

52nd Synod of the Diocese of Sydney

Third Session

Minutes of Proceedings of the Synod for Tuesday 13 September 2022

1. Assembly

The Synod assembled in the Wesley Theatre at 3.15 pm.

2. Prayers

Prayers were read by Archdeacon Kara Hartley.

3. Bible study

Bishop Jay Behan led the Bible study.

4. Minutes

The President signed the minutes for Saturday 10 and Monday 12 September 2022.

5. Answers to Questions

5.1 **Preaching of ordained women to mixed congregations**

Ms Lyn Bannerman asked the following question –

In his paper titled “The Ministry of Women in The Diocese of Sydney”, dated February 2016, the then Archbishop of Sydney, the Most Rev’d Dr Glenn N. Davies wrote, and I quote: “... the Synod has not endorsed the view that women should never preach to mixed congregations. On the contrary, the Synod has embraced the long-standing custom of women preaching.....” Davies concluded, in summary, to say that at the end of the day, Rectors are free to make their own decision on this matter. His paper acknowledges these different practices and encourages us to respect our differences.

Please confirm to this Synod that the position outlined in the above paper remains unchanged, thereby ensuring that all Rectors and parishes understand that there is no formal barrier to allowing ordained women to preach to mixed congregations, while respecting alternative views of some Rectors.

To which the President replied –

The question is out of order under rule 6.3(4) of the Synod standing orders as it contains assertions, expresses opinions and offers an argument.

Nevertheless, I am able to advise the Synod that I have not adopted any practice contrary to that now long endorsed by Synod that the Rector of a parish is at liberty to invite suitably authorised, gifted and godly men and women to preach, if he chooses.

5.2 **Doctrine Commission Report: The Unchanging Heart of Parochial Incumbency**

Ms Lyn Bannerman asked the following question –

- (a) What is the formal status of this Report, which is in Book One, commencing at page 138?

- (b) The paper asserts (eg. at paras 10 and 30), in summary, that incumbents must devote themselves entirely to their tasks, giving “single-minded devotion to this task” and requiring “...all the minister can give, and then more”. The only exception is if the Diocese calls upon his time, What then are the expectations of a clergyman’s wife? Is she expected to ensure he is never distracted by, for example, the needs of home and family, young children, elderly parents as well as all household duties, plus involvement in some ministries, no matter what?
- (c) What is “tent-making” (para 30) in the 21st century?
- (d) Has the Safe Ministry Board been asked to consider this paper, particularly the emotional and physical impact on both the husband and wife, and also the children?
- (e) The recommendation for an allowance to be paid in respect of “an accompanying wife” (para 4) does not say to whom the allowance is to be paid – clergyman or his wife? And if not to the wife, have the authors considered D.V. expert’s advice about the importance of some financial independence in healthy relationships?

To which the President replied –

I am informed that the answer is as follows –

- (a) The Standing Committee requested this report from the Doctrine Commission as theological advice to the Stipends and Allowances Committee to assist their policy review of ministry remuneration and preparation for retirement.
- (b) This part of the question is out of order under rule 6.3(4) of the Synod standing orders as it contains assertions and offers an argument.
Nevertheless, the Doctrine Commission did not consider the expectation of a clergyman’s wife since this was not included in the Standing Committee’s reference.
- (c) “Tent-making” means the income producing employment of a person which enables ministry which would not otherwise not be possible under particular circumstances (e.g. church planting).
- (d) No.
- (e) Paragraph 4 of the Report exegetes a part of 1 Corinthians 9 and does not refer to allowances of any type.

5.3 Living Faith Council Establishment

Ms Lyn Bannerman asked the following question –

- (a) It is understood that the Living Faith Council was initially rejected by the Australian Charities and Not-for Profit Commission.
 - (i) What were the reasons given for this rejection?
 - (ii) What was advised to the ACNC in response to this rejection that resulted in successful registration?
- (b) The Ordinance for this Council provides for it to own property. As the Council’s role is described as essentially a support and counselling service, what activities are envisaged that would require acquisition of property?
- (c) From where does the Council currently operate and does the Council own it or pay rent? Depending on the answer, how much did the property cost, or how much rent is paid?
- (d) How many staff are employed? Are they full or part time?
- (e) Do any Board members or any staff member have expertise in medical and/or psychological counselling on LGBTIQ+ issues? If not, why not (in both cases)?
- (f) From which source of Diocesan funds is the Living Faith Council funded?
- (g) As Synod was first advised of this Council on the first (ordinary) day of May 2020:
 - (i) Why has Synod not received any report, including financial statements, from this Council?
 - (ii) Could Synod please be provided with a report of income and expenditure over the period since its formation?
- (h) The Diocesan Governance Policy requires that the majority of Board members of a Diocesan Organisation be appointed by Synod (Appendix 1 D (b) of the Policy.) Why have no appointments been made by Synod?

To which the President replied –

I am informed that the answer is as follows –

(a)

- (i) The application for registration as a charity was not rejected; the ACNC issued a preliminary notice of intention to refuse registration on the basis it did not consider Living Faith to have purposes that are for public benefit and invited Living Faith to provide a response.
- (ii) The arguments put to the ACNC by Living Faith in its response centred on the following points:
 - The ACNC misconstrued Living Faith’s purpose and the section of the public to whom those purposes are directed.
 - The ACNC considered irrelevant evidence in relation to practises and therapies that are neither conducted nor supported by Living Faith.
 - The ACNC failed to acknowledge that expert medical opinion in relation to gender incongruence is divided and proceeded as if a settled position had been reached.
 - The ACNC used an incorrect methodology to assess public benefit, in particular by failing to identify and weigh benefit with possible detriment. Clear evidence exists of the benefits flowing from the activities of Living Faith – namely, that they will lead to greater support, acceptance and understanding, and a welcoming place in the Church for individuals who experience same sex attraction or gender incongruence and wish to stay true to their Christian faith.

Living Faith also undertook to make certain amendments to its purposes to clarify the section of the public to whom its purposes are directed.

Having considered these arguments and the amendments, the ACNC accepted that Living Faith has purposes that are for the public benefit.

- (b) No activities are envisaged at this time that would require acquisition of property. The provision is there in case a need arises in the future.
- (c) Living Faith staff either work from home or from a small office rented from an inner west parish. The rental on the small office is \$2000 per annum.
- (d) There are two part time staff, each employed three days a week. There is an administrator, who works half a day a week.
- (e) Living Faith does not engage in medical or psychological counselling but rather pastoral care. There are Council members and staff with theological, pastoral expertise in LGBTIQ+ issues. Both pastoral workers have theology degrees, one also has a Masters in counselling. However, they do not engage in counselling for Living Faith. One Council member has a PhD in gender studies.
- (f) Living Faith is funded by donations from parishes and individuals. If you would like to make a donation please go to www.livingfaith.online/give

(g)

- (i) The Synod has received an annual report from Living Faith. See item 17.1 (21) of the Business Paper for Day 1. Living Faith has not yet been categorised under the *Accounts, Audits and Annual Reports Ordinance 1995*. The Finance Committee has recently received the necessary financial information to determine a category and is expected to consider the matter at its next meeting.
- (ii) From 1 December 2020 to 31 December 2021, total income was \$80,351. Total expenses for 2021 were \$59,045. As a result, there was a net surplus of \$21,035 for 2021.
- (iii) From 1 January 2022 to 30 June 2022, total donations were \$50,782. Total expenses were \$70,787. As a result there was a net loss January to June 2022 of \$20,004.
- (h) The Standing Committee elects the majority of members of a number of diocesan organisations. The Standing Committee and the Synod are not intended to be differentiated for the purpose of this requirement in the Governance Policy.

5.4 Development of the new Archbishop’s Residence

The Rev Dr Antony Barraclough asked the following question –

Could the Archbishop inform the Synod of the progress in the construction and expected availability of the new Archbishop's residence in Catherine St. Forrest Lodge?

To which the President replied –

I am informed that the answer is as follows –

The answer to this question is still being compiled, with the intention that it will be provided to the Synod next Monday in a short video format.

5.5 Expenditure under Fund 127 'Work Outside the Diocese'

Mr Tony Brownlow asked the following question –

- (a) What organisations/projects were funded under Fund 127 in 2020 and 2021 financial years, and what was the amount in each case?
- (b) Could you please provide a statement on the specific purpose for which each grant was provided.

To which the President replied –

I am informed the answer is as follows –

The answer is set out in tabular form and will be provided to the questioner and posted on the notice board in the foyer [see below].

Grants and other funding provided from Work Outside the Diocese Fund 127

	2020	2021
WITHIN AUSTRALIA		
Other Dioceses -		
Armidale - <i>in support of ministry expenses of the diocese</i>	5,000	5,000
North West Australia - <i>in support of ministry expenses of the diocese</i>	60,000	60,000
Tasmania - <i>in support of ministry expenses of the diocese</i>	5,000	5,000
Northern Territory - <i>in support of ministry expenses of the diocese</i>	50,000	55,000
Indigenous ministries -		
National Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Anglican Council (NATSIAC)	1,000	1,000
WITHIN AUSTRALIA SUBTOTAL	121,000	126,000
Diocese of Bathurst - <i>in support of ministry expenses of the diocese</i>	250,000	250,000
WITHIN AUSTRALIA TOTAL	371,000	376,000
OUTSIDE AUSTRALIA		
Strategic EOS travel and visitors -		
Archbishop's overseas visits - <i>air fares and accommodation</i>	6,870	-
SUBTOTAL	6,870	-
Training leaders and providing bursaries -		
Madagascar - <i>contribution to Bible School bursaries</i>	-	8,000
Sammy Shehata (Alexandria School of Theology) - <i>support for expenses as Dean</i>	17,457	-
Training leaders in Tanzania - <i>resource materials</i>	687	-
SUBTOTAL	18,144	8,000
Moore College PTC related -		
Province of Indian Ocean - <i>in support of ministry expenses</i>	5,340	-
SUBTOTAL	5,340	-
Gafcon -		
Archbishop, Malcolm Richards and others - <i>air fares and accommodation</i>	4,114	-
Gafcon Global - <i>support for central administration expenses</i>	10,000	10,000
Peter Jensen - <i>mobile phone expenses</i>	751	850
SUBTOTAL	14,865	10,850

Other

Travel insurance	844	329
FCAANZ - <i>support for administration expenses</i>	60,000	100,000
Diocese of Concepcion, Chile - <i>contribution to travel costs of Bishop</i>	1,869	1,920
Dublin Silicon Docks Project - <i>in support of ministry expenses</i>	10,000	7,000
	SUBTOTAL	72,713
	OUTSIDE AUSTRALIA TOTAL	117,932
	WOD TOTAL	488,932
		504,099

5.6 Grant from this Diocese to Gafcon internationally and to the Southern Cross Diocese

Mr Tony Brownlow asked the following question –

- (a) Has this Diocese provided any funds to Gafcon provinces, dioceses or parishes internationally in 2021 and/or 2022 for any purpose, for example by way of membership fees, grants for any purposes, including management support, or for specific projects across countries or within a specific country?
- (b) If so, how much, for what purpose and from which source of Diocesan funds, including the Endowment of the See?, and
- (c) Similarly, have any funds been transferred for any purpose to the Diocese of the Southern Cross?

To which the President replied –

I am informed that the answer is as follows –

- (a) Yes
- (b) The Fellowship of Confessing Anglicans Aotearoa and New Zealand for administration expenses –

2021: \$100,000

2022: \$80,000 (budgeted but not yet approved)

The Diocese of Concepcion, Chile as a contribution to the travel costs of the Bishop -

2021: \$1,920

GAFCON Global – support for central administration expenses

2021: \$10,000

2022: \$10,000

The payments were made, or will be made, from the Work Outside the Diocese Fund.

- (c) No

5.7 Gender Balance at Moore College

Mr Tony Brownlow asked the following question –

- (a) In the first circular for this Synod, page 9, Notices of Contested and Uncontested Elections were provided, including one position for the Council of Moore College. As has been the case for a number of years now, the advice given by the College on gender balance is that it “remains under active consideration.”
 - (i) What precisely does “active consideration” mean?
 - (ii) What specific action has the Council undertaken?
 - (iii) What is the current gender balance on the Council, the Boards and other Boards or Committees of the College and its four Centres?
- (b) In relation to job opportunities, the College claims on its website that it is “an equal employment opportunity employer.” What are the current figures relating to employment, by gender, for the College and its four Centres separately, broken down between major categories (e.g. senior leaders, admin staff, lecturers and other support staff)?

To which the President replied –

I am informed that the answer is as follows –

(a)

- (i) “Active consideration” means the Moore Theological College Governing Board welcomes and actively seeks appropriately skilled women to join the Council.
- (ii) Each time a vacancy occurs on the Moore Theological Council, the question is asked whether there is an appropriate woman who might be nominated for the position. However, it should be noted that the College Ordinance requires three of the four synod-elected clergy places on the Council to be filled by ‘rectors of parishes within the Diocese’, given the role of the College in training those who in time will become incumbents.

The recent lay vacancy on the Council was created by the College’s long-serving Honorary Treasurer indicating his wish to retire from the Council at the conclusion of his current term, on the first day of this Synod. As the First Circular indicated to replace him the Council was looking for a ‘Chartered Accountant, preferably a partner of a major accounting firm’. This was the most important consideration as the College needs to comply with the *Higher Education Standards Framework (Threshold Standards) 2021*.

- (iii) The two legislated College boards are the Governing Board and the Academic Board. Note that the Centres report to the Academic Board and do not have separate management committees. The current gender balance on the Council and the two aforementioned boards is:

Council	Female	Male
Archbishop		1
Clergy (Synod-elected)		4
Lay (Synod-elected)	1	3
Total Council	1	8
Governing Board <i>(includes the Council)</i>	2	14
Academic Board	4	22

- (b) An ‘equal employment opportunity employer’ means that all employment decisions (including hiring, promotion, development, termination, compensation, etc.) must never be based on race, ethnicity, or gender, or any other factors which might be deemed discriminatory. With regard to ‘job opportunities’ selection is based on an applicant’s suitability to a role and agreement to work within Moore College’s vision, mission, and strategic plan.

The current gender balance of employees, for the College and its four Centres separately, broken down between major categories, is as follows –

Teaching Staff		
Role	Female	Male
Principal		1
Faculty	2	16
Chaplains	13	
Total Teaching Staff	15	17

Administrative Staff		
Role	Female	Male
Executive		1
Managers	10	8
Specialist Support Staff	12	22
Other Support Staff	6	7
Total Admin. Staff	28	36

Centre for Global Mission		
Role	Female	Male
Director		1
Specialist Support	1	2

Priscilla and Aquilla Centre		
Role	Female	Male
Director *	1	
Specialist Support	1	

Centre for Christian Living		
Role	Female	Male
Director *		1
Specialist Support	1	

Christian Ministry Development		
Role	Female	Male
Director *		1
Specialist Support	1	2

* Note: the persons filling these positions are also members of the Faculty.

5.8 Beneficiaries of the Archbishop's Christmas gift

The Rev Jon Guyer asked the following question –

- (a) How many retired ministers and clergy widows received the Archbishop's monetary Christmas gift in each of the last 5 years?
- (b) Prior to the recent reduction of this list, what criteria, method or information gathering process was conducted in order to determine which retired ministers and clergy widows were most in need of this gift?

To which the President replied –

I am informed that the answer is as follows –

- (a) 2021 - 113
2020 - 134
2019 - 134
2018 - 139
2017 - 143
- (b) In 2005 and in prior years, a questionnaire was sent to retired clergy and clergy widows asking if they wished to be included in the Archbishop's Christmas Grants and inviting them

to note any particular expenses or circumstances they would like taken into account. Any person declining a grant or not responding was removed from the list, but was free to reapply. Some found the questionnaire embarrassing and intrusive, so the practice was discontinued.

After that, and until 2020, retired clergy and clergy widows were added to the list and an informal assessment was made by the Registrar about the financial needs of those on the list and the grants were made accordingly.

In 2020, the amounts were standardised. There were some exceptions such as usually not providing grants to clergy who did not retire in the Diocese and providing larger grants to clergy and widows who were known to be in greater financial need.

In 2021, clergy who have been retired for less than 10 years were removed from the list and sent a letter of explanation. There has been no change to the practice in relation to grants to clergy widows.

5.9 Tertiary Education Ministry Oversight Committee (TEMOC) grants

Mr Eddie Ozols asked the following question –

Noting the Tertiary Education Ministry Oversight Committee Report (page 175 of Book 1) which states at point 2 –

“The Committee is committed to supporting the development of on-campus evangelical tertiary ministries (especially Chaplaincy) within the Diocese in accordance with the statement of vision, strategic priorities and core principles detailed in its report to the Synod in 2010 (listed at the end of this report in the Appendix)”

and at 11:

“For 2020 a total of 10 grants were distributed. All projects were initiated by Anglican ministries in consultation with evangelical student groups on campus. Continuing grants are assisting in the ministry at Unichurch (UNSW) and Sydney University, ministry trainees at four universities. New grants support cross cultural work at Macquarie university and ministry trainees at five universities.”

- (a) What percentage of TEMOC grants in 2020 were allocated to the actual Anglican organisations listed in column 2 at point 12?
- (b) Which organisations received the funds for Macquarie University, Sydney University (2), Wollongong University, and WSU Bankstown/Liverpool for “Anglican Chaplaincy”?
- (c) Are grants provided for other than Anglican identifying workers? If so, what percentage of the trainees in 2020 were not Anglican?
- (d) Which Anglican churches working directly on a campus in their parochial area received TEMOC grants in 2020?
- (e) Since its formation how many parish initiated on-campus ministries have applied for support to TEMOC? What percentage of applications did these represent?
- (f) Since its formation how many parish initiated on-campus ministries were successful in receiving grants from TEMOC? What percentage does this represent?
- (g) What is the relationship between TEMOC supported trainees and the local parishes in the parochial areas where the university is located?
- (h) How has TEMOC met its “Core Principle (b): In addition to the values in the vision above, we want these university and VET campus ministries to serve churches in partnership through training and equipping their members”
- (i) Specifically, how has this core principle been enacted across all Anglican churches in the mission area surrounding the Wollongong University?
- (j) How did staff supported by TEMOC support international students during COVID, many of whom lost employment and were in significant distress?

To which the President replied –

I am informed that the answer is as follows –

- (a) TEMOC grants are allocated to specific individuals working or training in university ministries based on applications by (Anglican) Chaplains or Parishes. Anglican Chaplains are authorised clergy, however as a result of various historical developments they may not be employed by a parish. As such TEMOC distributes funds to their employing organisation. All funds were distributed for on-campus tertiary ministry and the percentage of grants allocated to an Anglican Parish was 52%.
- (b) Macquarie University: MTS Scholarship Fund - for the training of ministry apprentices.
Sydney University: EU Graduates Fund – both grants.
Western Sydney University Bankstown: AFES - for the training of ministry apprentices.
- (c) Grants recipients are provided to ministry workers or trainees who originate from a variety of denominational backgrounds.

Since its inception, all theologically trained workers who have received grants have attended Anglican churches and almost all have been ordained Anglican clergy.

TEMOC does not collect information on the denominational affiliation of grants given to trainees, however all grant recipients either attend or work at an Anglican Church or are under the supervision of an Anglican Chaplain in their university ministry. There were no grants given to anyone outside of these categories.

- (d) The Anglican Churches with campuses in their parochial area that have received grants in 2020 are –
 - Kingswood Anglican
 - St Barnabas Broadway
 - Parish of Unichurch (UNSW)
- (e) There have been 72 applications from parish initiated on-campus ministries in the last eleven years. This is 51% of all applications received.
- (f) Of the 72 applications received 60 were successful in receiving funding. The 60 applications that received funding were 43% of the total applications funded.
- (g) It is not possible in the time available to detail the involvement in their local church of all the trainees supported by TEMOC for campus ministry. A significant number are involved in local or on-campus churches with high numbers of university students. Some attend other Anglican and non-Anglican churches where most actively participate in church ministry. Both chaplains and trainees endeavour to develop ongoing relationships with a range of churches, especially those in the area where their campuses are located.
- (h) All campus ministries supported by TEMOC ascribe to the vision of 'serving churches through partnership in training and equipping their members.' Most students involved in campus ministries continue to attend and serve their local churches during their studies. Campus ministries are able to undertake intensive ministry training and equipping of students during their time on campus which is directly applicable to local church ministry and benefits these churches immediately and over the longer term. Where possible this partnership is also expressed through church visiting and ongoing prayerful support of campus ministries by churches.
- (i) All 3 grant recipients in 2020 at the University of Wollongong were active members of their local churches. One grant recipient was at an Anglican church and was primarily involved in training and equipping amongst the international students in that church.
- (j) The grant recipient, a ministry apprentice, working amongst international students supported them in a variety of ways, including: hosting, provision of meals, home groups, phone and Zoom conversations, walk and talks (during lockdowns), Bible Studies (online and in person), online activities and emergency financial support.

5.10 Departure of Headmaster of Shore School

Mr Chris Pettett asked the following question –

My question relates to the circumstances around the departure in July 2022 of the previous Headmaster of the Shore School, Dr Timothy Petterson, and how the diocese can learn from this experience – the question is in a number of parts –

- (a) What was the process that led to the recruitment of Dr Petterson to the role of Headmaster in 2020?
- (b) What was the process and circumstances that led to the departure of Dr Petterson from the role of Headmaster in July 2022?
- (c) Have any differences in the recruitment process of a new and permanent Headmaster been learnt that will be implemented in comparison to when Dr Petterson was recruited as the School's previous Headmaster?
- (d) Have there been any other lessons learnt resulting from these circumstances that the Diocese and the School could outline to the Synod for its assurance and edification?
- (e) Who are the current members of the school's Council and what are their qualifications?
- (f) Does the Archbishop have confidence in the current members of the school's Council?
- (g) Does the Anglican Diocese of Sydney have any accountability processes in place to assist governing bodies that are responsible to Synod in exercising their roles and responsibilities of governance?
- (h) What can members of Synod pray for regarding these circumstances?

To which the President replied –

I am informed that the answer is as follows –

- (a) A comprehensive international search was undertaken supported by an experienced recruitment firm and educational experts.
- (b) From the letter to parents July 15 2022 –

'I can assure you that this decision has only been made following deep deliberation and thorough assessment of the School's situation. As part of this deliberation, Council commissioned an independent review into the culture and leadership of the School to more fully understand the nature of and reasons for recent disquiet within elements of the School community.

Council thanks Dr Petterson for the loyalty and commitment he has given Shore, including guiding the School through the external challenges of the past two years and leading the introduction of a number of important and positive changes.

This decision is not based on any suggestion of improper conduct on his part. However, Council has concluded that in the interests of unity within the School, leadership renewal is required. While Council appreciates the significance of a change in leadership, we believe that it is in the best interests of the School and its students.'

- (c) Yes.
- (d) The value of the Synod's Governance Policy for Diocesan Organisations - which helps shared expectations to be understood.
- (e) These are listed on the School's website.
- (f) Yes.
- (g) The New South Wales Parliament has provided a legislative framework for our synod to carry out responsible and effective governance. The *Anglican Church of Australia Constitutions Act 1902* and the *Anglican Church of Australia (Bodies Corporate) Act 1938* empower our synod to make ordinances for order and good government within the Diocese, and to constitute such councils and committees as bodies corporate for the management and governance of our organisations. The Synod acknowledges that diocesan organisations should and have taken steps on their own to ensure proper and effective governance.

Nevertheless, the Synod as the 'parliament of the diocese' also has a responsibility to facilitate proper and effective governance as part of its oversight of all diocesan organisations. Currently, the Synod seeks to discharge this responsibility by electing a majority of the board or council members of diocesan organisations and by providing relevant guidelines and policies for diocesan organisations. The Governance Policy for Diocesan Organisations articulates the Synod's two broad expectations in the area of governance, namely seeking the highest standards of governance appropriate to the size

and nature of each organisation and, secondly pursuing the highest standards of governance to maximise the extent to which the objects of the organisation can be met.

An audit of each organisation's conformance to the Policy has recently been completed. The results are summarised in the Review of the Governance Policy for Diocesan Organisations Report received by the Synod on day 1.

- (h) The Synod should give thanks to God for the appointment of Dr John Collier as interim Principal. Synod can also pray for the wellbeing of all the students and their families, for unity among the staff of the School, for Dr Petterson and his family, for the Council and for the appointment of the next principal, asking that God would raise up a leader who is committed to seeing the gospel proclaimed and the School continue as a place of gospel hospitality.

5.11 Finances of Anglicare Community Services

Mr Chris Pettett asked the following question –

My question relates to the finances of Anglican Community Services (trading as Anglicare Sydney and will be referred to as Anglicare henceforward) and it is in a number of parts –

- (a) When was the last financial year Anglicare reported made a profit?
- (b) In the last five financial years, what has been the profit and loss reported?
- (c) What have been the reasons for the years of financial profit?
- (d) What have been the reasons for the years of financial loss?
- (e) What are the reasons why Anglicare began reporting the "change in fair value of its investment properties" as per the 2020-2021 financial report on page 14.
- (f) What are the reasons why Anglicare did not report the "change in fair value of investment properties" in the previous financial reports?
- (g) What is the difference in Anglicare's profit-loss within the 2020-2021 financial report if the "change in fair value of investment properties" had not been reported?
- (h) What is Anglicare's strategy to return to profit?
- (i) What is Anglicare's current debt?
- (j) What is Anglicare's current capacity to service that debt using its revenue streams?
- (k) What is Anglicare's current capacity to pay its debt without divesting its property portfolio?
- (l) What is Anglicare's current capacity to pay its debt that would include a strategy to divest its property portfolio?
- (m) Over how many years will Anglicare need to reduce its debt position to become sustainable against incoming revenues?
- (n) Does Anglicare project revenues to increase into the future? If so, what is that projection and from what revenue sources?
- (o) Does Anglicare's debt position impact its capability to deliver its services?
- (p) Is Anglicare still pursuing its 2028 strategy?
- (q) In percentage and dollar terms, what is the donor's giving as a revenue stream comparable to the rest of the revenue received into Anglicare?
- (r) Out of donations given to Anglicare, how much is spent on: the administration of donations, the salary of the donations team, donations events, contractors hired to support the donations team, marketing collateral produced for the donations team, and residual spend? To assist this answer, can this information please be itemized into dollar terms against total donations received?

To which the President replied –

I am informed that the answer is as follows –

- (a) The year ended 30 June 2021, Anglicare reported Total Comprehensive Income ('surplus') of \$46,476,000 for the year ended 30 June 2021.
- (b) The reported Total Comprehensive Income amounts in the five previous years have been –
Year ended 30 June

2021	Profit	\$46,476,000
2020	Loss	\$63,133,000
2019	Loss	\$15,801,000
2018	Profit	\$5,212,000
2017	Profit	\$13,502,000

Anglicare changed its accounting policy with respect to investment properties in the year ended 30 June 2021, the impact on the reported result in that year (and the comparative period) is set out in the notes to the accounts for that year (page 19).

- (c) In normal operating conditions Anglicare's various business activities will produce a small profit margin. This will be supplemented by income from investments and donations. That operating surplus will fund the cost of running various community, chaplaincy, pastoral care, support and parish partnership programs, in fulfilments of the objectives set out in Anglicare's constituting ordinance. (In the event there is no operating profit these are funded from Anglicare's retained earnings).

There will be a number of reasons that there are deviations from this –

- Asset values are volatile, investments are recorded at fair value and there will be years where values go up, and others where they go down;
- Sale of surplus assets can often generate a surplus; conversely, where assets are no longer of use, they may require a write-down;
- Anglicare has undertaken a significant program of capital expenditure and refurbishment, having old assets 'offline' and bringing new assets 'online' incurs significant additional operating costs for a transition period;
- Sectoral change. There has been significant decline in funding relative to costs and consequently in profitability in the residential aged care sector. This has developed over an extended period, but accelerating from 2018, and has resulted in the majority of the sector reporting losses. Residential Aged Care is the most significant activity Anglicare undertakes in terms of revenue and operating result;
- The significant levels of cost related to managing COVID-19 which cost well over \$10 million in FY20 and will do so again in FY22.

- (d) Refer answer above.

- (e) The change has been made to provide users of the financial statements and other stakeholders with a better understanding of the financial position of Anglicare's balance sheet (as noted on page 10 of the financial report).

The use of 'fair value reporting' of assets classified as investment properties, principally retirement villages, is consistent with the accounting treatment of similar assets by a significant number of other organisations (in both the 'for profit' and 'for purpose' sector).

This accounting treatment will produce a level of fluctuation in Anglicare's reported result as values are impacted by market factors and changes in economic conditions and outlook.

The movements may even look significant relative to Anglicare's net profit but are relatively minor as a percentage of an investment property portfolio valued at over \$2 billion.

The gains included in the reported result to 30 June 2021 are in large part related to a rebound in property values from declines reported in the previous financial year.

- (f) The inclusion of the change in fair value of investment properties is the result of adopting a change in accounting policy in the year ended 30 June 2021 and accounting for certain properties under AASB 140 *Investment Properties*.

Under the previous accounting policy Anglicare was not required to measure or disclose movements in fair value at the time the 30 June 2020 financial statements were prepared. The exercise is a complex one and would not generally be undertaken unless the amounts were required to be disclosed.

The impact on Anglicare's balance sheet as at 30 June 2020 and 2019 had AASB 140 been adopted in those years is shown in the 30 June 2021 financial statements (page 19),

and the comparative results for the year ended 30 June 2020 have been restated to show the results for that year on a like basis.

- (g) The reported result would have been a loss using the previous accounting basis – the positive change in value of investment properties of \$58,255,000 would be eliminated and an additional depreciation charge on those properties would have been incurred (as the calculation of depreciation was not performed at time of preparing the financial statements the amount of depreciation that would have been charged is not available).
- (h) The question pre-supposes that the profit resulting from a change in value of investment properties is somehow not a 'real' profit. That is not the case, it is an appropriate measure of the long-term value generated by Anglicare's management of its assets.

It is true however that Anglicare has experienced operating losses in its Residential Aged Care business. Anglicare operates in sector that continues to face very significant operating, staffing, regulatory and financial challenges. At the same time, it is an operation where Anglicare serves people at their most vulnerable and can make a significant impact in their lives – without operators like Anglicare many people would not be able to access the quality aged care they deserve.

Anglicare recognises the need to improve many aspects of its Residential Aged Care service, including financial outcomes, and is working towards that in a number of ways: with a new management team; in actively preparing for changes to be introduced in the sector over then next two years; by reviewing its operating systems and practises; by reviewing its facilities and withdrawing some services where appropriate. Anglicare continue to monitor the viability of the sector and at the same time are actively working to improve its performance within the constraints that exist.

- (i) Anglicare currently has bank debt facilities of approximately \$170 million drawn to approximately \$105 million.
- (j) Anglicare does not foresee any difficulty servicing its debt.
- (k) Anglicare does not need to divest property to service debt, and has not done so.

Anglicare will continue to divest properties that do not meet current service delivery requirements or future development needs, and similarly will continue to acquire other properties that allow Anglicare to expand its service delivery.

- (l) This has been addressed above – the capacity to pay debts and the divestment of property are not related.
- (m) Anglicare does not need to reduce its debt to be sustainable.

- (n) Over the last 6 years Anglicare has grown revenues consistently across all operational areas – the key challenge to profitability is not growth but the significant difficulty in delivering profitable residential aged care services in the current environment. The challenges here and Anglicare's plan to address this have been covered in the answers above.

Anglicare sees significant opportunities to expand its delivery of services to seniors and expects that the shape of that will continue to change – proportionally more emphasis on seniors in retirement living, increasingly with integrated care services; proportionally less emphasis on large format residential aged care services.

Anglicare is actively seeking to expand its reach to families, particularly those who are vulnerable and marginalised, and sees partnership with parishes as an increasingly important platform for doing this.

- (o) No.

Debt financing has enabled Anglicare to make a significant investment in social housing – the 550 dwellings Anglicare will deliver (of which over 500 are already operational) would not otherwise be a part of Anglicare's operations.

Anglicare also use short-term debt financing to accelerated delivery of new retirement village dwellings.

- (p) Anglicare is committed to the 'three pillars' underpinning that strategy – to see Christ honoured in all Anglicare does, to deliver services that transform the lives of its Customers, and to do this in a way that builds Community.

How Anglicare goes about its goals is something that should be under frequent re-appraisal. Anglicare's Board and management are currently working through an assessment how Anglicare can be most impactful – in the current environment, with the resources Anglicare has at its disposal – and what changes need to be made to deliver that effectively and sustainably into the future.

- (q) In the current financial year (ended 30 June 2022), donation income totaled \$10.2 million out of total revenue of \$417 million, or 2.4%.
- (r) In the current financial year Anglicare raised \$10.2 million in donations (including legacies and bequests) and incurred \$0.8 million in direct costs (marketing, event costs, etc) and \$1.2 million in salaries and costs related to running the team. No management overheads are allocated to the fundraising team, and the net amount is committed to current or future program expenditure.

5.12 General Synod Statutory Assessments

Mr Tim Tunbridge asked the following question –

What is the quantum of the General Synod statutory assessments payable by the Sydney Diocese to the national church for each of the years 2019, 2020, 2021 and 2022?

To which the President replied –

I am informed that the answer is as follows –

2019	\$481,252
2020	\$530,100
2021	\$530,106
2022	\$535,400

5.13 Synod membership

Mr Peter M G Young asked the following question –

- (a) How many individuals are entitled to attend this Synod (in September 2022) in aggregate?
- (b) How is this number divided into the different Parts (for example from 1 to 9 inclusive)?

To which the President replied –

I am informed that the answer is as follows –

- (a) 821
- (b) Part 4 = 253
Part 5 = 495
Part 6 = 7
Part 7 = 26
Part 8 = 28
Part 8A = 1
Part 9 = 11

5.14 Parishes operating under the 'hub and spoke' system

Mr Peter M G Young asked the following question –

- (a) Which parishes in the Diocese are currently operating under the "hub and spoke system", where the Rector concerned has oversight over more than one parish?
- (b) Are there any further arrangements proposed and, if so, which parishes are to be affected?

To which the President replied –

I am informed that the answer is as follows –

- (a) 'Hub and Spoke' is any arrangement where two or more Parishes come together to one Parish that then operates with multiple centres seeking to coordinate ministry and resources under one Rector and Parish Council to have effective gospel reach. As such, the Rector of a 'hub and spoke system' does not have oversight of more than one Parish. There are currently ten 'hub and spoke' parishes:

- Christ Church Inner West and Drummoyne
- Kirribilli and Neutral Bay
- Bondi and Waverly
- St George North and Bexley
- Chester Hill and Villawood
- Fairfield and Bossley Park
- Ingleburn and Glenquarie
- Wollongong and Corrimal
- Glenmore Park and Mulgoa
- St Mary's and St Clair

As well, three Parishes have developed a 'hub and spoke' arrangements with additional congregations in other areas:

- Soul Revival has four 'spokes'
- MBM has two 'spokes'
- Camden Valley has one 'spoke'

- (b) Presently 14 parishes are considering future 'hub and spoke' arrangements. Until the parishes make final decisions, it is not possible to give further information.

5.15 Lay Synod membership under Part 5

Mr Peter M G Young asked the following question –

- (a) With the reduction in the number of Part 4 Rectors entitled to attend this Synod, has the Diocese considered any plans to reduce the number of laity entitled to attend future Synods under Part 5?
- (b) If so, what plans have been or are being considered?

To which the President replied –

I am informed that the answer is as follows –

The question is out of order under rule 6.3(d) of the Synod standing orders as it contains an assertion.

The assertion in the question is false. There has not been any reduction in the number of Part 4 Rectors entitled to attend this Synod.

5.16 Long leases of Real Property

Mr Peter M G Young asked the following question –

- (a) How many long leases of real property of twenty-five (25) years or more have been granted by the Anglican Church Property Trust of Sydney in the past ten (10) years?
- (b) Where are they located?
- (c) To whom have they been granted?

To which the President replied –

I am informed that the answer is as follows –

- (a) Under the relevant ordinances, the ACPT has granted one (1) ground lease for a term of greater than 25 years during the past 10 years. In addition, the ACPT is in advanced negotiations in respect to two separate parishes regarding another two leases with terms each exceeding 25 years (assuming all options are exercised).
- (b) The ground lease approved during the past 10 years relates to church trust property at 118 Darlinghurst Road, Darlinghurst (expiring 2057 plus two 10 year options). The two ground leases under negotiation relate to church trust property located at 335 Cobbitty Road, Cobbitty (30 year term inclusive of options) and 75 Hawkesbury Rd, Westmead (99 years).
- (c) The Head Lessee of the ground lease approved over the past 10 years is a wholly owned special purpose subsidiary of HammondCare. The proposed Head Lessees of the two ground leases currently under negotiation are Learning Tree (Cobbitty) and Schools Infrastructure NSW (Westmead).

5.17 Proposed reconstitution of the Glebe Administration Board

Mr Peter M G Young asked the following question –

- (a) In what specific and detailed ways is it proposed that the Glebe Administration Board is to be reconstituted in order to avoid the risks of being the sole trustee of the Diocesan liquid assets, as envisaged in the Standing Committee's Report entitled Review of Diocesan Investment Strategy?
- (b) What are such particular risks, which are alluded to in the Report and its Attachments?

To which the President replied –

I am informed that the answer is as follows –

The question is out of order under rule 6.3(4) of the Synod standing orders as it contains assertions. Nevertheless, I am able to advise as follows.

- (a) There is no intention to reconstitute the GAB. The GAB is currently the sole trustee of \$200 million of liquid investment assets (being assets capable of being withdrawn at short notice). If the Synod passes the motion concerning the Diocesan Investment Strategy, the GAB will become the sole trustee of \$283 million of liquid investment assets. While there is no intention to reconstitute the GAB, the GAB will continue to review its membership in co-operation with the Standing Committee to ensure it collectively has the skills and experience necessary to effectively fulfil its role as trustee in whatever form the Synod determines.
- (b) A number of matters have been raised as risks and objections to establishing the GAB as the trustee of an amalgamated central investment vehicle for the Diocese. These can be summarised under the following 3 headings –

The risk of amalgamation outweighs the benefit

Amalgamation would prevent future differentiation of investment objectives

ACPT assets should not be held by another trustee for investment purposes

These matters have received extensive and careful consideration. A detailed response from the GAB to these matters can be found in Attachment 4 of the report to the Synod (which is posted on the Synod webpage). The Finance Committee's own conclusions in relation to these matters can be found in Attachment 3 of that report (Book 2, pages 102-104).

6. Questions

Questions were asked by the following members –

- (1) The Rev Dr Raj Gupta
- (2) Mrs Paula Turner
- (3) Professor Penelope Coombes
- (4) Professor Bernard Stewart AM
- (5) The Rev Michael Turner

- (6) The Rev James Warren
- (7) Mr James Flavin
- (8) The Rev Mike Doyle
- (9) The Rev Mike Doyle
- (10) The Rev Mike Doyle
- (11) The Rev Mike Doyle
- (12) The Rev Mike Doyle
- (13) Canon Alistair Seabrook
- (14) Canon Alistair Seabrook
- (15) Mr Chris Pettett
- (16) Mr Chris Pettett
- (17) The Rev David Clarke
- (18) The Rev Zac Veron
- (19) The Rev Dr Brian Tung

7. Notices of Motions

Notices of motions were given by the following members –

- (1) The Rev Roger Fitzhardinge
- (2) Mrs Nicola Fortescue
- (3) Mrs Nicola Fortescue
- (4) Professor Bernard Stewart AM
- (5) Dr Robert Tong AM

8. Procedural motions from members

8.1 **Arrangements for consideration of motion regarding the election of the Rev Darrell Parker as the next Bishop of the Diocese of North West Australia**

Dr Robert Tong AM moved the following procedural motion –

'Synod agrees to consider the motion for which notice was given today, regarding the election of the Rev Darrell Parker as the next Bishop of the Diocese of North West Australia, immediately following the consideration of M23 (Gospel Foundation Fund of the Diocese of North West Australia).'

Seconded and carried

9. Notice of motions

Notices of motions were given by the following members –

- (6) Mrs Patricia Jackson
- (7) The Rev Richard Blight
- (8) Mr Chris Hamam
- (9) Bishop Chris Edwards
- (10) The Rev Peter Tong

10. Calling of motions

The President called the motions in the order in which they appeared on the business paper, except those motions about a proposed ordinance or those motions to be considered at a time determined by the President.

10.1 **Arrangements for consideration of motion regarding holding surplus assets in trust for the purposes of the Diocese**

Mr Daniel Glynn moved –

'Synod, noting that the motion at M17 (Holding surplus ministry assets in trust for the purposes of the Diocese) has been moved, and an amendment to the motion has been moved by Mr Malcolm Purvis, agrees –

- (a) to allow the mover of the amendment to withdraw his amendment, and move instead the amendment in his name listed at M17 amendment (2), and
- (b) to allow the mover of the amendment to speak for up to five minutes to the amendment, prior to resuming debate on the matter,

and suspends so many of the Standing Orders as would prevent these arrangements.'

Seconded and carried

10.2 Fund 127 Work Outside the Diocese

Ms Lyn Bannerman moved –

'Synod requests that a report be provided to each ordinary session of the Synod in relation to Fund 127 ("Work Outside the Diocese"), advising which projects or organisations were funded, how much each received, and for what specific purpose(s).'

Seconded and carried

10.3 Mr Daniel Glynn

Bishop Michael Stead moved –

'Synod, noting that Mr Daniel Glynn has resigned as Diocesan Secretary and as the Secretary of the Synod with effect from the conclusion of this session, gives thanks to God for his faithful and committed service in these roles since 2017 and prior to that as Manager, Diocesan Services since 2014, and assures Mr Glynn of its prayers for him in his new role as Head of the Parishes and Operations Division of SDS.'

Seconded and carried by acclamation

The Rev Tom Hargreaves led the Synod in prayer for Mr Glynn.

10.4 Book launch regarding Canon John Chapman

The Rev Dominic Steele moved –

'Synod notes that Archbishop Kanishka Raffel will formally launch a book examining the life and legacy of Canon John Chapman, authored by the Rev Dr Baden Stace, at St Andrew's Cathedral, on Wednesday 14 September 2022, beginning at 1:00pm; and that all Synod members are warmly invited to attend.'

Seconded and carried

10.5 Doctrine Commission report on parish system

Archdeacon Anthony Douglas moved –

'Synod, in light of the anticipated growth of new communities in greenfields areas of the Diocese, the speed at which this growth is occurring, and the urgent need to plant churches to reach them, requests the Doctrine Commission to prepare a report on the parish system for the 2023 session of Synod, with special attention to:

- (a) its definition, history, theological rationale and pastoral objectives,
- (b) its relationship to a biblical ecclesiology that prioritises the local congregation as the arena for gospel mission and ministry, and
- (c) its continuing usefulness in a complex urban and semi-urban environment.'

Seconded and carried

10.6 Engagement with members of parliament

The Rev Mark Tough moved –

'Synod encourages each parish rector to make positive connections with their local state and federal members of parliament, so as to be in a position to engage on concerns such as religious freedom and other social issues as well as matters of public Christianity.'

Seconded and carried

11. Motions

11.1 The Rev Greg Peisley

The Rev Dominic Steele moved –

'Synod gives thanks for the life and ministry of the Rev Greg Peisley, former Rector of Pitt Town, and Rector of Arndell Community Church, who died of brain cancer in 2020. Greg planted the church in Arndell School out of Wilberforce Parish in 2000, which later moved to become Pitt Town Anglican Community Church. Under his leadership the ministry grew from 30 in 2000 to 300+ in 2020.

Synod gives thanks for Greg's integrity, passion, action and mission in service for Jesus, as a pastor, mission area leader & evangelist. Particularly we give thanks for the many who were saved and built up in Christ through Greg's ministry.

Synod prays for God's comfort to Greg's wife Sue and family as they grieve his death and undertake many changes in their life.'

Seconded and carried

Dr Terry Herder led the Synod in a prayer of thanks for the life of Mr Peisley.

11.2 Ministry Standards Ordinance 2017 Amendment Ordinance 2022

Mr Michael Easton moved –

'That the Ministry Standards Ordinance 2017 Amendment Ordinance 2022 be approved in principle.'

Seconded

Mr Easton spoke in support of the proposed ordinance.

The President asked –

'Does any member have a question about the proposed ordinance?'

There was a time for questions.

The President asked –

'Does any member wish to speak for or against the motion, or move an amendment to it?'

There was no member who wished to speak against the motion or move an amendment to it.

The motion that the ordinance be approved in principle was put and was carried.

The President asked –

'Does any member wish to move an amendment to the text of the proposed ordinance?'

A member of Synod indicated that they wished to move an amendment to the text of the proposed ordinance.

Mr Easton moved –

‘That Synod resolve itself into the Synod in Committee to consider the text of the proposed ordinance.’

Seconded and carried

The text of the proposed ordinance was considered by the Synod in Committee.

Before consideration of the text of the proposed ordinance in Committee had concluded, the Chair of Committee moved –

‘That the Chair of Committee leaves the chair and reports progress.’

Seconded and carried

The Chair of Committee reported progress to the Synod.

Mr Easton moved –

‘That the report of the Chair of Committee be adopted.’

Seconded and carried

Mr Easton moved as a procedural motion –

‘That this matter be deferred until a suitable time.’

Seconded and carried

12. Anglican Schools in the Diocese presentation

The Rev Tim Bowden, Miss Athena Jiang and Master Ben Mallin gave a presentation, including a video presentation, regarding Anglican Schools in the Diocese.

Archdeacon Simon Flinders led the Synod in prayer for the work of Anglican Schools in the Diocese.

Adjournment

At 5.48 pm, Archdeacon Simon Flinders moved –

‘That the Synod adjourn and resume at 7.00 pm tonight.’

Seconded and carried

Resumption

The Synod resumed at 7.00 pm.

13. Motions

13.1 Indigenous Ministry in the Diocese of Sydney

Having been granted leave, the Rev Michael Duckett moved –

'Synod, noting the report, 'Indigenous Ministry in the Diocese' and associated documents from the Synod Task Force for Indigenous Ministry in the Diocese of Sydney –

- (a) acknowledges and apologises for past failures in relationships with this nation's First Peoples,
- (b) supports and encourages every person from parishes and Diocesan organisations to seek reconciliation with Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples and commit to partner in Indigenous Ministry through development of an Action Plan which –
 - (i) is informed by the following diocesan documents –
 1. *A Theological Framework for Reconciliation, with Special Reference to The Indigenous Peoples of Australia* (Doctrine Commission Report, Diocese of Sydney, 2020)
 2. *Ministry to, and Reconciliation with, Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Peoples in the Diocese of Sydney* (Social Issues Committee Report, Diocese of Sydney)
 - (ii) notes the challenges provided in Dr Peter Adam's paper –
 3. *Australia – whose land? A call for recompense.* (The Rev Dr Peter Adam *John Saunders Lecture 2009*)
 - (iii) encourages the development of personal relationships with Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples with a view to *walk alongside* them, as well as partnering in prayer and partnering financially and in other practical ways with one or more Indigenous ministries,
- (c) notes and endorses the model for Indigenous ministry as envisaged by the Rev Michael Duckett and now established by the Sydney Anglican Indigenous People's Ministry Committee in the Macarthur Region at 19 Lysaght Rd Wedderburn, NSW,
- (d) noting the importance of ongoing and appropriate capital support for Indigenous ministry in the Diocese in order to purchase further suitable properties in the future, requests the Standing Committee to –
 - (i) consider and prioritise the needs of the SAIPMC in the allocation of funds for purchase of properties for new ministry infrastructure, and
 - (ii) report back to Synod in September 2023 with proposals to identify suitable property priorities to progress Indigenous ministry, along with the identified funding sources, for inclusion in the overall ministry infrastructure planning for the Diocese, and
- (e) requests that a review of the action outcomes from this report be brought to the Synod in 2024.'

Seconded

Ms Larissa Minniecon moved as an amendment –

'In paragraph (a), following the words "First Peoples", insert the words, "and affirms the call for the establishment of a First Nations' Voice enshrined in the Constitution and the need for Makarrata".'

Seconded

The Rev David Morgan moved as a procedural motion –

'Synod, noting the goodwill of the mover of the proposed amendment, agrees to treat the proposed amendment as a separate motion.'

Seconded

Dean Sandy Grant moved as an amendment to Mr Morgan's procedural motion –

'Omit the matter, "separate" and insert instead, the words "notice of".'

Seconded

Archdeacon Simon Flinders moved as an amendment to Mr Morgan's procedural motion –

'Immediately prior to the final full stop, insert the matter ', to be referred to the Sydney Anglican Indigenous Peoples' Ministry Committee for consideration.'

Seconded

Archdeacon Flinders' amendment to Mr Morgan's procedural motion was not carried.

Mr James Flavin moved as an amendment to Dean Grant's amendment to Mr Morgan's procedural motion –

'Immediately prior to the final full stop, insert the matter ', and requests the Order of Business committee to schedule consideration of the motion at a suitable time in consultation with members of the Sydney Anglican Indigenous Peoples' Ministry Committee.'

Seconded

Mr Flavin's amendment to Dean Grant's amendment was carried.

Dean Grant's amendment, as amended, was carried.

Mr Morgan's procedural motion, as amended, was carried in the following form –

'Synod, noting the goodwill of the mover of the proposed amendment, agrees to treat the proposed amendment as a notice of motion, and requests the Order of Business committee to schedule consideration of the motion at a suitable time in consultation with members of the Sydney Anglican Indigenous Peoples' Ministry Committee.'

The motion of Mr Duckett was carried without amendment.

13.2 **Recognising local Indigenous history**

Dean Sandy Grant moved –

'Synod –

- (i) recalling resolution 21/14 which among other things encouraged individual parishes to develop their own Reconciliation Action Plan, and
- (ii) noting the report "Ministry to, and Reconciliation with, Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Peoples in Diocese of Sydney Parishes" (especially paragraphs 39-56),

requests each parish to take concrete steps towards first identifying and then recognising the Indigenous history of the area in which their parish is situated, alongside any current identifiable Indigenous community, ministry or other significant matters of Indigenous concern in their area.'

Seconded and carried

13.3 **Church Land Acquisitions Levy Ordinance 2022**

Bishop Michael Stead moved as a procedural motion –

'Synod agrees to consider passing the Church Land Acquisition Levy Ordinance 2022 in the form attached to today's business paper and incorporating the following further amendment –

"In clause 6, omit the matter 'Archdeacon of the area (or their delegate)', and insert instead the matter, 'Archdeacon (or their delegate) of the area'."

and suspends so many of the Standing Orders as would prevent these arrangements.'

Seconded and carried

Bishop Michael Stead moved –

‘That the Church Land Acquisitions Levy Ordinance 2022 pass as an ordinance of the Synod.’

Seconded and carried

13.4 **Ministry Standards Ordinance 2017 Amendment Ordinance 2022**

Consideration of the Ministry Standards Ordinance 2017 Amendment Ordinance 2022 resumed.

Mr Easton moved –

‘That Synod resolve itself into the Synod in Committee to consider the text of the proposed ordinance.’

Seconded and carried

The text of the proposed ordinance was considered by the Synod in Committee. After consideration of the text had been completed, the Chair of Committee reported the proposed ordinance with amendments.

Mr Easton moved –

‘That the report of the Chair of Committees be adopted.’

Seconded and carried

Having been granted leave, Mr Easton moved –

‘That the Ministry Standards Ordinance 2017 Amendment Ordinance 2022 pass as an ordinance of the Synod.’

Seconded and carried

13.5 **Reportable Allegations and Convictions Ordinance 2022**

Mr Michael Easton moved –

‘That Synod agree to consider passing the Reportable Allegations and Convictions Ordinance 2022 formally.’

Seconded and carried

Mr Easton spoke in support of the proposed ordinance.

The President asked –

‘Does any member have a question about the proposed ordinance?’

There were no questions.

Mr Easton moved –

‘That the proposed ordinance pass formally as an ordinance of the Synod.’

Seconded and carried

13.6 **Safe Ministry Board Ordinance 2001 Amendment Ordinance 2022**

Having been granted leave, Ms Nicola Warwick-Mayo moved –

'That the Safe Ministry Board Ordinance 2001 Amendment Ordinance 2022 be approved in principle in a form incorporating the following amendment –

"In the definition of 'vulnerable person' in clause 2 of the Schedule, omit the words 'a child or'."

Seconded

Ms Warwick-Mayo spoke in support of the proposed ordinance.

The President asked –

'Does any member have a question about the proposed ordinance?'

There were no questions.

The President asked –

'Does any member wish to speak for or against the motion, or move an amendment to it?'

There was no member who wished to speak against the motion or move an amendment to it.

The motion that the ordinance be approved in principle was put and was carried.

The President asked –

'Does any member wish to move an amendment to the text of the proposed ordinance?'

There was no member who wished to move an amendment to the text of the proposed ordinance.

Ms Warwick-Mayo moved –

'That the Safe Ministry Board Ordinance 2001 Amendment Ordinance 2022 pass as an ordinance of the Synod.'

Seconded and carried

13.7 **Ministry Standards and Safe Ministry Amendment Ordinance 2022**

Ms Nicola Warwick-Mayo moved –

'That Synod agree to consider passing the Ministry Standards and Safe Ministry Amendment Ordinance 2022 formally, in a form incorporating the following amendment –

"Omit paragraph 2(o)".'

Seconded and carried

Ms Warwick-Mayo spoke in support of the proposed ordinance.

The President asked –

'Does any member have a question about the proposed ordinance?'

There were no questions.

Ms Warwick-Mayo moved –

'That the proposed ordinance pass formally as an ordinance of the Synod.'

Seconded and carried

13.8 **Standing Committee Ordinance 1897 and Synod Membership Ordinance 1995 Amendment Ordinance 2022**

Having been granted leave, Bishop Michael Stead moved –

‘That Synod agree to consider passing the Standing Committee Ordinance 1897 and Synod Membership Ordinance 1995 Amendment Ordinance 2022 formally, in a form incorporating the amendments shown in marked form on today’s business paper.’

Seconded and carried

Bishop Stead spoke in support of the proposed ordinance.

The President asked –

‘Does any member have a question about the proposed ordinance?’

There was a time for questions.

Bishop Stead moved –

‘That the proposed ordinance pass formally as an ordinance of the Synod.’

Seconded and carried

13.9 **General Synod – Episcopal Standards (Child Protection) (Amendment) Canon 2022 Adopting Ordinance 2022**

Mr Garth Blake AM SC moved –

‘That Synod agree to consider passing the General Synod – Episcopal Standards (Child Protection) (Amendment) Canon 2022 Adopting Ordinance 2022 formally.’

Seconded and carried

Mr Blake spoke in support of the proposed ordinance.

The President asked –

‘Does any member have a question about the proposed ordinance?’

There were no questions.

Mr Blake moved –

‘That the proposed ordinance pass formally as an ordinance of the Synod.’

Seconded and carried

13.10 **Accessibility Guidelines**

The Rev Dr Andrew Errington moved –

‘Synod, noting the Accessibility Guidelines produced by Dr Louise Gosbell and the Social Issues Committee –

- (a) gives thanks for the work of all those involved in developing the Accessibility Guidelines,
- (b) encourages Parish Councils to give consideration to the Guidelines in order to make their parish a welcoming and accessible place for all of the community.’

Seconded and carried by acclamation

Adjournment

At 9.28 pm, Archdeacon Simon Flinders moved –

‘That the Synod adjourn and resume at 3.15 pm tomorrow.’

Seconded and carried

We certify that, to the best of our recollection, these minutes are a correct record of the Synod's proceedings.

Two Members of the)
Minute Reading Committee)

Signed by the President

14 September 2022

DRAFT