

Culture is not a Department

The Role of Governance in National Cultural Institutions

Prepared by

Matthew Davies – National Film and Sound Archive

David Fitzgerald- Australian War Memorial

Gina Grey – National Archives of Australia

Dominique Nagy – National Gallery of Australia

Deb Sulway – Old Parliament House

Sponsor

Professor Graham Durant, Director, Questacon

Table of Contents

Executive Summary	3
Introduction	5
Background to governance in the Australian Government	6
Project Methodology	14
Key Findings – Themes	21
Conclusions	25
Recommendations	27
Appendix I – Key References	29
Appendix II – Comparative Table of Cultural Institutions	31
Appendix III – Comparing the FMA and CAC Acts	38
Appendix IV – Notes on Existing Collaborations	41
Appendix V – Notes on Opportunities for Collaboration	43
Appendix VI – Recent Collaborations by the AWM	45
Acknowledgements	53

Executive Summary

This report outlines the principles for good governance in the public sector for national cultural institutions. It recognises that good governance is about performance and conformance; specifically how public servants in cultural institutions take decisions and implement policies.

The report defines the parameters under which cultural institutions operate to deliver their core business to their stakeholders while adhering to legislative regulations. Furthermore, it explores the concepts surrounding an optimal governance arrangement for cultural institutions and the challenges current arrangements have on organisational governance and structures to deliver optimal and effective outcomes.

The **background** section of the project report places in context the subject of governance and its relevance to national cultural institutions. It explores why good governance is important. Key definitions are identified and direct comparisons are made between the current governance arrangements across national cultural institutions.

In the **project methodology** section, the project approach to gathering information is outlined. A two stage approach was followed, which involved

- research on public sector governance, including discussions with the project team sponsor and ;
- the design of an outcomes-based set of questions on governance arrangements which led to a formatted interview questionnaire..

The questionnaire was designed to elicit responses from senior executives and managers from various national cultural institutions. They in turn participated fully by candidly answering questions relating to governance and their particular institution's legislative environment. Summaries of these responses are also contained in this section.

The **key findings - themes** section of the report is structured around themes emerging from the research and interviews. From the interview responses a number of themes emerged as perceived outcomes for cultural institutions in managing their governance. These themes are

- Autonomy
- Collaboration
- Accountability
- Small details/big picture
- Minister or department
- Performance and agency health

- Challenges and opportunities.

The report's **conclusions** draw on these themes to emphasise the value of this project's research for understanding more about the governance framework that exists for cultural institutions. This project has

- provided a picture of the governance environment for cultural institutions and has laid out the key elements of this framework across the sector
- confirmed that cultural institutions do currently acknowledge the importance of the variability, alignment, and clarity of governance arrangements that have been identified as significant in earlier research into general public sector governance
- provided recommendations for specific practically oriented action that will add value to existing arrangements

The report's **recommendations** consolidate the analysis of the survey results with the research into existing cross agency collaborations to identify and propose new opportunities and more effective practices for cultural agencies in relation to good governance.

Recommendation 1. Share information about existing collaborations.

Recommendation 2. Develop a more coordinated approach to collaboration

Recommendation 3. Develop specific forums for governance specialists in cultural institutions to share information.

Recommendation 4. Raise awareness among all cultural institution staff of the big picture with respect to the national cultural institutions.

Recommendation 5. Disseminate this report to all officers with governance responsibilities in participating institutions.

Recommendation 6. Extend research to examine the impact of governance arrangements to other cultural institutions or agencies with cultural functions

Recommendation 7. Explore the possibility of extending the Cultural Management Development Program (CMDP) to include additional cultural institutions or agencies with a cultural focus.

Introduction

The project discussed in this report investigated the theory and practice behind governance in the public sector to explore the principle of good governance for cultural institutions. In particular it drew on knowledge and experience of senior executives in the cultural sector to explore the parameters of governance arrangements.

The project focused specifically on the national cultural institutions funded directly by the Australian Government that are located in Canberra, as well as the National Maritime Museum in Sydney. These cultural institutions comprise a group which includes museums, galleries and archives.

Critically, the project sought to identify the governance environment in which cultural institutions operate as well as the challenges and opportunities that governance arrangements pose for cultural institutions. Our findings, drawn from detailed research from secondary sources as well as first person interviews, have allowed us to draw conclusions about these challenges and opportunities. They have also allowed us to provide an assessment of how governance arrangements impact on the way cultural institutions do business and whether a single model or optimal governance arrangement would be the most effective for all cultural institutions.

This report outlines the project, its findings and provides a detailed response to these questions. It is also specifically intended to be used to raise awareness of governance frameworks more broadly across the cultural institutions sector so institutions can identify opportunities for collaboration.

Background to governance in the Australian Government

What is public sector governance?

At a day to day level, governance in the public sector generally has a practical edge. Public servants take decisions and implement policies that are determined by the governance frameworks their organisations have established. Governance is about the effective structures, processes and relationships we use to manage our business and to monitor that management, including those that ensure we comply with legal requirements and legislation.

At a broader level, public sector governance covers

... the set of responsibilities and practices, policies and procedures exercised by an agency's executive, to provide strategic direction, ensure objectives are achieved, manage risks and use resources responsibly and with accountability. (ANAO, quoted in APSC, 2008)

An earlier Australian definition of corporate governance pushed the boundaries to include culture and stakeholders. Under this definition, corporate governance could be seen as encompassing

... how an organisation is managed, its corporate and other structures, its culture, its policies and strategies, and the ways in which it deals with its stakeholders. (quoted in Edwards and Clough: 2)

The elements common to these two definitions are the policies, strategies and structures that are determined to a greater or lesser extent by the enabling Acts that bring agencies into being and the financial and other kinds of legislation (such as the Public Service Act) under which agencies must operate. Within this specific legislative framework, Australian government agencies also have to respond to broader reporting and accountability requirements, established either directly by legislation or by government budgetary processes for example.

Although an agency's governance arrangements have an effect on individual staff who make decisions, provide services and implement policy on a day to day basis, the agency's executive is primarily responsible for setting the agenda in relation to governance. These responsibilities include creating the policies, strategies and structures that comply with legislation but they also include establishing the agency's broad cultural and political response to its position within government. This can include the agency's strategic management of its stakeholders (something that in turn may be determined in part by legislation)

and its management of any Boards or Councils that form part of its governance arrangements. The way an agency's executive responds to these governance responsibilities can have a very direct impact on an agency's ability to carry out its business effectively and accountably.

What is good governance and why is it important?

Against the concept that "one size fits all", recent thinking on good governance practice emphasises the importance of a more flexible approach in which the governance arrangements are tailored to the nature of the organisation. (Edwards and Clough, 2005: 22)

Australian Government agencies vary in terms of their size, complexity, structure and legislative background. The Australian Public Service Commission (APSC) makes the key point that good public sector governance practices have to be applied within an agency taking these specific factors into account (APSC, 2005: 4). This does not mean however, that elements of good governance can be applied selectively.

The APSC also outlines features of good governance in the public sector that are common to high performing agencies and which should be taken as a model for all public sector agencies. In high performing agencies

- resources are aligned with desired outcomes
- responsibility and accountability requirements are made clear
- key risks are identified, articulated and remediated, and the focus is on effective risk management, rather than on ... process monitoring and measurement ...
- a conscious assessment is made about the appropriate level at which particular decisions should be made
- performance is benchmarked against the wider environment
- governance arrangements are regularly reviewed to take into account changes in the agency's internal or external environment
- committee systems operate in a timely and efficient manner with a clear sense of purpose
- committee membership is considered carefully
- agency leadership cooperates fully with external scrutiny requirements (APSC, 2007: 15)

These features contribute to what the APSC further identifies as the two key components of good governance:

Performance – how an agency uses governance arrangements to contribute to its overall performance and the delivery of goods and services

Conformance – how an agency uses governance arrangements to ensure it meets the requirements of the law, regulations, published standards and community expectations of probity, accountability and openness (APSC, 2005)

These two components are inextricably linked because good governance is essentially multi-dimensional. In its narrowest sense, governance is about compliance with legal and legislative obligations (conformance) that in turn leads to effective performance. Performance however is not just about how well an organisation complies with its obligations; performance is also linked firmly to the cultural framework that an agency establishes for itself and its relationships across and outside government. In essence “... relationships and behaviours are as important to the quality of governance as structures and systems”. (Edwards and Clough, 2005: 18)

Realistically, in any public sector organisation, different governance features will assume greater importance at specific times in an organisation’s life. Tensions will exist for example between external and internal accountability, accountability and transparency and efficiency and inclusiveness, so the challenge for an organisation’s leaders will be to balance these features in the longer term (Edwards and Clough, 2005: 4).

Governance is not the same as managing. Broadly, governance is about systems and processes at the leadership level that enable management, which is concerned with the “doing”, the coordinating of business activities. Here too however, the theoretical difference breaks down because the distinction may be “impractical and inefficient or simply not relevant” (Edwards and Clough, 2005: 3). Agency heads in the public sector may have to balance these two roles because they have legal responsibility for their organisations’ activities, while others with governing Boards or Councils may have to balance their own roles against Board micro-management of the agency’s business or conversely, Board passivity. Tensions will therefore also exist where agency heads in the public sector have to wear two hats; good governance can be achieved in these circumstances by establishing clarity around roles and responsibilities. (Edwards and Clough, 2005: 4)

The importance for public sector agencies of establishing good governance frameworks cannot be underestimated.

Good governance is not an end in itself. The reason governance is important is that good governance helps an organisation achieve its objectives. On the other hand, poor governance can

bring about the decline or even the demise of an organisation.
(Bartos, quoted in APSC, 2008)

Effective governance arrangements are therefore not only “key indicators of an agency’s corporate health”, they are also be key determinants of an agency’s success in achieving its objectives or ultimately of its ability to survive in the long term. (APSC, 2007: 15)

Changes in the public sector in recent years have thrown the importance of good governance into stark relief. The Government has a particular focus on a whole of government approach, involving achieving outcomes through and with other sectors. Related to this is its commitment to structural reform through consistency in the way organisations are designed, their financial management arrangements and their internal controls and regulations. The Government has also committed itself to providing clearer expectations to agencies as part of improving communication and focusing on better practice.

Agencies that don’t establish good governance arrangements and practices are at risk of not meeting their own corporate objectives and responsibilities. The Palmer and Comrie reports about the organisational shortcomings of the former Department of Immigration, Multicultural and Indigenous Affairs and the Cole Inquiry into the Australian Wheat Board highlight this. Agencies are also fundamentally at risk of not being able to respond to this broad reform agenda that is driving current Government thinking. An agency that cannot think across agency boundaries, that cannot respond flexibly to the changing expectations and priorities of Government could find itself marginalised within Government, have its funding base eroded and affected by rapid staff turnover and the resulting loss of skills and experience.

The first challenge for agencies in achieving good governance is in part about understanding and meeting their broad conformance requirements. The second challenge is to recognise that two-way nature of good governance; agencies are also in a position to exert control over the way they manage key relationships that contribute to meeting their conformance obligations as well as enhancing their performance.

What does governance look like in the public sector?

Recent management reform in the Australian Government has had two distinct elements: structural reform and accompanying cultural reform. Broadly, over the last ten years management reform has been driven by government concern that political priorities were not being realised through policy direction and program implementation and delivery. Along with this concern with responsiveness was a focus on coherence, governance structures, a whole of government approach

and the combination of a measure of central agency control alongside devolution of responsibilities to agencies (Halligan and Horrigan, 2005: 2).

The 2003 Uhrig Report, *Review of the Corporate Governance of Statutory Authorities and Office Holders*, was the major attempt by Government to initiate specific structural reform around governance and accountability. Uhrig's principal emphasis was on "the triangular accountability relationships between governmental entities, their managers and ministers" and his Report developed a two-limbed template approach. In order to differentiate two separate types of entities according to their legislative and financial frameworks (Halligan and Horrigan, 2005: 11). Uhrig argued for a more coordinated approach to governance that would align specific financial acts more closely with agencies that did business in particular ways, and align board and council roles in a similar way. These two recommendations were the principal ones from the Report that the Government initially adopted. Although Uhrig's Report focused specifically on statutory authorities, the Government has subsequently taken on its recommendations to attempt to apply them more broadly across the structure of government.

The process of cultural reform operated in tandem with elements of the structural reform agenda and was specifically focused on a whole of government approach to doing business, in which organisational and institutional culture played a large role. In broad terms, cultural reform requires agencies and their staff to think across agency boundaries and build strategic alliances in order to meet the emerging "social contract" relationship that government has with its citizens (Briggs, 2005)

As part of this general agenda of reform, a key part of the Government's approach to establishing effective governance structures has been to focus on the clarity of purpose of the organisation (including the organisation's interaction with other government bodies) and its independence amongst other factors that influence governance arrangements (DOFA, 2005: 32) The legislative framework that an agency operates under and its legal status as an entity are two of the key elements that express this clarity of purpose and relative independence.

For the purposes of this project there are two key legal status entities and two key financial framework Acts used across the Australian Government that need to be defined. The following definitions are taken from the 2005 Department of Finance and Administration publication, *Australian Government, Governance Arrangements for Australian Government Bodies*.

An **Executive Agency** is established by order of the Governor General and conducts business within the portfolio of a Minister. Its structure provides a measure of independence from departmental management and is appropriate where:

- the agency functions may cross portfolio lines;

- there is a desired separation of service delivery from policy;
- a separate identity would assist sponsorship or external funding;
- or the agency is required to administer a whole of government or joint Commonwealth-State initiative.

The Agency Head in an Executive Agency is directly accountable to the Minister responsible for the Agency, although the Departmental Secretary still retains a role in overseeing its governance.

A **Statutory Authority** is established under a separate Act of Parliament to fulfil prescribed responsibilities and is therefore an entity separate from a Department of State. Its structure is appropriate where:

- impartiality or expertise is required
- independence is needed and close association with any political party is undesirable
- the role of the agency is to monitor other government bodies
- an organisation must be seen to be controlled by non-government interests
- or the agency is required to enforce regulation and competition policy

The **Financial Management and Accountability (FMA) Act 1997** applies to budget funded authorities managed by a Chief Executive. It establishes various management and reporting responsibilities for the Chief Executive and allows the Minister to give the Chief Executive guidelines.

The **Commonwealth Authorities and Companies (CAC) Act 1997** applies to corporate entities that are managed by a board. It requires the CEO of the board to report to the responsible Minister and to ensure that the Authority's activities comply with government policies.

The key features of these two Acts – in particular the implications for board and council activities – are detailed in the comparative table in Appendix III.

How do cultural institutions fit in?

Federally funded national cultural institutions operate within this public sector governance framework as either agencies in their own right or as part of other Australian Government agencies. Cultural institutions therefore have to comply with the requirements of their own specific governance arrangements. However, they can also use their specific governance features to maximise their ability to carry out their core business.

Cultural institutions do constitute a specific group of agencies within the Australian Government. Common to cultural institutions is a stated intention to offer some means of interpreting or understanding Australia - politically, socially, culturally, scientifically or environmentally for example – that benefits the people of Australia. Beyond this broad, common intent however, cultural institutions do not really exist as a fundamentally homogenous group. In many cases missions,

functions, core business and outcomes and outputs diverge quite markedly from one another, as do the strategies and activities that institutions use to achieve these objectives.

This heterogeneity is directly reflected in the range of governance arrangements in place for these cultural institutions. Appendix II provides an outline of some of the key governance features of the cultural institutions in this group as they exist at the end of 2008.

The majority of institutions operate under the requirements of the CAC Act, which reflects more generally their status as Statutory Authorities; however, a number of institutions that have Executive Agency status for example are required to meet their financial obligations under the FMA Act. A significant majority also have their own separate governing or enabling Acts that define their functions legislatively. While a legislative feature common to many institutions is the requirement to act in the “national interest” for example when managing their collections, many institutions also have very specific functions articulated in their legislation. The Australian War Memorial (AWM) for example, has a specific function in its legislation to maintain the memorial itself to fulfil its commemorative role. The National Archives of Australia (NAA) on the other hand, has a very specific responsibility under the *Archives Act 1983* to authorise the disposal of Commonwealth records, alongside its legislative function to manage the archival resources of the Commonwealth.

The composition, functions and responsibilities of Boards and Councils that form part of cultural institutions’ governance frameworks also varies. There are specific differences between these bodies according to whether the institution comes under the FMA or CAC Act (see also Appendix III for a comparison of key arrangements under these Acts), but the differences play themselves out particularly in the strategic approach that an institution’s leaders take towards their Board or Council’s management roles and responsibilities. Broadly speaking, Boards or Councils in CAC Act agencies have a direct responsibility for shaping and maintaining the agency strategic direction and for reporting the agency’s activities formally to Government. For FMA agencies, such bodies act in an advisory capacity and have no direct responsibility for the management of the agency, although they can be used to influence Government on specific issues. To get the greatest value from them, cultural institutions therefore need to ensure that they use their Boards or Councils strategically within these legislative constraints.

Appendix II also shows that cultural institutions are attached administratively to a number of Portfolio Departments. Although in 2008 a majority continue to come under the broad control of the Department of Environment, Water, Heritage and the Arts (DEWHA), a number of other Portfolio Departments are also represented. The AWM sits with the Department of Veterans’ Affairs for example,

while both the NAA and Old Parliament House (OPH) come under the control of the Department of Prime Minister and Cabinet (PM&C).

These administrative arrangements can often reflect the shifting conceptions of the relative importance for Government of specific institutional functions and priorities over time as well as basic administrative change occurring more broadly across Portfolio Departments. A number of cultural institutions have experienced occasional or frequent changes in administrative responsibility, while many others have maintained a consistent administrative connection to a single Department. OPH and the NAA have recently been moved to PM&C (in the latter case from DEWHA via for a short time, the Department of Finance and Deregulation). Questacon has probably experienced the most change, moving from the Department of Communications, Information Technology and the Arts (DCITA) to the former Department of Education, Science and Technology (DEST) and in 2008 to the Department of Innovation, Industry, Science and Research (DIISR).

These moves could reflect the Government's intention to align these institutions more closely with the Portfolio Departments that best reflect what it sees as these institutions' emerging priorities and focus. Evidence of this thinking can be seen coming out of the Government's 2003 Review of Cultural Agencies. Questacon was recognised as having benefited from close links with national collecting institutions through its placement within the Department of Communications, Information Technology and the Arts (DCITA). However the 2003 Review's recommendation that it be moved to the Education, Science and Training (DEST) portfolio reflected the view that the move "would further enhance linkages with the science and education sectors and increase opportunities for DEST and Questacon to work towards shared objectives." (DCITA, 2003). The 2008 Review of Questacon further emphasises how this alignment process can and does change over time with Questacon now located within the Department of Innovation, Industry, Science and Research.

Cultural institutions also change their status as entities over time, often as a direct result of government legislative initiatives. Often these legislative initiatives reflect a perception of the specific advantages and opportunities for the institution's core functions that are offered by a specific governance arrangement. The NAA only became an Executive Agency in 2001, and OPH in the middle of 2008. The National Film and Sound Archive (NFSA) has also recently been accorded Statutory Authority status in tandem with its own enabling Act, after a number of changes in its governance arrangements. Most recently, Questacon has conducted a review of its activities which includes a review of its governance arrangements. In making the principal recommendation that Questacon become a Statutory Authority, the Review confirmed its belief that this governance arrangement offered the best fit for Questacon in relation to its emerging priorities as an institution.

Project Methodology

The project methodology included both primary and secondary research and was structured as a two stage process through: a literature review and background research; and face to face interviews with directors and senior managers of Australian Government funded cultural institutions.

Additional background information was provided by the project sponsor Professor Graham Durant, Director Questacon (The National Science and Technology Centre).

The background research covered available source material on governance and other corporate information from five institutions (the Australian War Memorial, National Archives of Australia, National Film and Sound Archive, National Gallery of Australia and Old Parliament House). This material was supplemented by a literature review of more general information and research on governance in the public sector from online and text-based resources. Appendix I provides details of resources used.

The primary means of collecting qualitative information was a survey conducted with eight Australian Government funded cultural institutions. The sampling of institutions included FMA and CAC Act agencies and a decision was made to include one non Canberra based institution. The breadth of agency structures also included Statutory Authorities and Executive Agencies. Additional Insights into the governance arrangements for cultural institutions that are programs or divisions of portfolio departments were derived through feedback from the project sponsor and Old Parliament House staff. Old Parliament House staff provided a comparative view of the arrangements for a departmental program and an executive agency, while National Film and Sound Archive staff provided a comparative view of the differences between executive agency and statutory authority arrangements.

Interviews were conducted with key staff in the following institutions:

- Australian War Memorial (2)
- Australian Maritime Museum (1)
- National Archives of Australia (3)
- National Film and Sound Archive (1)
- National Gallery of Australia (2)
- National Library of Australia (1)
- National Museum of Australia (1)
- Old Parliament House (2)

In all 13 people were formally interviewed. The staff who participated in the survey were identified as key senior managers in their institutions who either had

direct responsibility for the strategic direction and governance of the institution or who were involved in some aspect of the institution's business that related directly to governance. While the project sponsor was not formally interviewed an informal response was given to the questionnaire and is included in the subsequent themes.

Interviews were structured around seven questions, designed to draw out thoughts on the importance and perceived benefits of current governance structures as well as providing an opportunity for participants to make suggestions for improvements and efficiencies. Participants responded openly to the questions and participated fully with interviews taking between half an hour to an hour and half.

The following part of this section of the report provides a summary of responses that participants gave to individual questions during interviews, as well as reflecting the flavour of the conversations with specific but attributed comments.

Summary of Interviews

1) What impact do existing governance arrangements have on an institution's ability to manage its operations / core business / strategic direction effectively?

In general responses to this question fell into two categories the theoretical importance of governance and the practicalities of existing arrangements.

There was a positive response to the first and participants recognised the need for good governance arrangements in order to provide transparency and accountability for organisations. This was emphasised as publicly funded institutions need to be open to question and public review, and that probity and accountability are important considerations for cultural institutions.

The need for good governance arrangements was emphasised through world events such the collapse of HIH and where governance failure led to increased focus on the checks and balances of organisations.

Respondents also identified positive and negative aspects of their current governance arrangements and areas in which capability could be enhanced. There was general agreement that it was important for governance arrangements to be closely aligned with an institution's core business and this was reflected in the views expressed by most participants about the ability of their Boards and Councils to work effectively for the institution.

Specific comments included

- where the CAC Act applies – active board/council that sets strategic direction and acts at arms length from government: allows a focus for the collecting role in an institution
- In CAC Act agencies – relative freedom but have protection of the Department – not truly independent but a bit further away
- Where the FMA Act applies – advisory board/council can be more closely aligned with government policy; also a perception that FMA Act imposes more stringent regulations
- CAC and FMA act agencies have a linear structure that offers clarity and directness in decision making and accountability. In most cases there is an alternative authority at some point or other in the mix, offering additional checks and balances at the cost of some additional effort
- Specific mention was made that the requirements for reporting and compliance can be onerous under both Acts – how does this affect the Government’s current priorities for agency efficiency?
- There is also a need to acknowledge that broad whole of government policies may have unintended consequences, that don’t take into account the ability of smaller organisations to meet these policies for example the efficiency dividend.
- Governance structures should be closely aligned with an organisation’s core business – governance capability can be enhanced
- Clarity of roles and responsibilities is crucial

2) Do you think that cultural institutions as a broad group suffer from not having a single ministerial voice that represents their interests to government?

There was a general agreement by all participants to this question that a single ministerial voice would not be beneficial. “Culture is not a department” was a specific response here that encapsulates the broader view. The view was also expressed here that having different voices in Cabinet can offer more strategic opportunities for institutions.

Specific comments covered the following issues:

- The only potential advantages of cultural organisations being positioned in one department could be through increased bargaining power, however it was acknowledged that on matters of significant policy cultural institutions already collaborate and have a broad collective understanding.
- The acknowledged disadvantages are the competition for funding amongst institutions if all are in the same portfolio and the precarious nature of a single minister's point of view or interests. Expecting a Minister to be interested equally across all cultural institutions is probably an unrealistic expectation
- Advantages of positioning in different portfolios are the ability for a wider range of ministers to support issues and greater opportunities for ministerial attention and funding overall.
- Political positioning can be important eg OPH and NAA in Prime Minister and Cabinet
- Political positioning can also be important in relation to the operation of boards and councils eg. significant individual representation on the board of the NPG and NGA; specific political representation at the board level (for example at the NAA or the NLA) can offer specific opportunities for influencing Government
- There is a whole of government approach to be taken into account as well – each portfolio or minister is a component of the wider government – in this context ministerial influence only has so much effect. Relative ministerial power is also an issue here.
- Culture and heritage exist across the range of human activity and need to be managed as part of those activities.

3) In your view, is there an optimal governance arrangement for cultural institutions?

Respondents to this question generally agreed that there was no one optimal arrangement, although the question was not directly answered by many participants. This question also led to a discussion about ministerial roles versus the Acts under which organisations operate. Another theme that respondents mentioned was the opportunities for improving the way institutions could use their governance arrangements and the role played by public scrutiny and attention in institutions making improvements to their governance.

Specific comments covered the following issues:

- Governance arrangements should be appropriate to the core business of the institution. As long as good governance structures exist they can be tailored to the needs of the organisation.
- Respondents often cited their own institution as an example of a good, effective set of governance arrangements, supporting the view that when governance arrangements align well with core business, governance works reasonably well for an institution – particularly expressed in relation to alignment with specific portfolio departments
- The advantages of current arrangements were discussed by many respondents, particularly in relation to how institutions meet accountability requirements manage their performance against government benchmarks and their relationships with portfolio departments. One comment offered that cultural institutions could use the model of bigger departments to create efficiencies
- Specific responses included: “ a CAC Act agency with the CEO appointed by the Board is the benchmark” and “Statutory Authorities have very strong council/boards - the more independent the board, the better”
- Advantage of statutory authorities is that the council or board is responsible for controversial acquisitions or decisions and the minister is at arms length from these decisions - this situation works for both parties.
- It is possible that greater consistency of arrangements could encourage collaboration

4) Do you think there are opportunities for collaboration across cultural institutions?

Participants highlighted existing formal and informal collaborations listed in Appendix IV. General comments reflect participants' views that informal links are now wide spread through various forums. Participants did however consider it unnecessary to lock into formal arrangements. The challenge here is to coordinate existing links and expand shared services while improving individual Institutions' business outcomes.

Collaborative arrangements appear to exist at all levels, but are not necessarily coordinated. Although it is seen to be advantageous to “share services” care must be taken for the service to fit the requirements of the institutions involved. Although many cultural institutions look similar in their core business their internal systems and the services they provide to government and the public can be quite different.

5) What opportunities do you see for this collaboration in terms of shared services? What about informal links / other professional engagement across institutions?

Again participants highlighted existing collaborations listed in Appendix IV but emphasised that attempts at shared services must fit each organisation's needs. There were a lot of comments in the participants feedback which reinforce that collaboration is already part of our sector's culture and is becoming common knowledge.

Many opportunities exist externally such as combined training, storage facilities, panels of service suppliers, forums etc. Internal services such as HR, finance and IT services require more stringent control to ensure the differences between institutions are catered for. Contributing factors here include size of institution (appropriate infrastructure and design for smaller businesses), contract clauses that are not relevant to all institutions (collecting V's non collecting Institutions) and impact of visitor numbers for budgets & sales etc.

Forums and networks are in place that promote opportunities for collaborative arrangements to be explored. It is clear that collaboration can be within and outside of the cultural institutions environment. Appendix VI provides an example of the alliances and partnerships that the Australian War Memorial has developed over many years that are of mutual benefit. Examples of these partnerships are with the Australian Sports Commission and the strong link between the Sport of War travelling exhibition, Kamberra Wine Company for joint marketing initiatives, and Australian Federal Police for security advice and traffic management for major events.

Sharing information at existing forums is beneficial but cultural institutions are also good at networking outside of this structure. It seems that we are able to work as colleagues instead of separate institutions and we won't just wait until the next forum to discuss new or pending issues.

The challenge appears to be how we can inform other cultural institutions of what services are similar and what could be shared (could this knowledge sharing be incorporated into institutions' business plans for example?)

As mentioned in the summaries to these two questions, respondents highlighted a wide variety of actual and potential collaborations and details are provided in Appendix IV and Appendix V. Appendix VI also provides an example of the partnerships and collaborations that the Australian War Memorial has reported on in its most recent Annual Report.

6) What role does our Board / Council play within the organisation?

Generally Boards are the name given to the governing/guiding body within statutory authorities and Councils are the advisory bodies within executive agencies. However this is not consistently applied across cultural institutions. Answers to this question were generally consistent within the structures of the FMA and CAC Acts. Respondents from CAC Act institutions recognised a defined and accountable role for setting strategic direction and performance monitoring whilst FMA Act respondents recognised that the board is an advisory body and the strategic direction is set by the agency head.

Specific comments covered the following issues:

- Under the CAC Act the council/board has the ability to act independently and acts arms length from government.
- All organisations agreed that diversity of appointments to the board were important as was the ability of a board to lobby on behalf of the organisation and to act as an advocate for the institution.
- Levels of participation and hands on action by boards varied across institutions depending upon the legal structures and general make up of the institution or board itself and personal interests. In some instances the board will also provide financial support as well as advocacy this could be crucial for an institution
- Participants generally agreed that the most effective boards were ones that combined a diverse make up of serious players who addressed the strategic, fundraising and lobbying needs of the organisation.
- Boards are a resource cost and as such an organisation needs to ensure that they are treated strategically as a resource that effectively contributes to the organisation. A clear statement of expectations needs to be developed to ensure an effective working relationship, between boards and management. “Councils want to be used – they hate being kept in the dark” was a specific response.
- Regardless of whether the board/council is an advisory or governing body it is clear that good relationships need to be maintained between them and management.
- They are key stakeholders within the institution’s community and are important influencers of government and community. Individual members also represent specific constituencies..

7) What are the major governance issues that cultural institutions face in dealing with their portfolio departments?

In answer to this question participants outlined the formal governance arrangements with regard to the structure of reporting and direction from the department. Appendix II outlines these key features.

The view that all involved should be working towards one end was expressed by participants although there was a perception that the lines of reporting and the effectiveness of relationships can at times create barriers as well as additional levels of difficulty when it comes to communication and influence. Relationships between the institution, department and Minister were seen as crucial, and participants recognised their active role in managing these relationships and ensuring more direct access to the Minister.

- There is a perception of the potential for losing touch with the Minister's office due to greater distance compared to the closeness of the relationship with the department sometimes a three way relationship is what institutions are faced with
- Similarly, some concern was expressed about the ability of the department to adequately reflect the institution to the Minister – related specifically to quality of advice and knowledge gaps that exist across different levels of the relationship – this was magnified at times of administrative change
- Some agencies sitting within a portfolio department find the alignment of core business between agency and department is a positive influence and see the direct links between the two. It can also create a more regular contact and a direct line to the minister.
- It should be noted however that this is not always the experience and the fit of the agency and department needs to be complementary at not odds in terms of agendas.
- Departments are often looking for solidarity with other agencies on specific issues, rather than with the agencies in their portfolio – cultural institutions need to manage this possibility
- Does there need to be a more transparent relationship between the department and the institution?

Key Findings - Themes

The following themes are drawn from interviews, our discussion and other research around the issues of governance arrangements for cultural Institutions.

Big Picture/Small Details

Governance arrangements are established at the highest level of an organizations management structure. Particular arrangements for each institution have been established, with the intention of delivering the best outcomes. Differences in these arrangements are in part due to deliberate intention, and in part to history.

While the various legislative and administrative arrangements have specific differences, they all have to provide the same elements in a framework which empowers managers to manage, while ensuring accountability and transparency. Overall these arrangements are part of a larger picture, which regardless of the niceties of the CAC and FMA Acts ensures the institutions, their officials, and responsible Ministers have to face scrutiny – and consequences – for their actions.

The visible manifestations of any particular governance arrangement may be confined to the upper echelons, but can subtly affect the way an organization works at all levels, and can have positive – or negative - impact on the organization's customers, suppliers, collaborators and other stakeholders. The real test of any governance framework is when things go wrong; if there is a serious failure in performance or conformance, if there is abuse of position or power, if there is a breakdown in relationships between the responsible parties.

Autonomy

Autonomy within the public sector is strictly relative. CAC Act agencies operate at arms length from their Ministers and Departments but are in no way independent from them. FMA agencies have more responsibility for their own affairs than institutions which operate as programs within departments, but the degree of independence in their decision making is in part determined by their relationship with their lead department¹

Beyond the various formal reporting requirements there is a real political relationship between boards (or councils), CEOs (or Directors), Departments, Ministers and their offices which exercise control and restraint as well as influencing direction and priorities.

Cultural institutions which are confident in the effectiveness of their governance structure will be likely to feel confident in their ability to take decision and actions which support the agreed priorities of the organisation. When institutions are performing well and have good relationships with the all parties in their governance structure there is likely to be a high level of confidence regardless of the specific governance structure.

Performance and agency health

Good governance demands an ongoing focus on performance and agency health. CEOs and Boards are not in a position to engage with all the details which contribute to an agencies effectiveness and sustainability. Good governance includes systems and measures to ensure confidence that risks in these areas are properly managed.

The overall performance and health of cultural institutions can be markedly raised when their boards are able to effectively lobby government and industry, raise funds, and gain support for the agency.

Accountability

Accountability is the fundamental principle that any governance arrangement must adhere to. Expenditure must meet audit requirements. Conformance with all relevant legislation and administrative instruments must be documented. Effective use of resources must be demonstrated.

The more independent an institution is, the more it is reliant on its own resources to not only achieve its intended objectives, but also to report on and promote its own achievement.

Minister or department

For all the institutions considered in this project, ultimate responsibility sits with a Government Minister. Each of these responsible Ministers have broad portfolios, and so their Departments become instrumental, including in areas for which specific Statutory Authorities or Executive Agencies have been established. Departments are large, have their own cultures, and represent a complex player group in the governance equation.

Considering the Minister as a key stakeholder it is important that there is good alignment between the Minister's priorities and the core business of the institution. Effective relationships need to be established that minimise the potential for static between the Minister, the institution and the portfolio department.

Challenges and opportunities.

All cultural institutions surveyed indicated challenges around shrinking budgets due to the impacts of the efficiency dividend, and increased requirements for reporting and other non-core processes. Opportunities identified included the focus on development of broadband communication infrastructure, and the subsequent demand for content; the developing “knowledge economy”, and the forward looking agenda of a new government. Opportunities were often identified in relation to specific sets of challenges such as diminishing resources, which suggests that the identification of these specific challenges for cultural institutions could lead to the

Collaboration

Successful high profile collaborative arrangements are sought after, but can be high maintenance, and can include an element of competition. Other more relaxed collaborative arrangements exist at many levels between agencies, relatively independently of each other. Information sharing between professionals is very common, formal and/or informal group activities are also seen. Awareness of specific collaborative arrangements can be quite low amongst the sector, with the exception of those directly involved. Collaboration is the great challenge – and the great opportunity – for institutions across the sector. Details of some existing and proposed collaborations are at Appendices IV, V and VI.

Conclusions

The research for this project has provided an important perspective on the environment in which governance arrangements operate for Australian Government cultural institutions.

This project has: provided a picture of the governance environment for cultural institutions and has laid out the key elements of this framework across the sector; confirmed that cultural institutions do currently acknowledge the importance of the variability, alignment, and clarity of governance arrangements that have been identified as significant in earlier research into general public sector governance; and provided recommendations for specific practically oriented action that will add value to existing arrangements.

The project has researched individual national cultural institutions and has concluded that:

- cultural institutions can function together effectively but they do not constitute a homogenous group – significant differences exist as well as significant similarities
- differences in core business are often determinants of the differences in key elements of institutions' governance arrangements – legal status as entities, financial arrangements, attachment to portfolio departments for example
- changes in government priorities and perceptions can produce changes in governance arrangements

The project has confirmed that along with other mainstream agencies cultural institutions recognize that the key elements contributing to good governance apply to them. These elements include:

- the recognition that there is not a “one size fits all” approach to good governance – “culture is not a department” and cultural institutions can benefit strategically from being spread across government
- that there is not an optimal set of governance arrangements for cultural institutions - instead governance arrangements need to be aligned well with an institution's core business
- knowing that conformance with legal and legislative requirements is a crucial part of good governance and clarity around expectations contributes to this – accountability is important
- knowing that there is a strong relationship between governance and an institution's performance – the systems supporting conformance also contribute fundamentally to an institution's ability to manage performance and the risks associated with not meeting outcomes

- the acknowledgement that relationships and institutional culture are crucially important elements of good governance – relationships with internal and external stakeholders are equally important
- that cultural institutions operate within the government sector as a whole and an institution's independence in managing its own business has to be seen in relation to its position within government
- an understanding of the two way nature of governance, in which an institution can actively make its governance arrangements work to its advantage while meeting its obligations – the management and use of boards and councils is a specific example of this

The project has also recommended specific, practical actions that cultural institutions could take to add value to what they do individually and as a group. These recommendations focus on:

- coordinated collaboration activities, using both formal and informal networks
- the sharing of knowledge about governance issues and collaboration in particular – this includes addressing knowledge gaps across the sector
- the extension of cultural networks to include new organisations with a cultural focus, to enhance knowledge and perspectives across the sector, and to create opportunities for new initiatives

National cultural institutions need to be able to operate as independent bodies to achieve their goals. John Uhrig commented that

(t)he more independence, autonomy in decision making and separation of powers, the greater the need for governance and for, in fact, strong governance ... The more power you hand to somebody else, then the more you need governance to ensure that that power is not improperly used and is in fact used in a constructive way (quoted in Halligan and Horrigan, 2005: 11)

The findings of this project ultimately support Uhrig's view that effective, strong governance supports cultural institutions in doing their business independently and with due regard to conformance and performance.

Recommendations

Our project team has identified the following key recommendations that are intended to address the key issues identified in the conclusion of our report. These recommendations are designed to contribute further to an understanding of governance in national cultural institutions and to provide ways forward for cultural institutions to maximise the opportunities that their governance arrangements offer.

Recommendation 1. Share information about existing collaborations.

Our research identified a range of existing and proposed collaborations, but knowledge about these was patchy, often confined to those who already participate. By sharing information about these collaborative activities or opportunities institutions will be in a stronger position to identify and take up opportunities.

Recommendation 2. Develop a more coordinated approach to collaboration

This recommendation follows on from the first recommendation and focuses specifically on using established as well as newly created forums and networks to facilitate this coordination

Recommendation 3. Develop specific forums for governance specialists in cultural institutions to share information.

This recommendation extends the activities already being undertaken by the current informal corporate and finance forums across national cultural institutions for example to include a specific focus on assessing the opportunities that governance arrangements across institutions might offer.

Recommendation 4. Raise awareness among all cultural institution staff of the big picture with respect to the national cultural institutions.

Recommendation 5. Disseminate this report to all officers with governance responsibilities in participating institutions.

Recommendations four and five acknowledge that there is often patchy and incomplete knowledge about governance arrangements and their implications both within institutions and across the cultural institutions sector more broadly. This knowledge gap is not necessarily confined to specific groups of staff. These recommendations also acknowledge that all staff in institutions can potentially act to enhance collaboration and explore opportunities.

Recommendation 6. Extend research to examine the impact of governance arrangements to other cultural institutions or agencies with cultural functions (including for example the Australian National Botanic Gardens, the National Capital Authority, the Australian Broadcasting Corporation and the Special Broadcasting Service and the Business Arts Foundation).

Recommendation 7. Explore the possibility of extending the Cultural Management Development Program (CMDP) to include additional cultural institutions or agencies with a cultural focus.

These last two recommendations focus on enlarging the pool of potential institutions that could be involved in research and collaboration. They acknowledge specifically that opportunities for institutional collaboration could be enhanced by widening the potential pool of institutional participants. In addition, recommendation seven specifically acknowledges the value that formal programs such as CMDP have particularly for establishing informal professional networks in which solutions and initiatives can be identified and acted on.

Appendix I: Key References

Australian Public Service Commission, Foundations of Governance in the Australian Public Service, Commonwealth of Australia, 2005

Australian Public Service Commission, Agency Health. Monitoring Agency Health and Improving Performance, Commonwealth of Australia, 2007.

Australian Public Service Commission, Building Better Governance, Part One – What is Public Sector Governance?, 1 February 2008, <http://www.apsc.gov.au/publications07/bettergovernance1.htm> (sighted 6/08/2008)

Briggs, Lynelle, “Public Service reform”, speech to an SES Breakfast, 12 May 2005, <http://www.apsc.gov.au/media/briggs120505.htm> (sighted 28/07/08)

Department of Finance and Administration, Australian Government, Governance Arrangements for Australian Government Bodies, Financial Management Reference Material No.2, 2005

Department of Innovation, Industry, Science and Research, Stepping up to meet national needs. Review of Questacon The National Science and Technology Centre, July 2008.

Edwards, Meredith and Robyn Clough, “Corporate Governance and Performance. An Exploration of the Connection in a Public Sector Context”, Corporate Governance ARC Project, University of Canberra, Issues Series, Paper No. 1, January 2005.

Grant, Richard, “The Uhrig Review and the future of statutory authorities”, Parliament of Australia, Parliamentary Library Research Note no. 50 2004-05, 30 May 2005, <http://aph.gov.au/LIBRARY/pubs/RN/2004-05/05rn50.htm> (sighted 2/07/08)

Halligan, John and Bryan Horrigan, “Reforming Corporate Governance in the Australian Federal Public Sector: From Uhrig to Implementation”, Corporate Governance ARC Project, University of Canberra, Issues Series, Paper No. 2, December 2005.

Minister for Communications, Information Technology and the Arts,, and the Minister for the Arts and Sport, Joint Media Release, Review of Cultural Agencies – encouraging best practice, 13 May 2003, Department of Broadband, Communications and the Digital Economy (archival document),

http://www.dbcde.gov.au/Article/0_0_4-2_4008-4_114288.00.html (sighted 2/07/08)

Uhrig, John, Review of the Corporate Governance of Statutory Authorities and Office Holders, Commonwealth of Australia, 2003.

Appendix II: Comparative Table of Cultural Institutions

Elements of the Governance Framework for National Cultural Institutions						
Agency Name	Governing/Enabling Legislation	CAC / FMA Act	Type of Agency	Board / Council	Institution Functions and Core Business	Portfolio Dept
Australian Institute of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Studies (AIATSIS) - Steve Larkin (Principal) http://www.aiatsis.gov.au	Australian Institute of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Studies Act 1989	CAC	Statutory Authority	Council	<i>To undertake and promote Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander studies; publish the results of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander studies and to assist in the publication of the results of such studies; conduct research and to encourage other persons or bodies to conduct such research; assist in training persons, particularly Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islanders, as research workers in relevant fields; establish and maintain a cultural resource collection consisting of materials relating to Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Studies; and to encourage understanding.</i>	DIISR

<p>Australian National Botanic Gardens (ANBG) - Anne Duncan (Director) http://www.anbg.gov.au</p>	<p>broadly under the Environment Protection and Biodiversity Conservation (EPBC) Act 1999 (through the Director of National Parks)</p>	<p>CAC (through Director of National Parks)</p>	<p>Part of DEWHA - managed through DEWHA by the Director of National Parks (a corporation established under the EPBC Act)</p>	<p><i>Grow, study and promote Australian plants by: providing access to the Gardens as for enjoyment and appreciation of Australian plants; maintaining and enhancing integrated living, herbarium and photographic collections of Australian plants, supported by the library collection; providing high quality information and an educational resource for government, industry, scientific institutions and the community; conducting and encouraging research using the Gardens' living and herbarium collections; fostering understanding of the origins and values of Australia's plant biodiversity, while promoting its protection, conservation and wise use</i></p>	<p>DEWHA</p>
<p>Australian National Maritime Museum (ANMM) - Mary Louise Williams (Director) http://www.anmm.gov.au</p>	<p>Australian National Maritime Museum Act 1990</p>	<p>CAC</p>	<p>Statutory Authority</p>	<p>Council</p> <p><i>Bring maritime heritage to life and preserve it for future generations, through: exhibitions, programs and events that are creative, inclusive, enjoyable and memorable; development and management of the National Maritime Collection; research, acquisition, conservation, interpretation, scholarship, publication, outreach and education; national leadership and the provision of support and encouragement to local, regional and community museums which value maritime heritage; national and international cooperation and collaboration with museums and other organisations; and fostering traditional skills and practices</i></p>	<p>DEWHA</p>

<p>Australian War Memorial (AWM) - Steve Gower (Director) http://www.awm.gov.au</p>	<p>Australian War Memorial Act 1980</p>	<p>CAC</p>	<p>Statutory Authority</p>	<p>Council</p>	<p><i>Support commemoration through understanding by maintaining and developing the national memorial; develop and maintain, as an integral part of the memorial, a national collection of historical material and key records of overseas commitments; exhibit historical material from the memorial collection; conduct, arrange for and assist in research into Australian military history; disseminate the results of this research; ensure that the widest audience of Australians is reached through commemoration, learning and research activities.</i></p>	<p>DVA</p>
<p>National Archives of Australia (NAA) - Ross Gibbs (Director General) http://www.naa.gov.au</p>	<p>Archives Act 1983</p>	<p>FMA</p>	<p>Executive Agency</p>	<p>Advisory Council</p>	<p><i>Ensure that Australians have access to a national archival collection that assists them to understand their heritage and democracy and contributes to the maintenance and understanding of political, social and cultural values in Australia by: preserving and providing access to records that document the interaction between the Australian people and their government; playing the leading role in the management of Commonwealth records; encouraging and facilitating the use of the archival resources of the Australian Government</i></p>	<p>PM&C (under Sen. Faulkner as Cabinet Secretary)</p>

<p>National Film & Sound Archive (NFSA) – Darryl McIntyre (CEO) http://www.nfsa.gov.au</p>	<p>National Film & Sound Archive Act 2008</p>	<p>CAC</p>	<p>Statutory Authority - from July 2008?</p>	<p>Board</p>	<p><i>Collect, store, preserve and make available screen and sound material relevant to Australia's culture; document and interpret the Australian experience and actively contribute to the development of Australia's audiovisual industry; complement documentary heritage collections; lead the preservation, presentation and development of screen and sound culture in Australia</i></p>	<p>DEWHA</p>
<p>National Gallery of Australia (NGA) - Ron Radford (Director) http://www.nga.gov.au</p>	<p>National Gallery Act 1975</p>	<p>CAC</p>	<p>Statutory Authority</p>		<p><i>Provide for the cultural enrichment of all Australians through: the development, protection and maintenance of the national collection of works of art, through displays, exhibitions and public programs; extensive access to and publication and promotion of the national collection and the visual arts.</i></p>	<p>DEWHA</p>
<p>National Library of Australia (NLA) - Jan Fullerton (Director General) http://www.nla.gov.au</p>	<p>National Library Act 1960</p>	<p>CAC</p>	<p>Statutory Authority</p>	<p>Council</p>	<p><i>Ensure that documentary resources of national significance relating to Australia and the Australian people, as well as significant non-Australian library materials, are collected, preserved and made accessible either through the Library itself or through collaborative arrangements with other libraries and information providers</i></p>	<p>DEWHA</p>

<p>National Museum of Australia (NMA) - Craddock Morton (Director) http://www.nma.gov.au</p>	<p>National Museum of Australia Act 1980</p>	<p>CAC</p>	<p>Statutory Authority</p>	<p>Council</p>	<p><i>Promote an understanding of Australia's history and an awareness of future possibilities by: developing, preserving and exhibiting a significant collection of historical material from the National Historical Collection that relates to Australia's past, present and future; taking a leadership role in research and scholarship in the field of Australian history; engaging and providing access for audiences nationally and internationally; and delivering innovative programs that use the national collection in the nation's interest</i></p>	<p>DEWHA</p>
<p>Old Parliament House (OPH) – Jenny Anderson (Director) http://www.oph.gov.au</p>	<p></p>	<p>FMA</p>	<p>Executive Agency - from July 2008</p>	<p>Governing Council</p>	<p><i>Provide a comprehensive visitor experience onsite online and through outreach, by deepening understanding of Australia's past and future democracy through: public and scholarly activities; providing relevant, effective and engaging exhibitions, tours, public programs and events; interpretation and education programs; managing, conserving, interpreting and presenting the heritage building and its collections for visitors; and ensuring the provision of a range of complementary visitor services.</i></p>	<p>PM&C</p>

<p>Questacon (NSTC) - Graham Durant (Director) http://www.questacon.edu.au</p>		<p>Under FMA (through portfolio department)</p>	<p>Division within DIISR</p>	<p>Advisory Council</p>	<p><i>Help Australia maintain the strong science, research and innovation capacity required to generate and use knowledge by: presenting creative, interactive science exhibitions and programs that emphasise the importance of science, technology and innovation; encouraging students to pursue careers in science, maths and engineering; operating outreach programs to support national education priorities in indigenous education, mathematics, early childhood, primary science and teacher support</i></p>	<p>DIISR</p>
<p>Royal Australian Mint (RAM) - Janine Murphy (CEO) http://www.ramint.gov.au</p>		<p>Under FMA (through portfolio department)</p>	<p>Prescribed agency within Treasury - under charter</p>	<p>Advisory Board</p>	<p><i>Meet the circulating coin and numismatic needs of Australia through the production of circulating and collector coins; the production of medals and awards; the maintenance of the National Coin Collection; and the management of a public gallery and museum that promotes public understanding about the cultural and historical significance of coins.</i></p>	<p>Treasury</p>

National Portrait Gallery (NPG) - Andrew Sayers (Director) http://www.portrait.gov.au	Under FMA (through portfolio department)	Division within DEWHA	Board	<i>Increase the understanding of the Australian people – their identity, history, creativity and culture – through portraiture by: developing a representative collection of portraits of subjects who have made a major impact upon Australia; enhancing the cultural value of portraiture through access, display, exhibition, research and interpretation; making a wide range of portraits accessible to the public through strongly focussed and innovative exhibitions, displays and via the internet; and fostering enquiry, research, discussion and interpretation of portraiture and undertake programs that reflect the culture, history and diversity of Australia</i>	DEWHA
Notes:					
1. Portfolio Department acronyms: DEWHA - Department of Environment, Water, Heritage and the Arts; PM&C - Department of Prime Minister and Cabinet; DVA - Department of Veterans' Affairs; DIISR - Department of Innovation, Industry, Science and Research					
2. Descriptions of institutions' functions and core business are taken from institutions' websites as well as a range of corporate documents such as annual reports published on these websites					

Appendix III: Comparing the FMA Act and the CAC Act

The table below compares some of the key governance considerations between the FMA Act and the CAC Act

Issue(s)	FMA Act	CAC Act
Role of the Finance Minister and the responsible Minister	<p>There are clear lines of accountability and reporting for FMA Chief Executives to the Finance Minister (and the responsible Minister).</p> <p>Generally, there is significant scope for the responsible Minister to direct the Agency, unless constrained by the Agency's enabling legislation.</p> <p>The Finance Minister, as custodian of the Consolidated Revenue Fund, has primary control over public money and the handling of public money by agencies.</p> <p>The Ministers can request information from the Chief Executive.</p>	<p>Executives are accountable to the Board with the Board accountable to the responsible Minister.</p> <p>The scope of any power of direction that the responsible Minister may have is determined by the body's enabling legislation (or company constitution).</p> <p>The responsible Minister may issue directions to comply with Australian Government policies, while the Finance Minister has a power of direction with respect to procurement, in relation to particular bodies that have been prescribed under the CAC Regulations.</p> <p>The Finance Minister and the responsible Minister can request information from the Directors.</p> <p>Directors have a positive obligation to keep the responsible Minister informed of the operations of the body and its subsidiaries.</p>
Employee Arrangements	<p>Where a body comes under this framework, it should generally employ staff under the Public Service Act.</p> <p>However there are appropriate exceptions for military, police and parliamentary personnel etc.</p>	<p>Generally provides for flexible employment arrangements.</p> <p>These bodies should generally be free to determine their own employee arrangements.</p> <p>CAC Act bodies should generally not engage staff under the Public Service Act unless there are good reasons to do so.</p>
Flexible regime for acting efficiently	<p>The FMA Act provides sufficient flexibility to encourage entrepreneurial activity while at the same time promoting efficient,</p>	<p>The board of a CAC Act body can determine the body's strategic direction (allowing a large degree of flexibility for the body to act in</p>

and effectively	effective and ethical financial management practices.	an entrepreneurial fashion), and the responsible Minister may be required to approve the body's corporate plan (depending upon the body's enabling legislation).
Nominees on committees or boards	Representational appointments to an advisory board, including industry and State Governments, may be made.	Governing board appointments should be skills-based, rather than representational.
Financial Framework	<p>The FMA Act prescribes rules governing the financial management practices of agencies.</p> <p>FMA Act agencies do not hold money on their own account, but rather hold public money (that is, money that forms part of the Consolidated Revenue Fund).</p> <p>Chief Executives are accountable for the expenditure and handling of any money under the FMA Act.</p> <p>Bodies that fall within the general government sector (GGS) should generally be prescribed agencies under the FMA framework, unless there are strong reasons for a governing board.</p>	<p>The board largely determines the financial management practices of a CAC Act body.</p> <p>CAC Act bodies hold money on their own account and are accountable for the expenditure of that money through annual reports and other reports as requested by the Minister.</p> <p>A CAC Act body could either fall within or outside of the GGS depending upon whether the body is wholly or substantially funded by the government.</p> <p>Bodies that require a governing board for effective governance should be CAC Act bodies.</p> <p>The CAC Act framework is generally well-suited to commercial or entrepreneurial activities.</p>
Independence	<p>The extent of ministerial direction is determined by the enabling legislation of the FMA Act agency.</p> <p>The ANAO, ATO and ACCC are all statutorily independent bodies (that is, they are not subject to government interference in the performance of their functions), and also prescribed under the FMA Act.</p>	<p>Generally, there is a substantial degree of financial independence. These bodies are legally and financially separate from the Commonwealth, although the level of independence can be determined by enabling legislation (for example, by providing for ministerial powers of direction). General policies can be notified to most bodies, but after a consultation process.</p>
Governance Structure	<p>The FMA Act framework does not easily accommodate a governing board. The Chief Executive is accountable under the</p>	<p>A governing board is the appropriate governance structure for a CAC Act body.</p> <p>A CAC Act body could also have</p>

	<p>FMA Act.</p> <p>However, an advisory board may be created, which would instead advise the Chief Executive.</p> <p>No equivalent duties for members of an advisory board to those that exist under the CAC Act. Duties would be negotiated in an instrument of engagement.</p> <p>Where members are required to perform statutory functions, a commission structure may be appropriate.</p>	<p>an advisory board. The advisory board's role would be to advise the governing board.</p> <p>There may be a risk of a conflict of duties where a public servant is a board member.</p> <p>Directors have legal duties under the CAC Act and Corporations Act 2001, with penalties attaching to breaches of these duties.</p> <p>Governing boards should govern a body (such as setting strategy and overseeing management). Performing statutory functions is generally not considered to be governing a body.</p>
--	---	--

This table was taken directly from Appendix E of Governance Arrangements for Australian Government Bodies, Department of Finance and Administration, 2005
(<http://www.finance.gov.au/financial-framework/governance/docs/Governance-Arrangements-for-Australian-Government-Bodies.pdf>)

Appendix IV: Notes on Existing Collaborations

Participants highlighted existing formal and informal collaborations:

Collecting and exhibition institutions shared services for Finance, HR, IT and Facilities working groups
National Collection Preservation Committee i.e. Canberra University Cultural Heritage Management Course (includes lab time)
Establishing Industry parameters
Joint procurement eg cleaning services panel of service providers only pay one lawyer for tender docs.
Joint procurement of utilities (1 contract)
Finance & HR looked in to it but what we have worked quite well against a collective model
Minded to look for other possibilities
Conservation
CMDP (Cultural Management Development Program)
Combined billing of gas/electricity
Many various working groups
Shared storage facilities
Disaster recovery i.e. MOU with National Library
It does not have to collaborate with collecting institutions i.e. Action Bus's to come to the Memorial, Canberra Uni to do conservation courses etc.
Yes- through professional networks but this could happen more at senior management level
Absolutely, at the executive level reporting to HOCl & HOCO. A new meeting of HOCl is being organized but not sure whether it will continue or be disbanded
There is also the Corporate Managers Forum which deals with IT, Finance & Corporate areas.
There are also collection groups which are collaborative efforts across a number of organisations, like Federated Research Discovery Searches & Picture Australia.
Find ways to promote and support each other rather than compete for Minister's attention
Yes. Already some executive level collaborations like Corporate Managers Forum (CMF), HOCl, NCETP, PACER, CMDP, APMC (who's set up involves other cultural institutions like NAA & NLA.
Redefine collecting responsibilities for maximum collaborative results.

Corporate collaboration – sharing resources, common tender panels, common outsourced arrangements.
Informal sharing and grass roots arrangements – e.g. corporate governance officers occasional catch up.
Secondments and other flexible staffing arrangements.
Operation Sunlight – investigating depreciation funding and the effect of the efficiency dividend.
Treasury and Dept of Finance Efficiency Exercises will/should motivate cooperation.
Shared services, corporate arrangements, infrastructure e.g. storage, digital infrastructure.
National Outreach & Relevance
Common storage, tenders, digitization,
Opportunities: Provision of service, discussion forums, DCITA paper discusses opportunities for cultural collaborations
Challenges: Not always viable – not everyone has the same needs/interests, more incidental collaboration than strategic, could be encouraged more through the existing forums.
Professional forums – strong associations already at a professional level
We are already a high functioning group – informal links already created – shared understanding is high – integration is an issue
Informal opportunities rather than formal arrangements are the way to go – doesn't favour being locked into formal arrangements. Formal arrangements that are agreed to by all parties are hard to come by. We don't want a Smithsonian model – not efficient.
Organisations can be at their most efficient when they are responsible for the significant amount of their own functions. Relative priorities and favouritisms can exist strongly in formal arrangements so that some institutions invariably end up losing out – needs are not always the same or equal. Applies too to the shared purchase and use of equipment etc – who has the priority, the greatest need, who pays for upkeep, security etc, who manages access – costs here without much gain.
Favour informal meetings at the senior level – regular meetings – share similar issues, what is good practice across the sector, benefit of experience.
Limits on what shared services can do – limited arrangements can succeed, especially when using the specific skills of other institutions when the service you need is not one of the core areas of business that you have eg. NMA using picture conservators at the NGA. When it's a core business, better off having your own dedicated services. Formalise service arrangements that are imposed can actually create barriers.
Because we are all cultural institutions, there is an assumption that we are all the same, that we have the same needs, priorities etc – Ministerial fallacy. Core business diverges at significant points.

Appendix V: Notes on Opportunities for Collaboration

Participants highlighted opportunities for formal and informal collaborations:

Informal network very valuable eg CMDP
Corp management forum
Looking at what future issues might be and looking for solutions
State and NZ galleries CAAMD – director attends
International art museum administrators meet annually no office bearers or funds talk about contemporary issues
Counselling service, CMDP, gas/electricity and others suggested in question 4 including external panel of suppliers. But finance & internal systems/services don't necessarily work as we may think we are similar but when we get down to the nuts and bolts we are so different.
(positive) Some collection management areas such as storage of specific collection items ie shared cold store areas of film could reduce costs
(negative) The environment of competition that relies on visitor numbers and tourism to justify.
In terms of shared services, one instance is NLA organizes the payroll for NAA (Orion). This collaboration works best when it can offer the same service across the board. The measure is the 80/20 principle of success.
It is not so effective if everyone wants different things because it becomes complicated & inefficient.
Opportunities for OPH:
Economies of scale – corp services/IT/HR (PM&C)/specific finance package for small institutions
Deal directly with DOFD
Shared service agreements for services like electricity. But must have a common interest & distinct advantages. Bulk buying works if it serves the organisations interests.
With regard to shared services, economy of scale is the issue for OPH. We are too small for our own payroll/IT system. We need to team up with another organizations systems, e.g. NLA.
CMF can facilitate common agreements for commodities like gas & electricity. Perhaps there could be more collaborative opportunities in exhibition design, IT platforms to name a few. Another suggestion might be a lobby group for costs like insurance, etc. There is discussion about items like this at HOCl. At the very least HOCl participants share information in a collegiate manner.
Shared services have to come about as a result of dialogue not imposition – have to reflect similar business, commonalities – decision to do shared services must be a good business decision – ask the question “will it improve our business?”

Shared services are more likely to work (eg electricity) than shared management of infrastructure (eg buildings) – special needs of individual institutions get lost

Professional forums can offer part protection against portfolio departments eg DCITA tendency to pick off individual institutions and bully them

Shared services happen because of a perceived need – happen organically

Small agency – under strength in HR areas – difficult to offer a full range of services to staff without sharing – opportunities for ICT / Finance – but how do you make contracting out models work? – we have probably been too pure in the past

DCITA cooperative model in 2003 review general message keep doing what you're doing

Appendix VI: Recent Collaborations by AWM

Alliances, Partnerships and Cooperation

The Memorial has over a period of years developed alliances and partnerships that are of mutual benefit. In 2007-08 these included:

<i>All Souls College (UK)</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> loaned objects for the <i>Lawrence of Arabia and the Light Horse</i> exhibition
<i>Army History Unit</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Cooperation on the Collection Coordination Group. Provision of conservation and training for Army museum curators by Memorial staff Regular cooperation with ongoing transfer of archival records and acquisitions for the National Collection Cooperation, including membership by the Head, Military History Section, Army History Committee
<i>Australian Bureau of Statistics</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Information provided on a range of collection management activities for ABS surveys Provision of advice regarding the proposed development of data standards for major cultural institutions
<i>Australian Capital Territory Heritage Council</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Membership on the ACT Heritage Council by Senior Conservator, Large Technology Objects
<i>Australian Capital Tourism</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Cooperation on joint tourism publicity and marketing including support of trade shows, promotional exhibitions, and special familiarisation tours for international media and inbound operators Support for the ACT visitor satisfaction survey and National Capital Educational Tours project Membership of Grants Advisory Committee
<i>Australian Defence Force</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Cooperation with Australia's Federation Guard to assist with special closing ceremonies once a month as well as various other ceremonies throughout the year Cooperation with Royal Military College Band, Duntroon in assisting with closing ceremonies each week, as well as providing musical assistance for various ceremonies and events Support for ceremonies and events by providing fly-overs Provision of special tours for new recruits and unit members Staging of Beat Retreat at the Memorial in 2007
<i>Australian Defence Force Academy</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Collaboration on academic/historical projects and assistance to course work Formal links established with ADFA School of Social Science and Humanities Assistance with various ceremonies Assistance to Australian Technical Staff Officer course (ATSOC) with practical projects and site visits
<i>Australian Embassy, Washington</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Provided small photographic exhibitions for ANZAC Day 2007 and 2008.
<i>Australian Federal Police</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Cooperation, especially with security and traffic management during major events and security advice for buildings and collection facilities Assistance in coordination of UN Day+

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cooperation with Peacekeeping Official History research
<i>Australian Government Fraud Liaison Forum</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Membership on the Steering Committee of the Australian Government Fraud Liaison and use of Telstra Theatre for Fraud Liaison Forum Symposium
<i>Australian National University</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Australian Research Council linkage project for the <i>Official History of Peacekeeping and Post-Cold War Operations</i> • Cooperation on the "Remembering the war in New Guinea" project • Cooperation with the ANU Faculty of Science • The Memorial's Evaluation and Visitor Research Manager lectures for the Graduate Diploma of Scientific Communication. This arrangement is now in its seventh year, and a fee is received on a consultancy basis • Senior Historian Visiting Fellow, Strategic and Defence Studies Centre • Cooperation over 2006 Annual Scholarship
<i>Australian Quarantine Inspection Service</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Advice and facilitation of inspection for incoming loans from England for the <i>Lawrence of Arabia and the Light Horse</i> exhibition
<i>Australian Research Council</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Linkage project on the use of femto-second lasers in conservation in association with the ANU, Army History Unit, Naval Heritage Collection, Artlab Australia and the Art Gallery of New South Wales • Linkage project on deterioration of dyes and pigments in documents, artworks and photographic materials in cooperation with the University of Canberra and the National Archives of Australia • Linkage project for joint Gallipoli research project to translate documents in the Turkish military archives with Macquarie University. • Linkage project for the <i>Official History of Peacekeeping and Post-Cold War Operations</i> with the Australian National University • Linkage project for the war crimes trials project ("Law reports series on Australia's post-Second World War war crimes trials") with University of Melbourne
<i>Australian Society of Archivists</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Professional association membership, including some committee positions held by Australian War Memorial staff at ACT Branch level, contributions to newsletters, hosting of events and tours
<i>Australian Tourism Export Council</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Corporate membership • Attend regular meetings on international marketing
<i>Australian War Memorial Anzac Foundation</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Assists the Memorial in fund raising particularly via bequests
<i>Canadian War Museum</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Advice on documentation standards for collection management systems
<i>Canberra and Capital Region Tourism Awards</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Member and sponsor of the Awards Committee • Provision of one-on-one sessions with entrants to assist in submission writing
<i>Canberra Business Council</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Participation by Director in the Task Force on Arts, Tourism and Sport
<i>Canberra College</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cooperation with staff in development of new science curriculum and assessment requirements
<i>Canberra Convention Bureau</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Director on Board • Staff member is a member of Research and Learning Institutes Group (RALIG)

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cooperation on joint promotion of Canberra as a unique destination to hold meetings, conferences and exhibitions
<i>Canberra Institute of Technology</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Collaboration in program for Statement of Attainment for Volunteer Guides • Joint delivery of Workplace Skills development course • Provided lectures and assistance to Museums Studies Students.
<i>Carbine Club</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provided special display in conjunction with function held at AWM
<i>Changi Museum, Singapore</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provided information on copyright issues related to the display of reproduction art
<i>Coffs Harbour TAFE</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provided information and assistance to Museums Studies Student.
<i>Commonwealth Collecting Institutions Forum on Reference Services</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Meets quarterly, hosting and secretarial duties shared
<i>Commonwealth Heads of Conservation Committee</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Membership on the Commonwealth Heads of Conservation Committee by Head, Collection Services.
<i>Computer Education Group of the ACT (CEGACT)</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cooperation in the promotion of learning technologies
<i>Copyright in Commonwealth Institutions group</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Professional liaison between cultural institutions regarding copyright issues.
<i>Council of Australian Museum Directors</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provided feedback to 2006 – 2007 CAMD Survey of Museums
<i>CSIRO, Division of Manufacturing and Infrastructure</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Co-operated to organise long-pulse laser workshops. The workshops will be hosted by the Memorial, Artlab Australia, the Art Gallery of Western Australia and Museum Victoria.
<i>Department of Defence</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Advice and information regarding conflicts and eligibility for the Roll of Honour • Assistance regarding acquisitions for the National Collection • Assistance to and support of Peacekeeping Official History research • Provided images, loans, advice and practical assistance from Head, Collection services for refurbishment of ANZUS Corridor exhibition, the Pentagon • Provided training, advice, and assistance to practicum student from Department of Defence. • Provided tour of conservation workshops for DMO Safety Forum participants • Provided assistance to Defence Library on thesaurus development • Provided assistance to Defence on display of radioactive objects
<i>Department of Education, Science and Training</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Collaboration on the administration of the PACER rebate for schools. Mandatory for schools to visit the Memorial
<i>Department of Environment and Water Resources</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Liaison on EPBC Act requirements and heritage and planning advice
<i>Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Assistance to Peacekeeping Official History research
<i>Department of Veterans' Affairs</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Funding for Travelling Exhibitions, Memorial Box project, and School wreathlaying, Peacekeeping Conference and 1917 and 1918 Anniversary exhibitions

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Historical consultancies for oral history project • Close collaboration with DVA Commemoration Branch historical education projects • Assistance provided in judging of ANZAC Day 2004 Schools Activities Awards • Portfolio coordination matters • Funding for anniversary exhibitions • Collaboration in the coordination and delivery of the National Indigenous Veterans' Commemoration Ceremony
<i>DisACT (Disaster ACT)</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Secretary of Disaster ACT committee: Senior Paper Conservator; and Member of DisACT Committee: Preventive Conservation Officer. The AWM hosted one of the DISACT network meetings • Memorandum of Understanding on Disaster Preparedness between Canberra's Cultural Collecting Institutions was renewed in 2006.
Embassy of Japan	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Continuing financial support for the Australia-Japan Research Project</i>
<i>Heraldry and Genealogical Society of Canberra</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Liaison related to ongoing delivery of training programs and talks
<i>History Teachers Association of Australia (HTAA)</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Regular collaboration on HTAA Professional development and participation in HTAA conferences • Participation in judging of National History Challenge
<i>Hyatt Hotel</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Delivery of catering management at Australian War Memorial
<i>Imperial War Museum, London</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Facilitated IWM couriers' tours of Australian museums' conservation laboratories and storage facilities • Coordination provided by IWM for loan and return of objects from UK collections for <i>Lawrence</i> exhibition • loaned objects for the <i>Lawrence of Arabia and the Light Horse</i> exhibition • Provided information on policies and procedures for dealing with radiation and asbestos hazards in collections • Advice on collection conservation planning and policy development. • Liaison for research project on aircraft doping materials • Staff exchange program • Development of joint battlefields tour
<i>Institute of Museum and Gallery Education (IMAGE)</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A special interest group in Museums Australia Association: Education Manager is President
<i>International Council of Museums</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Membership on the Museum Management Board by the Director • Participated in ICOM's Australia Museum Partnership Program by providing training, advice, and assistance to staff at the Solomon Islands National Museum to establish best practice standards and procedures for collection management in conjunction with staff from the Queensland Museum
<i>Kings College London (UK)</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • loaned objects for the <i>Lawrence of Arabia and the Light Horse</i> exhibition)
<i>Lambert Vineyards</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A sponsorship agreement with Coolah Holdings Pty Ltd in trust for The Lambert Family Trust (Lambert Vineyards) for the provision of wines to the Memorial to be used at major launches over a three year period.

<i>Land Warfare Studies Centre</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Memorial staff member on Editorial Board of <i>Australian Army Journal</i>
Macquarie University, Sydney	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Australian Research Council linkage grant for joint Gallipoli research project to translate documents in the Turkish military archives.</i>
<i>Martin and Sally Hughes</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • loaned rare photo for the <i>Lawrence of Arabia and the Light Horse</i> exhibition
<i>Mellon Foundation</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provided summary of research on conservation uses of femto-second lasers being done by AWM / ANU consortium funded by an ARC Grant.
<i>Ministry of Culture and Heritage, Government of New Zealand</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provided information on the practical application of the provisions of Australia's Protection of Movable Cultural Heritage Act 1986 to the Senior Adviser, Heritage Operations Unit, Ministry of Culture and Heritage, Government of New Zealand
<i>Museum of Costume, Bath (UK)</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • loaned objects for the <i>Lawrence of Arabia and the Light Horse</i> exhibition
<i>Museum of Victoria</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provided information on conservation section structure, tasks, and performance measures • Provided information on policies and procedures for dealing with radiation hazards in collections • Provided information on exhibition display lighting policies and light induced degeneration
<i>Museums Australia</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Corporate Membership • Head, Photographs, Film and Sound – President of Museums Australia • Assistance to the annual Museums Australian Conference in the form of the Welcome to Delegates event, the provisions of parallel session space, and the volunteer assistance of many AWM staff
<i>National Archives of Australia</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Implementation of the Australian War Memorial-NAA Agreement and ongoing liaison about the development, implementation and maintenance standards and procedures for archival management and public access to Commonwealth records • Regular liaison regarding digitisation of collection material • Provided Research Centre and Conservation staff assistance with Shake Your Family Tree Day event • Provided six-month placement for NAA staff in Paper Conservation Laboratory
<i>National Capital Attractions Association</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Corporate membership. • Staff members hold Treasurer and Research positions on executive • Providing an opportunity for joint marketing initiatives and networking
<i>National Capital Authority</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cooperation in commemorative precinct (ANZAC Parade) including promotion of Memorial
<i>National Capital Education Tourism Project and National Museum of Australia</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Collaboration on History Teaching Fellowship • Joint promotion and marketing of education programs and products
<i>National Film and Sound Archive</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • loaned objects for the <i>Lawrence of Arabia and the Light Horse</i> exhibition
<i>National Foundation of Australian Women</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Continuing consultancy service for the development of the 'Women in War' website, a component of the Australian Women's Archives Project, in partnership with the Department of Veterans' Affairs, Royal Australian Historical Society, State Library of New South Wales, State Records Authority of New South Wales and the National Archives of Australia
<i>National Gallery of Australia</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provided access to and use of specialised conservation equipment to facilitate conservation treatment of NGA collection items

<i>National Heads of Collection Forum</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cooperative forum for heads of national and state cultural heritage collections
<i>National Institute for Defense Studies, Tokyo (NIDS)</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Translation and publication of extracts from the Japanese Second World War official history
<i>National Library of Australia</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Images from the Memorial's photographic collection made available for retrieval through the <i>Picture Australia</i> search interface • Regular liaison with various staff and teams regarding digitisation of collection material and possible cooperation • Partnership in the Pandora digital archiving project • Regular liaison with Manuscripts section on archival matters • MOU re provision of disaster recovery assistance • Paper Conservator to NLA for six-month placement in Paper Conservation Laboratory • Provided information on environmental parameters for collection storage
<i>National Library of Australia, National Archives of Australia, National Gallery of Australia, National Museum of Australia, ScreenSound Australia, and Australian National Maritime Museum</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Co-operative forum for Branch Heads, Public Programs • Joint membership of the Disaster Recovery ACT response group • Cooperative forum for Branch Heads, National Heads of Collections Forum • Provided information for Register of Research Projects to National Heads of Collections Forum • Cooperative forum for <i>National Conservation and Preservation Committee</i> (NCPC: Heads of Conservation) • Hosted Imperial War Museum couriers' visit and behind the scenes tours
<i>National Library of Australia, National Archives of Australia, National Gallery of Australia, National Museum of Australia and National Film and Sound Archives</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cooperation on disaster recovery, assessment of depreciation funding and useful lives issues, and risk management and insurance issues relevant to cultural and collecting institutions • Joint Cultural Management Development Program • Copyright in Commonwealth Institutions group • Advanced Workplace Skills program • Joint membership of the Disaster Recovery ACT response group
<i>National Library of Indonesia</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provided behind the scenes tour of Conservation facilities and Research Centre for Head of the Preservation Centre and Preservation Centre staff, National Library of Indonesia
<i>National Museum of Australia</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provided information on conservation lab fit-out to assist with design of NMA new conservation facilities • Provided information on Subject thesaurus and data entry standards • Supplied conservation materials to frame 24 paintings for exhibition • Provided access to and use of specialised conservation equipment to facilitate movement of NMA collection items.
<i>Queanbeyan Business Council</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Marketing in the Queanbeyan Visitor Information Centre
<i>Queensland Police</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Received advice and assistance with licensing and permits for Long Tan filming. <i>(NB: This straddled 2 financial years: 06/07 & 07/08 BR)</i>
<i>RAAF Historical</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Liaison regarding custody and transfer arrangements for RAAF official historical records • Assistance to Peacekeeping Official History

<i>Seapower Centre Australia</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Co-operation in acquiring relics, photographs and documents relating to RAN participation in current operations in the Persian Gulf • Assistance in transporting to Australia material collected by the Army during the second Gulf War • Liaison regarding custody and transfer arrangements for RAN official historical records • Examination and analysis of materials from HMAS <i>Sydney</i> relics retrieved from Christmas Island • Assistance to Peacekeeping Official History
<i>Royal Society for Asian Affairs (UK)</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • loaned objects for the <i>Lawrence of Arabia and the Light Horse</i> exhibition
<i>RSL- ACT Branch</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Delivery of ANZAC Day Dawn Service
<i>Shrine of Remembrance, Melbourne</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Liaison on possible joint education projects • Provided information on collection object types for use in collection categorization in a collection management system • Provided support for the development of the Shrine's bid for \$15,000 from the National Library of Australia's Community Heritage Grants scheme.
<i>Simpson Prize Tour</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provided 'Behind the Scenes' visit to collection storage for tour participants • Provided tour leader
<i>Tate (UK)</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • loaned objects for the <i>Lawrence of Arabia and the Light Horse</i> exhibition)
<i>The National Archives (UK)</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • loaned objects for the <i>Lawrence of Arabia and the Light Horse</i> exhibition
<i>The Royal Collection Trust (UK)</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • loaned objects for the <i>Lawrence of Arabia and the Light Horse</i> exhibition
<i>University of Canberra</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Gallery talks, laboratory tours, collection management information and work experience placements provided to students on the course • Conservation and Cultural Materials course co-operation. Teaching assistance and guided site visits to the Memorial's galleries, conservation and storage facilities provided by conservation staff; work experience placements and assistance provided to students on the course. • Participation by Head, Collection Services, in curriculum development for proposed conservation course • Partners in Learning (PAL) Internships in Professional Education in Information Studies • Collaboration in development of new Art Program (education) • Establishment of working group with ACT Art Teachers • Support for the ACT visitor satisfaction survey and National Capital Educational Tours project evaluation • Participated in the Sustainable Tourism Cooperative Research Centre Attraction Satisfaction Benchmarking Project
<i>University of Melbourne</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Conservation Course co-operation: specialist lectures provided by conservation staff; supervisory support provided for special projects; and Professional Practice work placements provided to students on the course • Provided advice and assistance to Conservation Students • <i>Assistance provided to the ARC research project on copyright management and digitisation practices</i> • Planning of collaborative research on war crimes trials
<i>Vincent Fairfax Family Foundation</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support for development of online products to support Discovery Zone.

<i>Visions of Australia</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Participation by Assistant Director Public Programs on the Visions of Australia committee
<i>Warsaw Rising Museum</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provided information on relative advantages and disadvantages of barcodes versus Radio Frequency Identification as used for collection management
<i>Westmead Hospital, Medical Physics Dept</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Received assistance with Laser Licence Application for ARPANSA

Reference: Appendix 12, Alliances and Partnerships, *Australian War Memorial Annual Report 2007-2008*, pp 135-141.

Acknowledgements

The Governance Project team would like to acknowledge particularly the support and direction of the Project's sponsor, Professor Graham Durant, who gave his time during the year to discuss the project with us and to provide valuable insights into how governance works in the public sector and for cultural institutions specifically.

In addition, the Project team would like to acknowledge and thank the executives and managers from the following institutions who generously gave their time for face to face interviews and provided valuable advice on project directions and insights into governance.

Australian National Maritime Museum

Russell Smylie - Executive Officer, Governance

Australian War Memorial

Rhonda Adler - Assistant Director Corporate Services

Sophie Powell - Council Secretary

National Archives of Australia

Ross Gibbs - Director-General

Cheryl Watson - Assistant Director General, Corporate Services Branch

Margaret Chalker - Assistant Director General, Government Information Management Branch

National Film and Sound Archive

Anthea Tinney - Interim CEO

Annette Cronin - Manager, Governance, Strategy and Evaluation

National Gallery of Australia

Alan Froud - Deputy Director

Helen Gee - Manager of Governance and Reporting

National Library of Australia

Gerard Linehan - Assistant Director General, Corporate Services

National Museum of Australia

Craddock Morton - Director

Old Parliament House

Jenny Anderson - Director (CEO)

Mark Cannon - Human Resources & Governance