominees Ltd* [1991] AC 187; [1990] BCLC 868; *ASIC v Adler* (No 3) (2002) 20 ACLC 576].

About us

The Australian Institute of Company Directors (AICD) is committed to strengthening society through world-class governance. We aim to be the independent and trusted voice of governance, building the capability of a community of leaders for the benefit of society. Our membership includes directors and senior leaders from business, government and the not-for-profit (NFP) sectors.

For more information t: 1300 739 119 w: companydirectors.com.au

Disclaimer

This document is part of a Director Tools series prepared by the Australian Institute of Company Directors. This series has been designed to provide general background information and as a starting point for undertaking a board-related activity. It is not designed to replace legal advice or a detailed review of the subject matter. The material in this document does not constitute legal, accounting or other professional advice. While reasonable care has been taken in its preparation, the Australian Institute of Company Directors does not make any express or implied representations or warranties as to the completeness, currency, reliability or accuracy of the material in this document. This document should not be used or relied upon as a substitute for professional advice or as a basis for formulating business decisions. To the extent permitted by law, the Australian Institute of Company Directors excludes all liability for any loss or damage arising out of the use of the material in this document. Any links to third-party websites are provided for convenience only and do not represent endorsement, sponsorship or approval of those third parties, or any products and/or services offered by third parties, or any comment on the accuracy or currency of the information included in third party websites. The opinions of those quoted do not necessarily represent the view of the Australian Institute of Company Directors.

© 2020 Australian Institute of Company Directors