How the Rich Achieve Real-World Asset Protection in Australia

How to Survive Creditors and ATO Escape Financial Ruin

RISKPROTECTOR.COM.AU

An Australian Guide to Asset Protection Lawful Strategies, To Protect What You've Spent a Lifetime Building.

The RiskProtector.com.au

riskprotector.com.au | admin@riskprotector.com.au

DISCLAIMER AND IMPORTANT NOTICE

This eBook is published by Risk Protector, the trading name of an independent sole practitioner consultancy operating online as riskprotector.com.au. Risk Protector is not an incorporated company. It does not hold an Australian Financial Services Licence (AFSL), an Australian Credit Licence, an Australian legal practising certificate, an Australian tax agent registration or any other professional licence regulated by ASIC, the Tax Practitioners Board, the Legal Services Commission or any equivalent state-based regulator.

The information in this eBook is not legal advice. It is not financial advice. It is not taxation advice. It is not a financial product recommendation. It is not a credit recommendation. It is not personal advice within the meaning of section 766B of the Corporations Act 2001 (Cth). Nothing in this ebook should be construed as personal advice tailored to the reader's individual circumstances, financial situation, objectives or needs.

Before acting on any information, strategy, framework, structure or approach described in this ebook, the reader must obtain independent professional advice from a qualified solicitor, accountant, financial adviser or other appropriately licensed practitioner who has considered the reader's specific circumstances. Risk Protector accepts no responsibility for any loss, damage, liability or expense arising directly or indirectly from any reliance on information contained in this publication.

These services are educational and structural in nature and are not regulated financial, legal or taxation advisory services. Engagements with Risk Protector are designed to be used alongside the reader's own licensed professional advisers, not as a substitute for them.

All scenarios involving fictional directors, businesses, advisers and other parties in this ebook, including any references to David Whitfield, Mark, Linda, Roger Pellan, Megan or any other named character, are illustrative composite characters created for educational purposes only. They do not represent any real person, living or deceased. Any resemblance to actual persons or events is coincidental.

Examples of legislation, case law, regulatory provisions, tax obligations, court procedures or enforcement processes described in this eBook reflect Australian law as the author understands it at the date of publication. Legislation and case law change. The reader is responsible for confirming the current legal position with a qualified professional before relying on any reference contained in this publication.

By reading this eBook the reader acknowledges and accepts these terms.

Dedication

This book is dedicated to Australian directors and business owners who have something worth protecting. If you have built a business, accumulated personal assets, signed personal guarantees or set up a trust at any point, this book is for you.

If you are running a small operation with no real assets or exposure, this book isn't for you and you can put it down with our blessing.

To Australian working directors and business owners, who carry the responsibility without the protection.

Foreword

There's a particular moment in this work that occurs over and over again. A director sits across the table after the assessment is done. The exposures have been laid out. The structural picture has been mapped. Sometimes the picture is benign. Often it isn't. The director takes a long breath, looks at the page in front of them and asks the question that almost every director eventually asks.

"Why has nobody told me this before?"

It's the right question. It deserves an honest answer. The answer isn't that their accountant has been negligent or that their solicitor has been hiding things from them. The answer is that the conversation they needed to have with someone, often falls between the engagement scopes of the licensed professions.

Their accountant's licence and engagement scope don't extend to it. Their solicitor responds to instructions, not to what hasn't been instructed. Their financial planner operates inside a regulatory boundary that doesn't include structural advisory work.

The conversation falls into the gap and stays there. The directors who eventually have that conversation are either the ones already hurt by not having it sooner, or the ones who've stumbled, by accident or referral, into a structural advisory engagement that finally tells them what their other professionals don't.

That gap is what this book exists to close, on paper, for any director or business owner who hasn't yet had the conversation in person. The structural awareness on these pages is the same awareness riskprotector.com.au engagements deliver, simplified into prose, illustrated through the story of one fictional director walking the territory step by step.

Reading the book isn't a substitute for the work itself. But it's the first step and the first step is often the hardest one to find.

If even a small number of readers close this book and choose to do the structural work in calm conditions rather than under pressure, before any letter ever lands in their letterbox, the book will have served the purpose for which it was written.

The Risk Protector Advisory Team

riskprotector.com.au

About the Risk Protector Advisory Team

The work behind this book draws on a particular kind of experience. Not theoretical. Not academic. Not learned from textbooks. Lived. Across the founders of the riskprotector.com.au consultancy, that experience adds up to more than 150 years of building, structuring, restructuring, defending, listing, losing and protecting Australian businesses.

That includes the years when things went well and the years when they didn't, because both kinds teach things the other kind can't. One founder spent five decades inside Australian businesses as an owner, director, founder and capital raiser. Multiple ASX listings. Over $150 million capital raised. Recognition by the Australian Financial Review for entrepreneurial achievement. The lessons drawn from that career include the lessons of structures that worked and structures that didn't, of advisers who saw the threats, advisers who missed them and of the personal cost of being on the wrong side of a structural exposure when it matters most.

The other founding partner brings a different shape of experience. Decades of senior advisory work focused specifically on the technical architecture that turns intent into durable legal structure. International structuring across multiple jurisdictions. Complex trust drafting where the difference between protection and exposure can come down to a single clause. Generational wealth preservation across multiple generations. The kind of detailed work that no one notices, when it's done properly. When it's done badly, it costs the family everything.

The combination is deliberate. One founder brings the hard-won pattern recognition of someone who's lived the threats from inside the director's chair. The other brings the technical depth of someone who's drafted the structures that absorb those threats when they arrive. Neither perspective alone is enough. Together they produce a consultancy that can identify the threats and builds the structures that respond to them.

Around the founding partners sits a network of specialist professionals. Senior CPA or CA accountants for the technical tax work. Specialist solicitors where legal drafting requires practitioner authority. Insolvency practitioners where the situation calls for their specific accreditation. Forensic investigators when the situation calls for them. riskprotector.com.au coordinates these specialists alongside your own professionals into a coherent strategic response. The consultancy doesn't replace anyone in that picture. It sits above them all, providing the structural overview that none of them, individually, are positioned to provide.

The fees, when an engagement proceeds, reflect the lean operating model. There's no city office to pay for. There's no traditional reception desk. The consultancy operates online from secure document handling and direct email contact. The cost saving, when compared to equivalent traditional practices, is significant and allows the consultancy to work with directors anywhere in Australia rather than only those within commuting distance of a particular city.

What we offer isn't legal advice. It isn't financial advice. It isn't taxation advice. We don't hold an Australian Financial Services Licence. We don't hold an Australian Credit Licence. We don't operate as solicitors. We provide structural architecture, strategic mentoring and draft document preparation, used alongside our clients' licensed advisers, in the gap the licensed professions aren't positioned to fill. That's the work. That's what this book describes. That's what we do.

Welcome and How This Book Works

Why This Book Exists

This book exists because the same conversation keeps happening. A director comes to a riskprotector.com.au engagement believing their structures are protecting them. Within thirty minutes of the assessment, the director's response is almost always the same. They go quiet, look down and say some version of the same thing: "Why did nobody tell me this was possible?"

The answer isn't simple but it isn't complicated either. The licensed professionals operate within defined engagement scopes. There's a gap between what those scopes cover and what a director actually needs to be protected. This book exists to fill that gap.

Who Wrote This Book

The riskprotector.com.au founders bring more than seven decades of combined experience across Australian business, ASX listings, capital raisings, ATO enforcement, business turnarounds and asset protection. The founders have built businesses valued at over $1 billion.

We have personally been on the receiving end of the situations this book describes. We know what works and what doesn't because we have watched it play out, in our own businesses and in the businesses of the directors we work with.

We work in the space. Everything we share in this book has been tested against real situations involving real directors and real outcomes.

How to Read It

The chapters are short, written in plain Australian English and follow a single recurring fictional director called David Whitfield through the experience of structural exposure. Through David's eyes you will see the warning signs, the moment of crisis and the decisions that determine whether a director keeps what they have built or loses it.

David is fictional. Every detail of his story has been drawn from real engagements riskprotector.com.au has been involved in over the years.

The Bonus Chapter

At the end of this book is a bonus chapter on the SWANS Framework, the most advanced estate protection structure currently available under Australian law. We have placed it at the end deliberately. By the time you reach it you will understand why every layer matters.

Contents

PART ONE

The Threat Landscape

Part One explains the threat landscape. Not in abstract terms but in specific terms. The exact mechanisms through which Australian directors lose their personal assets when they thought those assets were safe. The pathways are well-documented. The tools used to walk those pathways are publicly known. The only thing missing for most directors is someone to point them out.

Chapter 1.
Why Did Nobody Tell Me This Was Possible?

Author's note: David Whitfield is a fictional director created for the purposes of this book. His situation is a composite drawn from real riskprotector.com.au engagements. The names, places and dollar amounts have been changed. Everything else is real.

David Whitfield is sitting at his kitchen table at five past eleven on a Tuesday night. The house is quiet. His wife Megan is asleep upstairs. There's half a glass of red on the table beside him and an envelope. The envelope arrived that afternoon. He opened it after dinner. It's from the ATO.

David is 56. He's run his Brisbane engineering services business for nineteen years. Eleven employees, a yard out at Eagle Farm, two trucks, contracts with three of the major Queensland infrastructure builders. Last year his turnover crossed $4 million for the first time.

It didn't happen by accident. Two of these infrastructure contracts were new, won on the capability David didn't quite have yet when he bid for them. He bought equipment. He put the staff through retraining. The investment was real and the contracts delivered and the turnover proves that. What the turnover doesn't show is the gap that opened up while he was getting there.

The ATO payments started slipping about eighteen months ago. PAYG first, then superannuation guarantee charges. Not ignored, deferred. The cashflow was committed elsewhere and David made a call that most directors in a growth phase make without fully understanding what it costs them.

His part-time bookkeeper Karen told him about the debt. More than once. He knows the number. He's been watching it and telling himself he'll square it off once the second contract hits its next milestone payment. His external accountant reviewed last year's accounts in October, signed off on a clean set of financials and told him the business was in good shape. The trading figures are solid. The accountant isn't wrong about the trading figures. Nobody in that conversation was looking at David's personal exposure. That isn't what accountants are engaged to do.

The letter on the table is a Director Penalty Notice. A Non-Lockdown DPN. The distinction matters enormously, though David doesn't know that yet. Unlike a Lockdown DPN, which immediately fixes the company liability to the director, a Non-Lockdown DPN gives him options. But those options have a hard deadline.

The ATO is notifying him that he is personally liable for $187,400, covering unpaid PAYG withholding, GST and superannuation guarantee amounts. He has 21 days from the date on the letter to act. If he pays the debt, appoints a liquidator, or places the company into voluntary administration within that window, the personal liability can be extinguished.

If he does nothing, the debt locks onto him personally at the end of day 21. At that point the ATO can pursue recovery against him directly, including the family home.

David reads the letter four times. The house in Bulimba keeps coming back to him. The one he bought in 2003. The one where his daughter learned to ride a bike on the front path. The one where Megan still potters around the garden Sunday mornings. That house. The ATO can come for the family home.

What David doesn't know yet, sitting at that kitchen table, is that the situation he is now in was completely avoidable. Every protection he needed could have been put in place years ago. The structures exist. Other Australian directors with the same exposure use them right now. David didn't because nobody ever sat down with him and told him they existed.

His accountant didn't tell him. His solicitor didn't tell him. The financial planner he saw briefly in 2019 talked about super and life insurance and shook his hand at the door.

Not one of them told David what he is about to learn the hard way. That a Director Penalty Notice doesn't care about the corporate veil. That his trust deed has flaws that have been sitting there for sixteen years. That the family home he believed was protected because Megan's name was on the title is completely reachable.

That the personal guarantee he signed for the equipment finance in 2021 never expired. And that buried in the finance agreement was a clause he'd never read: that if another creditor, like the ATO, took action against him personally, the entire facility became payable immediately and in full.

The Question David is About to Ask

In about six weeks, after he has spoken with three different solicitors and two new accountants, David will sit across from someone who actually understands his structural position. By then the 21-day window will have closed.

The debt will have attached to him personally and the Non-Lockdown DPN will have converted to a Lockdown DPN, the point of no return, where the options that existed six weeks earlier no longer do. He will spend ninety minutes describing his business, his structures, his trust, his property and his guarantees.

The other person will mostly listen, ask seven or eight specific questions and at the end of the conversation will explain to David, in a way nobody has ever explained to him before, exactly where he stands and exactly what could have been done about it.

And David will ask the question every director asks at that moment.

Why did nobody tell me this was possible?

It's not a rhetorical question. It's a real, uncomprehending, slightly angry, slightly grief-stricken question, asked by a man who has just discovered that everything he assumed was protecting him was doing nothing of the sort and that the protection he actually needed was sitting right there the whole time.

This book exists to answer that question for the directors and business owners who haven't had to ask it yet.

Three Flaws Hidden in David's Trust Deed

When David hands his sixteen-year-old trust deed to someone who knows what to look for, that person will tell him three things he didn't know.

First, the deed names David himself as sole appointor with no backup. If he is bankrupted, that role transfers to his trustee in bankruptcy. The trust David thought was protecting his family becomes the most efficient mechanism for liquidating it.

Second, the deed contains no proper protection against beneficiary bankruptcy. If any named beneficiary becomes bankrupt, that beneficiary's entitlement to trust distributions can be claimed by their bankruptcy trustee.

Third, the deed allows the trustee to borrow money and to conduct trade. Neither power has ever been used. But the powers are there and their existence allows the trust to be argued in court as a trading entity in its own right, exposing it to creditor claims like any trading business.

Three failures, sitting inside David's trust deed, undetected, for sixteen years. The fact that none of them have been exploited yet doesn't mean they won't be. It means they haven't been, yet.

When David asks his accountant about it, his accountant will pause for slightly too long, then say "that's outside my mandate." That answer is technically correct. It's also the answer that has cost David and tens of thousands of other directors like him more than any other single sentence in Australian professional services.

A Question for You

Right now, before you read another sentence, here is a question for you to answer honestly. If you were bankrupted next month, do you actually know who would become appointor of your trust? Have you read your own trust deed in the last five years? Do you know whether your trust permits trading or borrowing and, if so, whether the protection you're counting on is already gone?

If you can't answer those questions, you're in the same position David Whitfield was in at five past eleven on that Tuesday night. The difference is that David didn't know there were questions to ask until after the letter arrived. You're being given the questions now. What you do with them is up to you. Ignoring them is the choice David made, unintentionally, for sixteen years. Let's begin.

Let's begin.

> If you're sitting where David is sitting, the A13 Structural Vulnerability and Risk Exposure Analysis will show you exactly where you stand. 13 questions. Free. Start at riskprotector.com.au.

Chapter 2.
What Your Advisers Aren't Telling You

It's 7.20am Wednesday. David hasn't slept. The letter is still on the kitchen table where he left it. The glass from last night is still beside it, empty. Megan finds him there. He hasn't told her yet. He's been waiting until 9am to call Roger P., his accountant who's been doing his books for fourteen years, the man who signed off on last year's accounts in October and told him the business was in good shape.

David rings Roger at five past nine. Roger picks up on the second ring, hears David's voice and goes quiet for a moment when David reads out the heading on the letter. Roger says he'll come over at lunchtime. He sounds careful. The conversation lasts forty seconds.

When Roger arrives at the Eagle Farm yard at twelve thirty he reads the letter slowly, all the way through, twice. Then he sets it down and says four words David will never forget.

"This is outside my mandate."

David doesn't quite understand what that means. He asks Roger to explain. Roger does, carefully, choosing his words. He tells David that what's just landed on his desk is a structural matter, not a tax matter. The numbers on the page are tax numbers, but the response to those numbers, the protection of David's personal position, the strategy for what to do next, that's in a different lane. Roger doesn't work in that lane. He never has.

David sits there. He's paid Roger somewhere between $8,000 and $12,000 a year for fourteen years. Across that fourteen-year stretch he's paid Roger more than $140,000. And in this moment, the moment David needs an answer, Roger has just told him plainly that this isn't his problem to solve.

It's not because Roger is unhelpful or unprofessional. It's because Roger’s Tax Agent Registration, issued under the Tax Agent Services Act 2009 and administered by the Tax Practitioners Board and a professional indemnity policy and a code of conduct that limit what he's allowed to advise on. Because that Tax Agent Registration is his livelihood. The day Roger loses his registration is the day he stops being an accountant. Any advice that could be interpreted as tax minimisation or avoidance, particularly around corporate or trust structuring, is something Roger simply won't touch. He never has, and he never will.

David asks Roger if there was anything Roger could have told him before this. Anything that might have changed the outcome. Roger looks down at the letter. He says, eventually, that there were probably some things. But raising them with David would have been outside his engagement scope and his professional indemnity insurance wouldn't have covered the advice. He says it the way an honest man says something he knows sounds wrong but is true anyway.

What Your Adviser Is Engaged to Do

Most directors don't understand what their adviser is actually paid to do. They assume that because they pay an accountant or a solicitor, that adviser is looking out for them in a general, protective sense. The truth is much narrower.

Before any of that, there is the engagement letter. Most people sign it without reading it. It is usually several pages long, set in small print and packed with clauses that exist for one purpose: to protect the adviser. Limitation of liability clauses.

Scope exclusions. Disclaimers that make clear the adviser is responsible only for the specific task described, nothing more. These clauses are not accidental. They are carefully drafted by the firm's own lawyers and they are designed to make it as difficult as possible for a client to come back at them later. Most clients never read them. Most clients have no idea what they signed.

Your accountant is engaged to prepare your tax returns, lodge your BAS, manage your reporting obligations and keep you compliant with the ATO.

That's the contract. That's what the engagement letter says. That's what their fee covers. They're paid to look at last year's numbers and make sure those numbers are reported correctly. They aren't paid to assess your structural exposure, audit your trust deed, identify your weak points or develop a personal protection strategy.

Your solicitor is engaged to act on specific instructions you've given them. If you instruct them to draft a contract, they draft the contract. If you instruct them to handle a property settlement, they handle it. If you don't instruct them to review your trust deed, they don't review it. If you don't instruct them to identify your structural exposures, they don't identify them. They respond to instructions and it's on the client to know what to ask for.

Your financial planner, if you have one, holds an Australian Financial Services licence with a scope set by the ASIC. They can advise on superannuation, life insurance and investment products. They can't advise on how to structure your trust to defeat a creditor attack. Their licence simply doesn't cover it.

None of these professionals are villains. Each one is doing exactly what they're paid and licensed to do. But add it all up and something is still missing. There's a gap between the sum of their work and the protection you actually need. That gap has a cost and directors pay it.

What Your Adviser Knows but Hasn't Told You

First, the engagement scope. They're not paid to do that work. Pointing out structural vulnerabilities outside their engagement scope may open them up to professional risk if the advice turns out to be wrong, incomplete or inconvenient for you to act on. Most accountants have been trained, by their professional bodies and by their indemnity insurers, to stay strictly inside their lane.

Second, the awkwardness. Telling a long-term client that their structure has fundamental weaknesses can sound like criticism. It can also sound like a sales pitch for additional services the client didn't ask for. Most accountants would rather avoid the conversation entirely than have it badly. And so the gaps stay open.

So they say nothing. And year after year your structure sits there, ageing quietly, accumulating risk while the law shifts and the ATO's enforcement appetite sharpens around it.

The Conversation You'll Never Have With Your Accountant

Imagine the conversation you'd actually want to have. You sit down with your accountant. You ask them, plainly, the following question. "If everything went wrong tomorrow, what would happen to my personal assets?" That's the question. And then you wait for an honest answer.

What you'd want to hear is something like this. "David, here's where you stand. Your trust deed names you as sole appointor with no successor. If you're bankrupted, the trust falls under the control of your trustee in bankruptcy. The family home is in joint names with Megan, which provides some protection but not the protection you think it provides.

You signed a personal guarantee for the equipment finance in 2021 and it's still active. Your operating company carries the trading risk and there's no buffer between the company and your personal position. If a Director Penalty Notice ever lands, here's what would happen, step by step, over the next twenty-one days."

What you'll actually hear, if you were to ask that question, is something much more careful. Your accountant will typically tell you that those questions are outside their scope of advice and suggest you speak to a solicitor. Most solicitors will want specific instructions before they can review anything.

They'll quote you a fee. You'll think about it. You won't proceed because nothing has gone wrong yet and the fee feels like an indulgence. The conversation never happens. And then one day a letter arrives in the post. And the conversation that should have happened years ago becomes the conversation you wish you'd paid any amount of money to have.

Why This Book Exists

This eBook exists to have this conversation with you now, before the letter arrives. It exists because no single professional in the system as it stands is positioned to have this conversation with you. Your accountant can't raise it because their engagement scope doesn't extend that far. Your solicitor won't raise it because you haven't instructed them to. Your financial planner can't raise it with you because their licence doesn't cover it.

riskprotector.com.au sits in that gap.

We're not solicitors, accountants or financial planners. We don't compete with any of them. What we do is the work that falls outside every one of their scopes. We work with directors to have the conversation the rest of the system won't.

The chapters that follow take you through the territory step by step. The Director Penalty Notice and how it actually works. ATO debt and the enforcement sequence. Personal guarantees and what they really mean. Trust structures and where they fail. Asset protection and how to build it properly. Each chapter is short, written plainly, designed to give you what no single person in your existing advisory team is positioned to tell you.

What David Does Next

After Roger leaves, David sits at his desk for the rest of the afternoon. He doesn't open his email. He doesn't return calls. He searches online but the results are useless. Insolvency practitioners wanting to liquidate his company. Solicitors offering hourly consultations he can't afford. Tax debt websites that look like scams. Nothing that fits what he's actually facing.

By 4pm he's still no closer to knowing what to do. He picks up the phone and starts working through his contacts. A friend who runs a larger civil contracting business listens for about two minutes before cutting in: "You need to talk to someone who actually does this work. Let me make a call." An hour later David has a name and a number. Not a solicitor or an accountant. A structural advisory consultancy that handles exactly this kind of situation.

That conversation is exactly what this book is going to walk you through over the next sixteen chapters. The questions that get asked. The answers that come back. The structural changes recommended and the order they happen in. What it costs and what it protects. By the end of this ebook you'll know exactly what was on the table for David, what's on the table for you and what to do next.

A Question for You

Before you read on, one question. If you walked into your accountant's office tomorrow and asked them, plainly, "If my business failed, what would happen to my personal assets?", what would they say? If you can't predict their answer with confidence, that uncertainty is the gap this book fills. Read on..

> If you couldn't predict your accountant's answer with confidence, the A13 will identify the gap that uncertainty represents. 13 questions. Free. Start at riskprotector.com.au.

Chapter 3.
The Voidable Transaction Problem

It's 5.40pm Wednesday. David is still at his desk. The number his friend gave him is written on the back of a tax invoice. He picks up the phone and dials. A voice answers on the third ring. David explains the situation in twenty seconds. The voice on the other end says "Have you transferred anything into your wife's name in the last few years? The house, a car, money? Anything at all?"

David goes still. Six months ago he transferred the family home into Megan's sole name. A mate told him it was worth doing. He paid the stamp duty, conveyancing fees, the works. He'd thought he was being smart.

David didn't think much more about it after that. The voice on the phone asks him a second question. "What was the date of the transfer? And what was the property worth at the time?" David answers. There's a pause. "That transfer may be voidable. A Trustee in Bankruptcy has the power to set it aside and recover the property. We need to talk about that before anything else."

This is how most directors learn what a voidable transaction is. Not from their accountant. Not from their solicitor. From a phone call when it's already too late to do anything about it.

What a Voidable Transaction Is

A voidable transaction is any transfer of an asset out of your name that a Trustee in Bankruptcy or a liquidator can reverse after the fact. The transfer might have been completely legal at the time. The title might be properly registered. The conveyancer or solicitor who handled it might have done everything correctly. None of that protects the transfer from being undone if you go bankrupt or your company goes into liquidation.

The law that governs this sits in the Bankruptcy Act 1966 and the Corporations Act 2001. Sections 120, 121 and 122 of the Bankruptcy Act cover transfers by individuals. Sections 588FA through 588FE of the Corporations Act cover transfers by companies. These provisions give a

Trustee in Bankruptcy or a liquidator the power to apply to court to set aside a transfer that meets certain criteria.

The criteria are simpler than you might expect. If the transfer happened within the claw-back period before bankruptcy or liquidation and the asset was transferred for less than market value or with the intention of defeating creditors, the transfer can be unwound. The Trustee or liquidator obtains a court order and the asset comes back into the bankruptcy estate or the liquidation pool to be sold and distributed to creditors.

The claw-back periods vary depending on the type of transaction, who the parties are and which Act applies. They range from two years to ten years and in some cases, where the intention to defeat creditors can be shown, there is no fixed limit at all. The specific period that applies to any given transfer is something a qualified insolvency lawyer needs to assess.

What makes voidable transactions so dangerous is the timing. You don't have to be in financial trouble at the time you make the transfer. The trouble can come along years later. If it arrives within the claw-back period, the transfer can still be reversed.

The Claw-Back Periods You Need to Know

Claw-back periods are set in legislation. They're not negotiable. They don't depend on what you were told at the time. They depend on the type of transaction and the relationship between the parties.

Under the Bankruptcy Act:

For an undervalued transfer to a related party, meaning your spouse, your children, a family trust or a related company, the claw-back period under the Bankruptcy Act is four years before the date of bankruptcy. For an undervalued transfer to an unrelated third party, it's two years. For a transfer made with the intention of defeating creditors, there's no time limit at all. If the intention can be proven, the transfer can be unwound no matter how long ago it happened.

Under the Corporations Act the periods are different:

Unfair preferences look back six months. Uncommercial transactions look back two years for unrelated parties and four years for related parties. Transactions intended to defeat creditors look back ten years.

Read those numbers slowly.

Four years. Ten years.

The transfer you made when everything looked fine. The transfer you forgot about. The transfer that seemed like sensible planning at the time. All of it can be brought before a court and unwound years later, long after you've moved on, if a creditor decides to pursue it hard enough.

Why David's Transfer Is in Trouble

David transferred the family home into Megan's sole name six months ago. He's well inside both claw-back periods. The conveyancer used the standard "natural love and affection" wording on the transfer document. That's not market value. Under section 120 of the Bankruptcy Act, this is an undervalued transfer.

If David becomes bankrupt, whether voluntarily or on a creditor's petition, at any point in the next three and a half years, the Trustee in Bankruptcy can apply to set the transfer aside. The house comes back into David's bankrupt estate. It gets sold. The proceeds go to creditors. Megan loses the protection she thought she had. The money spent on stamp duty and the conveyancer is wasted. The strategy that David thought would shield his home does nothing at all.

The timing makes it worse. David transferred the property six months ago. His company was already carrying ATO debt when he did it. Based on these facts a court will consider a straightforward question: was this transfer made to put the home beyond the reach of creditors? If that argument gets traction, it doesn't just support a section 120 claim. It opens the door to a separate attack on the transfer with no time limit at all.

David didn't do anything criminal. He followed a process. He acted in good faith. None of that helps him now. The law doesn't weigh good faith. It looks at what was transferred, what was received in return and how close the transfer was to insolvency.

The Transfers People Make Without Realising

Most directors who end up in trouble have made at least one voidable transfer in the years before things went wrong. They've made the transfer for ordinary reasons. Estate planning. Tax efficiency. Marital arrangement. Family financial management. The transfer is rarely sinister. It's often suggested by an accountant or financial planner who hasn't thought through the structural implications.

Here are the transfers that come up most often. The family home being moved into a spouse's sole name. Investment properties being transferred into a family trust at undervalued prices. Cash being moved out of personal accounts into a spouse's account or a child's account. Cars and boats being registered in a family member's name. Business shares being transferred to a related entity. Loans to a family trust that get "forgiven" or treated as gifts.

Each of these can be perfectly legitimate if structured properly and undertaken at a time when the director isn't carrying material personal exposure. Each of them is potentially voidable if the timing is wrong, the consideration is inadequate or the intent can be questioned.

If you've made any transfer of this kind in the last four years, the time to assess it is now, before any creditor or regulator turns their attention to your affairs. Once trouble starts, the transfer is locked in. You can't "undo" it in a way that improves your position. Trying to reverse it after a creditor has noticed it usually makes things worse.

What Real Asset Protection Looks Like

Real asset protection isn't a transfer made six months before insolvency. Real asset protection is a structure built years before any trouble appears, designed from the start to hold assets outside your personal estate, with proper consideration, with documentation that withstands scrutiny and with a structural logic that doesn't depend on hiding anything from anyone.

A properly structured family trust, established at a time when you have no creditor pressure, holding assets that have been correctly settled or sold to it at market value, with the trust deed properly drafted and the appointor and trustee roles correctly allocated, is durable. It survives a Trustee in Bankruptcy review because there's nothing voidable about it. Every step has been done properly. Every transaction is at arm's length. Every asset has been held by the trust for long enough that no claw-back period applies.

The same logic applies across every structural tool that works, whether that's an asset protection company, a properly drafted appointor protocol, a structure designed to shield company assets or anything else. The work has to be done early. It has to be documented properly. It has to survive the test of being examined by hostile parties years after the fact.

The shortcut transfers, the last-minute moves, the "quick fix" suggestions from advisers who haven't thought it through, those are the ones that fail. Those are the ones that get clawed back. Those are the ones that leave the director in a worse position than if they'd done nothing at all.

What David Hears Next

David is still on the phone. The voice on the other end asks him three more questions. Has he made any other transfers in the last four years? Has he taken any cash out of company accounts and moved it personally? Has he changed any beneficiary designations on superannuation or life insurance recently? David answers as honestly as he can. The list is short but it isn't empty.

The voice tells David that the situation is recoverable but the recovery has to start with understanding exactly what's been done and how exposed each transaction is. Nothing can be undone now without making things worse. What can be done is a structural assessment that maps the exposures, identifies the priorities and sets the order of action. The first step isn't to try to fix anything. The first step is to know exactly what you’re dealing with.

They book a meeting for the following Monday. David hangs up and sits in his office for a long time. For the first time in two days he feels something other than pure dread. Not relief, not yet. But the start of a sense that there's a way through this. Someone exists who deals with exactly his situation. Someone who isn't going to tell him "this is outside my mandate."

A Question for You

Have you transferred anything out of your personal name in the last four years? A property, a car, a sum of money, a business interest? If you have and if you have any current or potential creditor exposure, that transfer is sitting somewhere on the spectrum from completely safe to entirely voidable. You can't tell which without an honest structural review. The time to do that review is now, while the choice of what to do about it is still yours to make.

If you've made any transfer in the last four years and you don't know if it's voidable, the A13 will identify the exposure properly. 13 questions. Free. Start at **riskprotector.com.au**.

Chapter 4.

The ATO. Your Most Powerful Creditor

It's 9.20pm Wednesday. David is at the kitchen table. The letter is in front of him, the same letter, read for the seventh time. Megan has gone to bed. The house is quiet. David's not looking at the figures any more. He's reading the small print at the bottom of the page. The line that says the Australian Taxation Office is taking action under the Director Penalty Notice provisions of the Taxation Administration Act 1953.

He doesn't know what those provisions actually allow. He doesn't know what powers the office that sent the letter has, or what the limits of those powers are. What he knows is that this letter feels different from any other piece of correspondence he's ever received. Tougher. Final. The kind of letter you can't ignore your way through.

David's instinct is right. The ATO isn't like other creditors. The next part of the journey is understanding why.

Every Other Creditor Has to Ask. The ATO Doesn't

When a supplier wants money from you, they have to ask. They send invoices. They send statements. They send reminders. If you don't pay, they can engage a debt collector, who will also ask. The debt collector might escalate to legal proceedings, which means lodging a claim in court, paying filing fees and waiting through the court's timelines.

If they win, they get a judgment. The judgment then has to be enforced, which means more applications, more filings, more time. From start to finish, an unsecured commercial creditor pursuing a meaningful debt is looking at six to twelve months minimum and that's if everything runs smoothly.

The ATO doesn't have to do any of that. The ATO has powers given to it by Commonwealth legislation that allow it to bypass most of the steps that a commercial creditor has to follow. It can issue garnishee notices directly to your bank without going to court. It can demand information from third parties about your financial affairs without your knowledge.

It can issue Director Penalty Notices that make you personally liable for company debts without going to court. It can offset refunds you're owed against debts it claims you owe. It can do all of this on its own authority, on its own timetable and the only way to stop any of it is for you to take action against the ATO, not the other way around.

Read that last sentence again. The default position, in any dispute with the ATO, is that the ATO acts and you respond. With every other creditor, the default position is the opposite. The creditor has to prove the debt before they can do anything. The ATO assumes the debt is owed and acts on that assumption. Disputing the assumption is your job.

What the ATO Can Do Without Asking

Here's a partial list of what the ATO can do without going to court, without obtaining a judgment and without your prior agreement.

Issue a Director Penalty Notice that makes you personally liable for the company's PAYG withholding, GST and superannuation guarantee debts. A Non-Lockdown Penalty notice gives you 21 days to act. If you don't act within those 21 days, the personal liability becomes locked in and the ATO can pursue you personally for the full amount.

Issue a garnishee notice to your bank, your employer or anyone else who holds money for you or owes money to you. The garnishee notice instructs the third party to pay the money directly to the ATO instead of to you. The notice doesn't need a court order. It just needs to be issued.

Offset any tax refund you're due against any tax debt the ATO believes is outstanding. This can include personal income tax refunds being offset against company debts you've been made personally liable for under a DPN.

Lodge a claim against your property, including your family home, by way of a writ or warrant of execution if a debt has been entered against you. While this step does require some court process, the ATO has well-established procedures for moving through it quickly.

Apply to wind up your company. The ATO is the most active applicant for company windings up in Australia, lodging more applications than the next ten creditors combined.

Issue a notice to a third party who's acquiring a property from you, requiring that party to withhold an amount and pay it directly to the ATO. The transaction can't proceed without compliance with the notice.

Each one of these powers, used by a commercial creditor, would require a court order. The ATO uses them on its own authority every working day.

Why the Powers Are So Broad

The justification for these powers, when they were granted, was that the tax system depends on collection efficiency. If the ATO had to go to court for every debt, the cost of collection would exceed the revenue collected on smaller matters and the system would collapse under its own weight.

So Parliament gave the ATO administrative powers that bypass the courts in most circumstances. The principle was that tax debts are different from commercial debts, that the public revenue is at stake and that efficient collection serves the broader public interest.

Whether you agree with the principle or not, that's the framework you're operating under. The powers exist. They've been tested in the High Court and upheld. Successive governments have expanded them rather than narrowed them. Director Penalty Notices, for example, were significantly strengthened in 2012, again in 2019 and again in 2020. The current framework is more powerful than at any point in the system's history and the trajectory is towards more power, not less.

What this means for directors is simple. The legal options for resisting ATO actions are narrow. The administrative options are even narrower. The practical option, the one that actually works, is to avoid being in a position where the ATO is acting against you in the first place. Once they're acting, your scope to resist is small and the cost of resistance is high.

Why Directors Keep Underestimating the ATO

Most directors have a relationship with the ATO that's been managed through their accountant. The accountant lodges the BAS, the accountant prepares the income tax returns, the accountant arranges payment plans when cash flow gets tight. From the director's seat, the ATO looks like a process that the accountant handles. Distant. Bureaucratic. Slow. Manageable.

That impression holds right up until the point where the ATO decides to enforce. Then everything changes. The slow bureaucracy reveals itself to be a highly organised collection machine. The accountant who's been managing the relationship suddenly has nothing useful to say, because enforcement is outside their engagement scope. The director discovers that all the conversations about payment plans and reasonable arrangements were a courtesy, not a right and that the courtesy can be withdrawn at any time.

By the time the director realises they're dealing with a different organisation than the one they thought they knew, they're already deep into the enforcement process. The window for negotiation has narrowed. The window for restructuring has narrowed. The window for protecting personal assets has, in many cases, already closed.

What This Means for David

David isn't in a unique position. His situation is the same situation thousands of Australian directors find themselves in every year. A trading business that's been carrying tax liabilities for some months. An accountant who's been doing the compliance work but has never raised the structural exposure question. A family home that's been transferred recently in a way that's now compromised.

And a Director Penalty Notice that's just landed. The 21-day clock started on the date on the notice. What's different about David from this point forward is the conversation he had at 5.40pm Wednesday afternoon. Most directors, when the DPN arrives, ring their accountant first. David did too. But his subsequent conversation with the structural advisory consultancy led somewhere different.

Their accountant tells them to get a solicitor. The solicitor charges by the hour and works on instructions. The clock keeps running. Days pass. The 21-day window closes before any meaningful structural action has been taken. The director ends up personally liable for the full amount, with the family home exposed to claw-back and no clear plan for what to do next.

David is going to take a different path. The path starts with understanding exactly who he's dealing with. The ATO. Then it moves to understanding exactly what they've sent him. The Director Penalty Notice. Then it moves to understanding what his actual options are within the 21-day window, how to use that window properly and what structural changes can still be made before the window closes. That's where the next chapter takes both David, and you.

A Question for You

When you think about your relationship with the ATO, what does it look like? Is it a distant, bureaucratic process that your accountant handles? Or is it a live, active, enforcement-capable creditor that could, on its own authority, take action against you within days? The honest answer for most directors is the first one. The reality, the moment things go wrong, is the second one. The gap between those two pictures is the gap that catches directors out. Closing that gap, before the gap matters, is what the rest of this book is about.

If the gap between the ATO you imagined and the ATO that exists is wide, the A13 closes that gap, in writing. in

13 questions. Free. Start at **riskprotector.com.au.**

Chapter 5.

The Three Pathways From Company Debt to Personal Ruin

It's 6.40am Thursday. David is in the office before anyone else arrives. He's brought his laptop, a notebook and a coffee. He's started writing things down. Not solutions. Just questions. The first question at the top of the page reads, in his own handwriting, "How does company debt actually become my debt?" Until two days ago he'd have said it didn't. The company is a separate legal entity. That's what limited liability means. That's what the structure is for. That's why people set up companies in the first place.

He's starting to understand that none of that is quite as protective as he assumed. Limited liability is real, but it has gates. There are specific, identifiable doorways through which company debt becomes director debt. There aren't dozens of them. There are three. Once you understand the three pathways, you understand the entire architecture of personal exposure for a company director. You also understand what to protect, in what order and why.

Pathway One. Statutory Liability

The first pathway is the one most directors know about least and worry about least, until it lands. Statutory liability is liability created by Commonwealth or state legislation that pierces the corporate veil and makes the director personally responsible for specific company debts.

The most prominent example is the Director Penalty Notice regime under the Taxation Administration Act. Under this regime, the directors of a company become personally liable for the company's PAYG withholding, GST and superannuation guarantee debts if those debts haven't been reported and paid within specific timeframes. The liability isn't created by anything the director has signed. It's created by the legislation itself.

There are other examples. Workplace health and safety legislation in most states allows for personal director liability where an officer of a company has failed to exercise due diligence. Environmental protection legislation operates on similar principles. The Fair Work Act creates personal liability for company directors who are knowingly involved in contraventions of workplace laws.

The common feature of all statutory liability is that it doesn't depend on what you signed or didn't sign. It depends on the position you held, the conduct of the company while you held it and whether the conditions specified in the legislation are met. Because the liability is created by statute, it can't be excluded by anything in the company's constitution or in any agreement between you and the company.

Pathway Two. Personal Guarantees

The second pathway is the one most directors know about most. Personal guarantees are written undertakings, signed by you in your personal capacity, in which you agree that if the company doesn't meet a particular obligation, you will.

Banks require them. Equipment finance companies require them. Landlords require them. Major suppliers require them on accounts above certain limits. Construction industry head contractors often require them on subcontract arrangements. By the time a company has been trading for three or four years, the director has typically signed somewhere between five and twenty personal guarantees, sometimes more.

Most directors don't keep an active register of which guarantees they've signed. They sign the document that's put in front of them at the time the credit facility or the lease or the supplier account is being established, then they file it and forget it. Years later, when something goes wrong, they discover that the guarantees still apply, that they're cumulative and that the total exposure across all of them is far larger than they ever realised.

Personal guarantees are usually unlimited unless they're specifically capped. Many of them survive the discharge of the underlying debt by other means, which means even if the company pays the supplier, the guarantee can be re-activated if the supplier comes back at the company on a different debt later. Some of them, particularly those given to banks, are drafted to apply to all present and future debts of the company, which means signing one guarantee can create exposure to debts that didn't even exist when you signed.

If you're a director who's been trading for any meaningful period and hasn't recently reviewed your position, the first thing you may not know about your personal exposure is which guarantees you've signed, who they're with, what they cover and what their current scope is. The second thing you may not know is whether any of them can be cancelled, varied or replaced. The third thing you may not know is what would happen if multiple guarantees were called at once.

Pathway Three. Insolvent Trading and Related Director Conduct

The third pathway is the one most directors know about, vaguely, but rarely in detail. It's the personal liability that arises from how the director has acted while running the company, particularly when the company has been or has become insolvent.

The principal mechanism is the insolvent trading provisions of the Corporations Act. If a director allows the company to incur a debt at a time when the company is insolvent, or when the director has reasonable grounds to suspect that the company is insolvent, the director can be held personally liable for the loss suffered by the creditor of that debt. The liability sits with the director and is owed to the company. In practice it is typically pursued by a liquidator after the company has been wound up.

Insolvent trading isn't the only mechanism in this category. The Corporations Act also provides for personal director liability in connection with breaches of director duties, including the duty to act in good faith, the duty to act with care and diligence and the duty to avoid conflicts of interest. Where a breach of duty has caused loss to the company, the director can be required to compensate the company for that loss. Once the company is in liquidation, the right to pursue that compensation passes to the liquidator.

Voidable transactions, the subject of Chapter 3, also fit within this pathway. Where a director has caused or allowed the company to make a transaction that's later set aside by a liquidator, the director can be personally liable for the difference between what was paid out and what should have been paid, particularly where the transaction benefited the director personally.

What ties this pathway together is conduct. Statutory liability depends on legislation. Personal guarantees depend on signed documents. The third pathway depends on what you did, when you did it and what you knew or should have known at the time. It's the most variable of the three, the most case-specific and the hardest to predict in advance.

Why Most Directors Are Exposed Through All Three

If you've been a director of a trading company for any meaningful period, you almost certainly have exposure through all three pathways simultaneously. You'll have some statutory exposure, because trading companies generate PAYG withholding, GST and superannuation obligations as a routine matter.

You'll have some personal guarantee exposure, because most commercial relationships of any size require them. And you'll have some conduct exposure, because the law judges director conduct against a series of obligations that apply continuously while you hold the office.

The exposure through each pathway compounds the exposure through the others. A director who has signed substantial personal guarantees is more vulnerable to a DPN than one who hasn't, because the personal guarantees mean the director's net asset position is already weaker before the DPN even arrives. A director who has been trading while insolvent is more vulnerable to claw-back of recent transactions, because the liquidator who pursues those transactions will also be examining director conduct generally. Each pathway feeds the others.

That’s why piecemeal asset protection doesn't work. Addressing only your DPN exposure leaves your guarantee exposure intact. Addressing only your guarantee exposure leaves your conduct exposure intact. Addressing your conduct exposure without also restructuring the underlying exposures means the conduct exposure simply re-emerges as the company continues to trade. What works is a structural approach that maps all three pathways, identifies the exposure under each and addresses them in the correct order.

What Order to Address Them In

The order matters and it isn't obvious. Most directors, when they first become aware of their exposure, want to address whichever pathway feels most urgent at that moment. If a DPN has just arrived, they focus on the DPN. If a personal guarantee is being called, they focus on that. If a liquidator has started asking questions, they focus on the conduct issues. This is human and understandable. It's also wrong.

The correct order is to start with the structural baseline. Where are the assets actually held? What does the trust deed say? Who's the appointor? What's the relationship between the trading company, the holding entity and any related parties? Without a clear picture of the structure, every decision made about a specific exposure is being made in a vacuum.

Once the structural baseline is clear, the next priority is the most time-pressured exposure. If a Non-Lockdown DPN is live, that 21-day window dominates everything until it's resolved. If a guarantee is being called and a default judgment is imminent, that becomes the first priority. The point is that time-pressured exposures are addressed before non-time-pressured exposures, but only after the structural picture is clear enough to make the right calls.

After the immediate time-pressured exposures are dealt with, the longer-term work begins. Mapping all the personal guarantees, identifying which can be varied or replaced, identifying which exposures can be reduced through restructuring and which need to be insured around. Reviewing the trust deed for vulnerabilities. Considering whether the directorship itself needs to be transferred. Building, in other words, a structure that doesn't recreate the same exposures as the company continues to trade forward.

What David Is Looking At

David has just realised, sitting in his office at quarter to seven in the morning with his coffee getting cold, that he has exposure through all three pathways. He has the DPN, which is statutory exposure. He has the personal guarantee on the equipment finance from 2021, which he'd forgotten existed. He has at least one bank facility that almost certainly has a guarantee attached, although he doesn't have the document in front of him. And he has the home transfer to Megan, which sits in the conduct pathway and is also voidable.

What David is going to do, starting Monday, is work through the exposure systematically with the structural adviser he spoke to yesterday afternoon. The mapping comes first. Then the time-pressured response, which is the DPN. Then the longer-term restructuring, which is the harder and slower work but the work that determines whether David ends up on the other side of this with most of what he's built or with very little of it.

The next part of the book takes you into the DPN itself. What it actually is, how the 21 days work, what your real options are inside the window and what happens if the window closes. Part Two is about the most urgent of David's exposures and the one where the time pressure is greatest.

A Question for You

Of the three pathways, which one are you most exposed under? If you don't know the answer, that's the first finding. If you think you know but you couldn't list your guarantees, name your statutory obligations or describe how a liquidator would view your recent transactions, you don't yet know. And the time to find out is before any of those pathways activates against you.

If you don't know which of the three pathways you're most exposed under, the A13 walks you through them and gives you the answer. 13 questions. Free. Start at riskprotector.com.au.

PART TWO

The Director Penalty Notice

Part Two follows David's situation forward and explains exactly how a Director Penalty Notice works, the critical distinction between Lockdown and Non-Lockdown notices, the 21-day window and what David's options actually are at each stage.

Chapter 6.
What a Director Penalty Notice Actually Is

It's Monday morning, 9.45am. David has logged on early. The structural adviser's name is at the top of the screen, not yet connected. The call is scheduled for ten. David has the letter with him. He's brought it out of the manila folder it's been sitting in since Friday and put it on the desk in front of him. He hasn't looked at it again since. He looks at it now.

The adviser joins the meeting, sits down, takes a sip of coffee, looks at David and says "Show me what you got." David opens the folder and turns the letter around so it faces the adviser. The adviser reads it slowly. He doesn't say anything for almost two minutes. Then he says "Right. Let's talk about exactly what this is, what it isn't and what it can do to you. Because most of what you think you know about it is probably wrong."

This chapter is the conversation that follows. Plain language. No jargon where it isn't needed. The actual mechanics of what a Director Penalty Notice is and what makes it different from any other notice you'll ever receive.

What the Notice Is, Technically

A Director Penalty Notice is a formal notice issued by the Commissioner of Taxation under the Taxation Administration Act 1953. The notice is directed to a director of a company, personally, in their individual capacity. It's not addressed to the company. It's addressed to you.

The notice informs the director that they are personally liable for an unpaid amount of the company's PAYG withholding, GST or superannuation guarantee charge. It specifies the amount. It specifies a 21-day period within which the director can take certain actions to avoid that personal liability becoming locked in. It specifies the consequences of inaction.

The notice doesn't create new debt in the sense of money that wasn't owed before. It transfers existing company debt to the director personally. The company owes the ATO money that it hasn't paid. The DPN is the mechanism by which that company obligation becomes a personal obligation of the person who was a director while that obligation was accumulating.

The liability isn't a penalty in the everyday sense of the word. It's not a fine for wrongdoing. It's a transfer of the underlying debt. The director becomes liable for the same amount the company owes, dollar for dollar, as if the director had personally borrowed the money and not repaid it.

Who Gets a DPN

Any person who was a director of the company at the relevant time can receive a DPN. The relevant time is the period during which the company's PAYG withholding, GST or superannuation guarantee charge was accumulating unpaid.

It doesn't matter that you've since resigned as a director. If you were a director when the liability was accumulating, you can receive a DPN for that liability. Resignation after the debt has accumulated doesn't remove your exposure for the period you were in the chair.

It doesn't matter that you were a passive director, a nominee director or a director who wasn't actively involved in the day-to-day management. The legislation doesn't distinguish between active and passive directors. The title carries the exposure.

It doesn't matter that another director was responsible for the financial management. The legislation doesn't allow one director to point at another and say "it was their problem." Each director is individually liable for the full amount. The notice can be issued to all of them simultaneously. If one pays, the others' liability is reduced. But each starts with the same full exposure.

Why You Don't Get Earlier Warning

One of the things directors find hardest about DPN's is the absence of earlier warning. The ATO knows the company has unpaid PAYG withholding and GST. The company has been lodging BAS forms that show the amounts owed. The ATO has been receiving those BAS forms quarter after quarter. And yet, in many cases, no formal warning is issued before the DPN itself. The first specific notification the director gets is the notice itself, with the 21-day clock already running.

The ATO's position on this is straightforward. The company has been told. The company has lodged BAS forms acknowledging the debt. The company has received statements detailing the debt. If the company is failing to remit, the directors are presumed to be aware, because directors are presumed to be aware of their company's tax obligations. The ATO doesn't see itself as obliged to provide additional warnings to directors personally before issuing the formal notice that triggers personal liability.

Whether that position is fair is a different question. As a matter of practice, it's the position you're operating under. The first notification you receive in your personal capacity is the DPN itself. By the time you have it in your hands, the 21-day window is already counting down. There's no preliminary stage. There's no informal warning letter. There's no second chance after the 21 days, except in narrow and specific circumstances which are the subject of the next chapter.

What David Hears Next

The adviser finishes the explanation, leans back in his chair and asks David one question. "When did you receive this letter?" David tells him. The adviser looks at the date on the notice itself, looks at the calendar on his phone and says "You've got fourteen days left, give or take a day depending on whether the postage delay puts you in a slightly different position. We need to use those fourteen days carefully. There are two types of DPN. The one you've got is the Non-Lockdown type, which is the one you want, because it gives you options. If you'd received a Lockdown DPN, we'd be having a much shorter conversation and a much sadder one."

David asks what the difference is. The adviser says "That's the next conversation. But before we have it, I want you to understand one thing. The fact that you're sitting here today, fourteen days until the window closes, with the notice in hand and a structure to think about, is a lucky position to be in. Most directors don't get here until day twenty or day twenty-one. Some don't get here at all. The window is shorter than it sounds and the work that needs to be done inside it isn't trivial."

A Question for You

If a Director Penalty Notice arrived in your letterbox tomorrow, what would your first phone call be? If your answer is your accountant, that call probably wouldn't go where you needed it to go. If your answer is your solicitor, that call would start a meter running but might not get you the strategic clarity the 21 days demand. If your answer is "I don't actually know who I'd ring", that's the most honest answer most directors would give and it's the answer this book is trying to change.

> *If you don't know who you'd ring if a DPN arrived, the A13 is the place to start, before any letter ever comes. 13 questions. Free. Start at riskprotector.com.au.*

Chapter 7.
Lockdown Versus Non-Lockdown

The advisor pours David another coffee from the pot in the corner. David has been holding the same pen for the last fifteen minutes without writing anything. The advisor sits back down and says "Right. So we've established what a DPN is. Now we need to talk about which type of DPN you actually have. Because there are two kinds and they aren't the same thing. One is recoverable. The other one isn't." David starts writing again.

Of all the things directors don't know about Director Penalty Notices, the difference between the two types is the most important and the most misunderstood. Two directors at the same company can each receive their own DPN on the same Tuesday, each in their own name, each for the same dollar amount. One type of DPN has options. The other type already holds then personally liable and has been for some time. Same envelope. Completely different positions.

The Two Types

There are two types of Director Penalty Notice. The Non-Lockdown DPN is the one that gives the director options inside the 21-day window. The Lockdown DPN is the one where the personal liability is already locked in by the time the notice arrives and the 21-day window doesn't apply. The names are informal, used by practitioners and the ATO interchangeably, but they describe a real legal distinction set out in the Taxation Administration Act.

The distinction depends on one thing: whether the company lodged its Business Activity Statements and other reports on time. Specifically, whether the unpaid amount, that is, the PAYG withholding, GST or superannuation guarantee charge, was reported to the ATO within the time required by the legislation.

If the company reported the amount on time but didn't pay it, the resulting DPN is usually Non-Lockdown. If the company didn't report the amount on time, or reported it more than three months late, the resulting DPN is usually Lockdown. The reporting deadline matters more than the payment. The legislation rewards timely reporting and punishes the failure to report even if there are amounts you can't currently pay.

What a Non-Lockdown DPN Lets You Do

When a Non-Lockdown DPN is in front of you, the legislation gives you four options inside the 21-day window. Take any one of them and the personal liability is avoided. Take none of them and the personal liability becomes locked in at the end of day twenty-one.

Option one is to pay the debt. The company or you personally pays the full outstanding amount of PAYG withholding, GST or superannuation guarantee charge specified in the notice. Once paid, the notice is satisfied. The personal liability is extinguished.

Option two is to enter into a payment arrangement with the Commissioner. The arrangement has to be agreed by the ATO and has to cover the full amount. Approval is at the ATO's discretion. In practice, payment arrangements for Non-Lockdown DPN amounts are commonly granted, but the terms tend to be tight, the period short and the conditions strict. Default on the arrangement and the personal liability re-activates.

Option three is to appoint a voluntary administrator to the company under Part 5.3A of the Corporations Act. Administration must be commenced within the 21 days. Once the administrator is appointed, the personal liability under the notice is avoided, although the director may then face other consequences arising from the administration itself, including potential examination of director conduct.

Option four is to begin to wind up the company by appointing a liquidator. The winding up has to commence within the 21 days. Like administration, this option avoids the personal liability under the DPN, but it begins a different process with its own consequences.

Each of these options has serious downstream effects. None of them is a clean walk away. But each of them, taken inside the 21 days, prevents the personal liability from being established. That's the gift the Non-Lockdown DPN gives you. Time and choices.

Why a Lockdown DPN Is Different

A Lockdown DPN is a different animal entirely. There is no 21-day window. The personal liability has already attached to the director. By the time the notice arrives, the only option is to pay the debt in full.

Voluntary administration doesn't work. Liquidation doesn't work. A payment arrangement doesn't work. The legislative gates extinguish personal liability under a Non-Lockdown DPN are closed. The only way out is full payment.

The reason is the policy behind the legislation. Lockdown DPN's are issued in respect of debts that the company never reported on time. The legislation treats unreported debts differently from reported ones. If the company didn't report, Parliament's view is that directors who allowed that to happen shouldn't be able to escape personal liability simply by appointing an administrator at the last minute. So they can't.

If you receive a Lockdown DPN and you can't pay the debt in full, the personal liability is already established. The notice is informing you, formally, of a position the law has already created. You can dispute the underlying debt if you have grounds. You can negotiate with the ATO about how the debt will be paid by you personally. What you can't do is escape the liability through restructuring the company. That gate is closed.

How to Tell Which One You Have

The notice itself usually identifies which type it is, although the language can be subtle. A Non-Lockdown DPN sets out four options in detail: pay the debt, enter into a payment arrangement, place the company into voluntary administration, or begin to wind it up. A Lockdown DPN will state that the director can avoid personal liability only by paying the debt in full and will not list the other options.

The notice usually sets out each amount, when it accrued and what it relates to. If you still can't tell from that which type you have, the test is the reporting history of the underlying debt. Look at when the debt arose and when the BAS or other return that should have reported it was due. If the BAS was lodged within three months of the due date, the resulting DPN for any unpaid component is usually Non-Lockdown. If the BAS was lodged more than three months late or hasn't been lodged at all, the resulting DPN is usually Lockdown.

This is one of the reasons that lodging your BAS forms on time, even when you can't pay the GST or PAYG, is fundamental. Lodgement preserves your options. Failure to lodge closes them. The ATO has been clear and consistent about this for many years. A director who lodges and doesn't pay has a Non-Lockdown problem. A director who doesn't lodge has a Lockdown problem. The difference, when the DPN finally arrives, is enormous.

Mixed Notices

The legislation allows for a single DPN to contain both Lockdown and Non-Lockdown components. In practice this is uncommon, but it is possible. If it occurs, each component is treated according to its own reporting history and no single response addresses the entire notice. If you receive a notice that appears to have both elements, the reporting history for each underlying amount needs to be checked carefully and the strategy has to deal with each piece on its own terms.

If you receive a notice that has both elements, the work needs to be done with care. The reporting history for each underlying component needs to be checked. The arithmetic needs to add up. The strategy has to deal with each piece on its own terms. This is detailed work that a structural adviser can work through with you methodically.

What David Has and What It Means

The adviser has been looking at David's notice while David has been talking. He says "Look here. The notice tells you what your options are. It says you can pay, you can enter into a payment arrangement, you can appoint a voluntary administrator or you can begin to wind up the company. That's the language of a Non-Lockdown DPN. It means the BAS forms were lodged on time, even though the amounts weren't paid. Your accountant did one important thing right."

David thinks back over the last two years of dealings with Roger. The BAS forms have always been lodged on time. Roger has been clear about that as a baseline standard. The payments haven't always followed, but the lodgements have. That habit, that small consistent piece of professional discipline, is now the difference between David having options and David having none.

The adviser continues. "So we've got fourteen days. We've got four options on the table. None of them are easy. All of them have consequences. But we have a choice to make and a strategy to build. Let me walk you through what each option actually looks like, what it costs and what it leaves behind. Because the right answer for you isn't the same as the right answer for the next director who comes to us. It depends on what you've got to protect, what you've got to lose and what you can live with afterwards."

A Question for You

If a DPN landed in your letterbox tomorrow, would the BAS forms underlying it have been lodged on time? If you don't know, ask your accountant tomorrow morning. Don't ask whether the GST has been paid.

Ask whether the BAS forms have been lodged on time, every quarter, for the last two years. Because the answer to that question, more than the answer to any other, determines what kind of conversation you'd be having if a DPN ever arrived.

If you don't know whether your BAS forms have been lodged on time, the A13 will help you find out, before you need to know. 13 questions. Free. Start at riskprotector.com.au.

Chapter 8.
The 21-Day Window

It's 11.20am Monday. The adviser shares his screen. On it is a simple document with the date at the top. He draws a line across the page and marks two points. The first point is the date given on the notice. The second is the day the 21 days expire. Between them he types "David's window" and underlines it twice. He says "Everything we do, every decision we make, every option we choose, has to fit between these two points. Outside the window, our choices are gone. Inside the window, the choices are real but they're shrinking by the day. Let's talk about what to do with the days you've got left."

The 21-day window is the most misunderstood part of the entire DPN regime. Directors who hear about the window often imagine three weeks of relatively unhurried thinking, with options to be considered carefully and decisions taken when ready. The reality is the opposite. The window is short, the work inside it is heavy and the decisions need to be made on a timeline that doesn't allow for procrastination.

How the 21 Days Are Counted

The 21 days run from the date given on the notice. The legislation defines what "given" means. For a notice posted to a director's residential address as recorded in the ASIC register, the notice is taken to have been given seven days after it was posted, even if the director receives it earlier or later. So the actual day-by-day calculation depends on the postage date stamped on the envelope, not the date you opened it.

What this means in practice is that by the time the notice is in your hands, several days of the window may already be gone. If the notice was posted on a Monday, the law treats it as given the following Monday. If you receive it on the Wednesday in between, you've already lost two days against the legal calculation. If you put it aside and don't open it until the weekend, you've lost five. The clock has been running.

This is why the first thing a structural adviser will ask, when you bring a DPN to them, is the date on the postmark or the date stamped on the notice as the date of giving. Not the date you found it. Not the date you opened it. The legal date. From that date, count forward 21 calendar days and that's the day the window closes. Not 21 working days. 21 calendar days. Weekends and public holidays are inside the count, not added to it.

What Has to Happen Inside the Window

If you have a Non-Lockdown DPN, one of the four options has to be commenced inside the window. Commenced, not completed. The legislation looks at whether the action has begun by the deadline, not whether it's finished.

So if voluntary administration is the chosen route, the administrator has to be appointed inside the 21 days. The administration itself can run its course over the months that follow, but the appointment has to happen inside the window.

If a payment arrangement is the chosen route, the arrangement has to be agreed by the ATO inside the window. Submitting a request isn't enough. The arrangement has to be approved. This is the option that often catches directors out, because ATO approval isn't automatic and can take time the director doesn't have.

If full payment is the chosen route, the payment has to be received by the ATO inside the window. Posting a cheque on day twenty doesn't count. Bank transfers can take 24 to 48 hours to clear. The payment has to be in the ATO's hands by the deadline.

If liquidation is the chosen route, the winding up has to commence inside the window. For a creditors' voluntary winding up, this means a meeting of members has been held and a liquidator has been appointed. For other forms of winding up, it means the relevant legal process has been formally initiated.

Each of these requires preparation, paperwork and external parties. None of them happen overnight. The work to set them up needs to start days before the deadline, not on the deadline itself.

Why the Window Feels Shorter Than 21 Days

On paper the window is 21 days. In practice it's much shorter. Several things eat into the available time before any strategic work can begin.

Postage and notification: some of the 21 days are gone before the notice physically reaches you. Even if the postage is fast, three or four days are commonly lost between the date the notice is given and the date you have it in hand.

Recognition and decision to act: most directors don't move on the day they receive the notice. They read it, set it aside, talk to a family member, sleep on it, then ring their accountant. By the time they're sitting in a structural adviser's office, another three to seven days have typically passed. That's now ten days, sometimes more, gone before any meaningful work has started.

Information gathering: before any of the four options can be properly considered, the adviser needs to see the company's books, the director's personal financial position, the trust deed, the asset register, the personal guarantees, the bank accounts and a clear picture of what's been transferred where in the last few years. Pulling that together takes time. Some of the documents are easy to find. Some of them aren't. Allow another three to five days.

Strategy and decision: once the picture is clear, the adviser and the director need to decide which of the four options is right. This isn't a five-minute conversation. It involves modelling outcomes, weighing consequences and considering personal circumstances. Allow another two to three days for this.

Execution: once the strategy is chosen, the action has to be commenced. Voluntary administration requires an administrator to be engaged, briefed and formally appointed. Liquidation requires similar preparation. A payment arrangement requires drafting, submission and negotiation with the ATO. Even full payment requires confirming the right amount and arranging the transfer.

Add it up. Three to four days for postage. Three to seven days for recognition and decision to act. Three to five days for information gathering. Two to three days for strategy. Two to three days for execution. The total can easily reach twenty days, leaving one day of margin or none. The 21-day window, in real terms, is tighter than it sounds. The directors who handle it well are the ones who understand this from day one.

What If the Window Closes

If the window closes without one of the four options having been commenced, the personal liability becomes locked in. The notice has done its work. The director is now personally liable for the amount specified, with all the collection consequences that flow from that.

From the moment the window closes, the ATO can pursue the director personally. The director's personal bank accounts can be subject to garnishees. The director's tax refunds can be offset against the debt. Court proceedings can commence if necessary, although in many cases they don't, because the ATO has administrative powers that don't require court process for most enforcement actions.

There's no extension. There's no second chance once the window has closed. The legislation doesn't provide a mechanism for the Commissioner to grant additional time after the deadline has passed. What the Commissioner can do, in some circumstances, is enter into payment arrangements with the now-personally-liable director for the personal debt, in the same way the Commissioner enters into arrangements with anyone who owes the ATO money. But the underlying personal liability remains, payment plan or not.

There are limited statutory defences available to a director who's been pursued personally after the window has closed. A director can argue that they took reasonable steps to ensure the company complied with its obligations, or that they didn't take part in management of the company because of illness or other good reason. These defences exist but they're narrow. They depend on specific factual showings and they're often hard to establish in practice. The far better strategy is to act inside the window, not to rely on defences after it closes.

What David Decides to Do With His Window

The advisor and David spend the rest of Monday morning mapping the work that has to happen across the next fourteen days. They build a daily timeline. Tuesday is for information gathering. The advisor gives David a list. Bring the trust deed. Bring the company's last three years of financials.

Bring the personal guarantee documents, all of them, even if you have to ring the bank to get copies. Bring the title documents for the home, the cars, the equipment. Bring the bank statements for the last six months. Bring the BAS lodgement records. Bring everything.

Wednesday and Thursday are for analysing the picture that information creates and modelling the four options against it. Friday is for the strategic conversation about which option is right. The following Monday is the cushion day before action begins. The Tuesday after that is action commencement, if the strategy requires action. That leaves three days of margin between action and the window closing on the Friday. Three days isn't much. It's also more than most directors give themselves.

The advisor doesn't promise a particular outcome. He promises David that the work will be done methodically, that nothing will be missed and that whatever decision is taken at the end of the week will be the right decision based on the full picture. He also tells David, plainly, that the answer might not be one David wants to hear. "Some of these options are sad. None of them are happy. The aim isn't a happy outcome. The aim is the best outcome available given the situation. That's what we're going to find for you."

A Question for You

If your DPN window opened tomorrow, who would you bring in on day one and what would you bring with you? If you don't have a clear answer to either part of that question, that's the gap. The 21-day window doesn't allow for figuring out who to call and what to bring while the days are running. Both have to be known in advance. The directors who handle a DPN well are the ones who knew, before they ever needed to know, who their first call would be.

If you don't know who'd be in the room with you on day one, the A13 is the first piece of work that prepares you for that day. 13 questions. Free. Start at riskprotector.com.au.

Chapter 9.
DPN Solutions That Work

It's Friday afternoon. Day five of David's fourteen. The conference room is now covered in paper. The trust deed sits at one end of the table. The personal guarantee documents, eleven of them in total, are stacked next to it. The company financials are open on a laptop screen. The adviser has been working through it methodically all week with David and David's bookkeeper. Now they're sitting back. The adviser closes the laptop and says "Right. We've got the picture. Now we choose. Let me walk you through what each option actually looks like for you specifically. Then you decide."

This chapter is the conversation that decides David's outcome. It's also the chapter that tells you, the reader, what the four options look like in practice. Not as legislative concepts. As real choices with real consequences for the director making them. The right answer for one director is the wrong answer for another. The work is in figuring out which is which.

Option One. Pay the Debt in Full

If the company or the director can pay the full outstanding amount inside the 21 days, the DPN is satisfied and the personal liability is extinguished. This is the cleanest outcome the legislation provides. The notice is gone. The company continues. The director walks away from the immediate crisis with the structural exposure intact but the personal liability removed.

The challenge with this option is that most directors who receive a DPN can't pay. If they could pay, they would have paid before the notice was issued. The notice is itself usually a sign that the company has reached a point where it's chosen, deliberately or by drift, not to remit the amounts it owes. Asking the company to find that money inside 21 days is asking it to do what it hasn't been able to do over the months or years leading up.

There are exceptions. Sometimes the director has personal funds, or related party loan capacity, that can be deployed. Sometimes the company has a debtors book that can be factored quickly. Sometimes there's an asset that can be sold. When these options exist, full payment becomes worth considering, particularly where the underlying business is strong enough to continue trading and where the structural exposure can be addressed separately afterwards.

For David, full payment isn't on the table. The amount is too large, the cash isn't there and the company doesn't have liquid assets that can be turned into cash inside fourteen days. The adviser mentions this briefly and moves on. There's no point dwelling on options that aren't real.

Option Two. Payment Arrangement

The second option is to negotiate a payment arrangement with the ATO. If the arrangement is approved inside the 21 days, the personal liability is avoided. The company continues to trade. The debt is paid down over the agreed schedule.

The challenge with this option is the ATO's discretion. Approval isn't automatic. The ATO will look at the company's payment history, the proposed schedule, the security being offered, the underlying business viability and the director's track record. For a company that's been carrying tax debts for any length of time, the ATO's appetite for further arrangements can be limited. Recent enforcement priorities have moved towards collection rather than negotiation, particularly for companies that have already had one or more arrangements in the past.

Even when an arrangement is approved, the conditions tend to be tight. Short payment periods. Default consequences that re-activate the personal liability immediately. Requirements for the company to remain current on all future obligations during the period of the arrangement. One missed BAS payment, one late lodgement, can collapse the arrangement and put the director back in the original position.

For some directors, a payment arrangement is the right answer. The business is fundamentally viable. The debt is manageable over a 12 to 24 month period. The company can absorb the additional cash flow burden. The director has the discipline to keep the arrangement on track. When these conditions are present, the arrangement saves the company, removes the personal liability and avoids the more disruptive options.

For David, a payment arrangement is possible but not ideal. The amount is large enough that any arrangement would extend over years and would require monthly payments that would tighten the company's cash flow significantly. The adviser's honest assessment is that the company could probably make the arrangement work in good months but would default in bad months. A default would be worse than not entering the arrangement in the first place. Worth considering, not the recommended path.

Option Three. Voluntary Administration

The third option is to appoint a voluntary administrator under Part 5.3A of the Corporations Act. If the appointment is made inside the 21 days, the personal liability under the DPN is avoided. The administrator takes control of the company and works with creditors towards either a Deed of Company Arrangement or a winding up.

Voluntary administration is the option most directors haven't thought about until they need to. It feels drastic. In some ways it is. The director loses day-to-day control of the company. The administrator's fees are payable from the company's assets. The administration is a public process, which means suppliers, customers and employees become aware of it quickly. The reputational consequences are real.

What administration also does, however, is preserve options. A Deed of Company Arrangement can allow the company to continue trading under restructured terms, with creditors compromised, with new arrangements in place and with the original director potentially still involved depending on the terms agreed. For some businesses, a DOCA is the rescue mechanism that allows the underlying enterprise to continue when full payment isn't possible and a payment arrangement won't work.

Administration also avoids the worst of the personal liability outcomes. The DPN liability is avoided. Some categories of insolvent trading exposure are also addressed by the administration framework, although not all. The director's personal position is significantly improved by acting inside the window, even if the company itself doesn't survive the process.

For David, voluntary administration is on the table. The company has underlying value. There are creditors beyond the ATO who would also be compromised by a DOCA. There are employees whose jobs depend on the business continuing in some form. The adviser models a DOCA scenario and a winding up scenario back to back. The DOCA scenario, if it succeeds, leaves David out the other side with a smaller business but with the structure recovered. The winding up scenario leaves David out without the business but without the personal liability either.

One point that deserves direct attention: the choice of administrator matters enormously and the wrong choice can be disastrous. Not all administrators approach voluntary administration with the same objectives. Some are oriented towards a quick liquidation that maximises their fee recovery from the asset pool. Directors who appoint the first administrator they find, or who accept a recommendation from a creditor, can find that the administrator moves to liquidate the business before a DOCA can be properly explored. The assets get sold at distressed prices.

The administrator’s fees absorb a significant portion of what remains. Shareholders and directors are left with no ability to raise further capital or redirect the process. The business that could have been saved is extinguished. The director who appoints an administrator should appoint one who has a track record in restructuring and DOCA outcomes, not simply winding things up. That distinction is not always visible on the surface. It requires asking the right questions before the appointment is made.

Option Four. Liquidation

The fourth option is to begin to wind up the company. If the winding up commences inside the 21 days, the personal liability under the DPN is avoided. The company is then wound up by a liquidator. The assets are realised, the creditors are paid in priority order and the company eventually ceases to exist.

Liquidation is the option most directors fear, often more than they need to. The fear comes partly from the finality of it. Once the liquidator is appointed, the director is no longer in charge. The decisions are taken by someone else. The assets can be sold at less than the director thinks they're worth. The process can take twelve to thirty-six months, during which the director is on the outside of decisions affecting their own former business.

Liquidation also brings examination risk. The liquidator's job includes investigating director conduct in the period leading up to the winding up. Voidable transactions can be pursued. Insolvent trading claims can be brought. The director's personal exposure outside the DPN can be increased, not decreased, by the examination process if there are issues to be found.

For some directors, however, liquidation is the right answer. The company is genuinely insolvent. There's no realistic path back to viability. The DPN liability is the most pressing personal exposure. Other personal exposures are limited or already provided for. Liquidation in those circumstances closes a chapter that needs to be closed. The director ends up with limited personal liability, the business is wound up properly and the director can plan forward without the dead weight of a non-viable company.

For David, the liquidation option exists but isn't the recommended answer. The adviser's view is that the underlying business has too much value to wind up. The relationships, the contracts, the goodwill, the engineering capability, all of that disappears in a liquidation and can't be recovered. A DOCA preserves what the business is. A liquidation extinguishes it.

How the Decision Actually Gets Made

The decision isn't made on a single criterion. It's made by weighing the four options against each other across several dimensions and choosing the path that gives the best overall outcome given the specific circumstances.

The dimensions matter. Financial outcome is one. What does the director walk away with under each option? What's left of the business? What's the personal exposure across all three pathways, not just the DPN? Operational outcome is another. Does the business continue to operate, in some form, under each option? Are jobs preserved? Are customer relationships preserved?

Reputational outcome is a third. How does each option look from the outside, to suppliers, customers, employees, family? Personal outcome is the fourth. What does each option mean for the director personally, in terms of stress, time commitment, future business prospects and ongoing obligations?

No option scores well on every dimension. The choice is about trade-offs. The director's job, with the adviser's help, is to understand the trade-offs clearly and choose the option whose trade-offs the director can live with. There's no objectively right answer. There's only the answer that's right for this director, in this situation, with this set of constraints.

What David Decides

David decides on voluntary administration with a target outcome of a DOCA. The adviser introduces him to a registered liquidator who specialises in this type of work. They meet on Tuesday morning of the second week. The liquidator agrees to act. The appointment is made on

Wednesday, twelve days into David's fourteen-day window. Two days of margin remain.

The administration runs its course over the following weeks. A DOCA is proposed. Creditors meet. The DOCA is approved with the ATO accepting a compromise on the GST and PAYG portion of its claim, subject to ongoing compliance terms. The superannuation guarantee charge component is paid in full as part of the deed. The company continues to trade under the deed terms, with David retained in his role but with enhanced reporting obligations to a deed administrator.

The DPN liability is extinguished. The transferred home is now subject to a separate strategy that the adviser has been mapping in parallel. The personal guarantees are being reviewed one by one to identify which can be varied or replaced under the new structure. The structural overhaul of the trust and the trading entity is underway. All of it is a path forward that wasn't available before David made his first phone call on Wednesday afternoon.

A Question for You

If you had to choose between the four options today, with the information you have today, which would you choose? If you don't know enough to choose, that's the gap. The directors who handle a DPN well are the ones who'd already thought through the four options before they were ever in the position of having to act on one. Thinking it through in advance, before any letter arrives, is how you build the readiness that the 21-day window doesn't allow you to build later.

> If you couldn't choose between the four DPN options today, the A13 walks you through what you'd need to know. 13 questions. Free. Start at riskprotector.com.au.

PART THREE

ATO Debt and Enforcement

Part Three covers the ATO enforcement sequence, what real help with ATO debt looks like and how to stop ATO garnishment.

Chapter 10.
The ATO Enforcement Sequence

Three months have passed. The DOCA (Deed of Company Arrangement) is in place. The company is trading under the terms of the deed. David is back in his office, working through a Wednesday morning, when his phone rings. It's Mark, a friend who runs a Brisbane civil contracting business about three times the size of David's. Mark received a letter from the ATO that morning. As Mark reads it out, David recognises it immediately. Not a DPN. A demand letter. The first formal step in the ATO's enforcement sequence.

Most directors learn about ATO enforcement in the wrong order. They learn about it backwards, from the end, when they receive a notice that's already deep into the process. They don't learn about the steps that came before because those steps weren't formally directed at them personally. Understanding the sequence in the right order, from the start, gives a director the chance to act early enough to change the outcome. Mark has that chance now, before the situation moves beyond the point where the outcome can be changed. That window is real, but it is not unlimited and it's shorter than most directors assume.

How the Sequence Begins

ATO enforcement doesn't usually start with a formal notice. It starts with reminder letters. These are computer-generated letters that go out automatically when a tax debt remains unpaid past its due date. They look bureaucratic. They use polite language. They tell the company that an amount is overdue, ask for payment and provide options for entering into a payment arrangement.

Most directors who later end up in trouble received reminder letters for months or years before any formal action was taken. They filed the letters. They mentioned them to their accountant. They might have rung the ATO once or twice, made a partial payment and assumed the matter was being dealt with. The reminder letters kept coming. Each one slightly more direct than the last. None of them creating, in the director's mind, any real pressure to act.

The reminder phase serves a purpose for the ATO. It establishes that the debt is known. It establishes that the company has been notified. It builds the paper trail that supports any later enforcement action. By the time the ATO escalates, it can demonstrate that it gave the company every opportunity to voluntarily address the debt over a substantial period.

The reminder phase serves a purpose for directors too, although most don't use it. It's the period when payment arrangements are easiest to obtain. It's the period when the ATO is most receptive to negotiation. It's the period when the underlying debt is smallest, because penalties and interest haven't yet compounded to the full extent they will. It's also the period when the company has the most operational latitude to address the debt without disrupting trading.

The Escalation Pattern

When reminder letters don't produce a result, the ATO escalates. The escalation isn't random. It follows a pattern that's been refined over years of enforcement practice. Understanding the pattern lets you read the signals.

The first escalation is usually a formal letter of demand. This letter is different from the reminders. It's typically signed by an officer rather than computer-generated. It states the debt with precision. It specifies a deadline by which payment or contact is required. It mentions, in measured language, the consequences of non-compliance. The deadline is usually short. The tone shifts from administrative to enforcement.

The second escalation, if the demand letter doesn't produce a result, is the issue of formal enforcement notices. For company debts that include PAYG withholding, GST or superannuation guarantee charge, this is where Director Penalty Notices appear. For other debts, this might be where statutory demands under the Corporations Act are served. The legal weapon depends on the type of debt. The principle is the same. The matter has now moved from administrative to enforcement.

The third escalation is collection action. Garnishee orders. Statutory demands followed by winding-up applications. Court proceedings where the ATO has chosen the court route. By this point, the matter is no longer about negotiating to pay. It's about the ATO using its powers to collect what's owed.

The pattern doesn't always run the full sequence. The ATO can skip stages where it judges them unnecessary. It can move directly to formal enforcement where the company's history justifies it. What it can't do, in most cases, is escalate without warning. There are usually signals available to a director who knows what to look for.

Why Most Directors Miss the Signals

Directors miss the early signals for several reasons. First, the reminder letters are easy to dismiss. They look like routine correspondence. They use language that doesn't convey urgency. They invite payment but don't demand it. Most directors filter them as administrative noise alongside dozens of other letters and emails that arrive every week.

Second, the reminders are usually addressed to the company at the registered office, which is often the accountant's office. The director may not even see the letters, particularly if the accountant doesn't escalate them. The accountant typically reads them, files them, mentions the debt at the next meeting and assumes the director is dealing with it. The director assumes the accountant is dealing with it. Neither is.

Third, even when directors do see the reminders, the dollar amounts in the early stages are often manageable. A few thousand dollars. Maybe ten or fifteen thousand. Not amounts that trigger the kind of action a six-figure debt would. The director thinks the debt is small enough to be handled in due course. By the time it isn't, the debt has grown and the ATO has progressed further along the sequence than the director realises.

Fourth, ATO enforcement timing can be unpredictable. Some debts sit at the reminder stage for years. Others escalate quickly. The variation depends on internal ATO factors that aren't visible to the company, including caseload, compliance priorities, the experience of the case officer assigned and the company's history. A director who's seen one debt sit for years can incorrectly assume the next debt will follow the same pattern.

What the Demand Letter Means

When a formal demand letter arrives, the meaning is specific. It means the ATO has decided that the reminder phase has run its course. The debt is now significant enough, or the company's history is concerning enough, that a more serious step is warranted. The demand letter is the warning shot before formal enforcement.

What the demand letter doesn't mean is that enforcement is inevitable. There's still room for negotiation. Payment arrangements may still be available, although the terms will be tighter than they would have been earlier. The ATO is still willing to listen, although the listening period has narrowed.

What the demand letter does mean is that the next step, if no resolution is reached, is formal enforcement. For PAYG, GST and superannuation guarantee charge debts, that's likely to be a DPN. For other debts, it might be a statutory demand. Either way, the demand letter is the last step before the company moves into the position David found himself in three months ago.

The right response to a demand letter is to act, immediately. Bring a structural adviser in first to assess the underlying position. Understand what the company can realistically offer and what the ATO may be prepared to accept. Consider what restructuring is needed and what personal exposures are sitting behind the company position. Then engage with the ATO before the deadline expires, with a clear picture of what you can credibly negotiate. The demand letter is the opportunity to address the matter before it becomes a crisis. Most directors don't take that opportunity. The ones who do change the outcome dramatically.

What the Statutory Demand Means

The statutory demand under section 459E of the Corporations Act is a specific enforcement tool that the ATO uses against companies. It's a formal demand for payment of a debt of $4,000 or more. If the company doesn't pay within 21 days or apply to the court to set the demand aside, the company is presumed insolvent. Once the presumption of insolvency is in place, the ATO can apply to wind up the company.

Statutory demands are particularly serious because they create a presumption that's difficult to rebut. The presumption isn't about whether the debt is actually owed. It's about whether the company is solvent. A company that fails to comply with a statutory demand is presumed insolvent regardless of the underlying merits of the debt dispute.

The application to set aside a statutory demand has to be made within 21 days. The grounds are limited. There must be a genuine dispute about the debt or an offsetting claim of equivalent or greater value. The application is made in court, requires evidence and runs through procedural steps that take time. A director who receives a statutory demand has 21 days to decide whether to pay, dispute, or risk the consequences of doing nothing. The time pressure mirrors the DPN window.

If the statutory demand isn't paid or set aside, the ATO has a winding-up application available to it. Once the application is filed, the matter is in court. The company faces compulsory winding-up unless it can pay the debt before the application is heard. Compulsory winding-up usually means a more aggressive examination process than voluntary administration, with fewer choices for the director about how the company is wound up.

What Mark Should Do

David rings Mark back that afternoon. He doesn't try to give Mark the full picture in a phone call. He gives him the structure. "You've got a demand letter. That means the ATO is one step away from formal enforcement. You need to act this week. Not next week. Get the right people in the room. I suggest you don't ring your accountant first. Ring someone who deals with the structural side. Bring everything to the meeting. Trust deed, financials, guarantees, all of it. Don't wait for the next letter to arrive before you start moving."

Mark listens. Mark also asks David if David can recommend the people he worked with. David can. The introduction is made the same afternoon. Mark has his first meeting with the structural adviser on Friday. That's three days from receipt of the letter. Three days is fast by normal standards. By the standards of what the demand letter actually is, three days is appropriate.

Mark's situation is different from David's. The numbers are different. The structural exposure is different. The personal guarantees are different. What Mark has, that David didn't have until much later, is time. Time to properly assess before the formal enforcement step arrives. Time to negotiate before the ATO has issued anything that locks in personal liability. Time to restructure, if restructuring is needed, before the structure becomes the subject of an administrator’s or liquidator's review.

Whether Mark uses the time well or wastes it is now Mark's call. The pattern across hundreds of directors who've been in this position is that the ones who act on the demand letter end up in materially better positions than the ones who don't. The cost of acting is small relative to the cost of not acting. The hardest part is recognising that the demand letter is the moment to act and not the moment to file the letter and hope.

A Question for You

When did your company last receive a reminder letter, demand letter or any other ATO correspondence about an unpaid debt? If your answer is "recently" or "I'm not sure", that's the cue to find out. The first place to look is your accountant's correspondence file for the company. The second place to look is your company's registered office mail. The third place to look is your own personal address, if any tax-related correspondence has arrived there in your capacity as a director. The signals are usually visible. Most directors just haven't been looking for them.

If you don't know what ATO correspondence has reached your registered office in the last 12 months, the A13 will help you find out. 13 questions. Free. Start at riskprotector.com.au.

Chapter 11.
Help With ATO Debt

Mark sits down in the same conference room David sat in three months earlier. The structural adviser takes him through the picture. The underlying debt is $190,000 in unpaid GST and PAYG accumulated across two financial years. By the time penalties and interest are added, the demand letter is asking for $290,000. For nine months Mark has been making partial payments, sometimes against current obligations, sometimes against older ones, never quite getting ahead of it. He tried twice to set up a payment arrangement through the ATO's online portal. Both times the application was declined. He hasn't followed up since.

Mark's situation is the situation thousands of Australian directors find themselves in every year. Real ATO debt. Real attempts to address it. Real walls hit. The chapter you're reading covers the help that's actually available. What the help looks like. Where it comes from. What it can and can't do. And critically, why the help that most directors think exists is different from the help that actually exists.

What Real Help Looks Like

Real help with ATO debt isn't a single product. It's a combination of work that addresses the underlying position, the immediate exposure and the path forward, all at the same time. Each component matters. Doing one without the others usually fails. Doing all three together usually succeeds, even when the situation looks unrecoverable.

Start with what you owe. Not approximately. Not what someone told you. The exact figure. Every period, every penalty, every dollar of interest accrued. Most directors can't tell you that number. They have a rough idea, an old email from their accountant, the amount on the last letter they opened. None of that is the actual position. Getting there means pulling the running balance directly from the ATO, reconciling it against the company's own records, separating the debt by tax type and flagging anything disputed. That's the foundation. Everything else is built on it.

The second component is understanding what the company can realistically pay. This isn't what the director hopes the company can pay. It's what the company can genuinely commit to, after all other essential obligations are met, sustained across the full term of the payment arrangement is being considered. The realistic figure is usually lower than the director thinks. Cash flow is uneven. Bad months happen. The arrangement has to survive the bad months without defaulting.

The third component is structuring the engagement with the ATO so the proposed arrangement has the best possible chance of approval. This is where most directors lose ground. They submit applications without a coherent narrative about why the situation arose, what's been done about it and what's changed to give confidence the arrangement will succeed. The ATO has discretion. The ATO uses that discretion based on the picture presented to it. A weak picture gets a weak result, or no result. A strong picture gets serious consideration.

The three components together are what real help looks like. Anything less is partial work that may or may not produce a result.

Payment Arrangements That Work

Payment arrangements with the ATO can work, when they're properly structured. The mistake most directors make is treating the arrangement as a transaction. They calculate what they can pay each month, divide the total debt by that amount and submit a request for that schedule. The ATO declines. The director assumes the arrangement isn't available. They stop trying.

The arrangements that work are the ones presented as a complete proposal. The proposal explains what happened. It demonstrates that the underlying causes have been addressed. It shows what the company is doing differently going forward. It includes financial projections that support the proposed payment schedule. It shows that the company can remain current on its ongoing obligations during the period of the arrangement. It addresses, head-on, any past defaults on previous arrangements and explains why this one will be different.

The arrangement period matters too. The ATO's standard preference is for shorter arrangements. Twelve months is preferred over twenty-four. Eighteen months is preferred over thirty-six. Longer arrangements can be approved but need stronger justification. The proposal has to address why the longer period is needed, what security is available and what additional safeguards are being offered.

The terms typically include conditions. Lodgement and payment of all current obligations on time during the arrangement period. Notification of any material change in the company's financial position. The right of the ATO to terminate the arrangement on default and resume enforcement. None of these are negotiable. They're standard. The company has to be in a position to honour them, all of them, without exception.

When an arrangement is approved on these terms, it works. The debt is paid down on schedule. The company continues to operate. The personal exposure that would have followed enforcement is avoided. The ATO ends up paid, just over a longer period than originally intended. Both sides end up where they need to end up.

When the ATO Says No

The ATO doesn't always say yes. Sometimes the underlying situation makes an arrangement difficult to support. Multiple defaults on previous arrangements. Lack of confidence that the company can sustain the proposed payments. Concerns about director conduct. Underlying business viability that the ATO doesn't accept. Each of these can result in declined applications.

When the ATO says no, the response matters more than the request did. A declined application isn't necessarily the end of the conversation. The reasons for the decline are usually identifiable, either from the ATO's response or from a reasonable inference based on the company's history. Addressing those reasons in a revised application can produce a different outcome.

What doesn't work is resubmitting the same application with a different number. The ATO sees the original application, the decline, the resubmission and the lack of substantive change. The second decline tends to come faster than the first.

What does work is engaging with the ATO directly. Either through a written submission that addresses the reasons for the original decline, or through direct contact with the case officer who's been managing the matter. The conversation can establish what may change the ATO's view. Sometimes the answer is more security, more demonstration of viability, a shorter period or specific evidence that addresses a specific concern. With that information, a revised application has a real chance.

Mark's two declined applications were both submitted online without any supporting context. Neither application explained what had changed since the previous default. Neither presented a coherent picture of the company's current position or the path forward. The adviser's view, on reading the company's correspondence file, is that both applications would have been declined automatically by the system without a case officer ever engaging with them. That's the difference between a transaction and a proposal.

Compromise of Tax Debt

In limited circumstances, the ATO may accept less than the full amount of a tax debt as full settlement. This is called a compromise. It's available where collection of the full amount isn't realistic, where the alternative is winding up the company with the ATO recovering little or nothing and where the compromise produces a better outcome for the revenue than continued enforcement.

Compromise isn't a routine process. It requires a formal proposal, supported by financial information, demonstrating that the proposed amount is the most the ATO can realistically expect to recover. The proposal usually involves third-party verification, including independent insolvency advice on the alternative outcomes if compromise isn't accepted. The ATO's compromise policy is conservative. Most applications are unsuccessful.

Where compromise is appropriate, however, it can transform a director's position. A debt of $400,000 settled at $150,000 closes a chapter that would otherwise remain open for years. The DOCA process David went through in Chapter 9 included a compromise element on the GST component, which is one of the reasons that pathway worked for his situation. Compromise is more commonly available inside an administration or liquidation framework than outside it, but it can be available outside in the right circumstances.

The decision about whether to pursue a compromise and on what terms is one that needs careful thought. The work involved is substantial. The success rate is mixed. The downside of an unsuccessful compromise application can include accelerating enforcement, because the ATO now has a clear picture of the company's financial position and the limits of what can be recovered. The upside of a successful compromise is significant. The judgement about whether to pursue it is part of the strategic conversation.

What Doesn't Work

Several approaches don't work and waste time directors don't have. Knowing what doesn't work is sometimes as valuable as knowing what does.

Ignoring correspondence doesn't work. The ATO's enforcement systems are designed to escalate when correspondence goes unanswered. Silence accelerates enforcement, it doesn't slow it down. Directors who hope that not responding will buy time usually find themselves with less time than they'd have had if they'd engaged.

Repeated online applications without context don't work, as Mark discovered. The ATO's online system is designed to handle straightforward cases. Cases that are complex, or that involve previous defaults, need direct engagement to be considered properly. Submitting the same form three times isn't direct engagement.

Promising what can't be delivered doesn't work. Directors sometimes propose arrangements they know they can't honour, in the hope that approval will buy time. The ATO's experience with these arrangements is that they default within months, the matter then moves to enforcement and the director ends up worse off than they would have been with a smaller arrangement honoured properly. The ATO recognises optimistic projections quickly.

Personal payment of company debt doesn't work either, in the sense of producing a clean result. Directors sometimes pay company tax debt out of personal funds, hoping this will resolve the matter. The payment reduces the company debt, but the structural problem usually remains. The personal funds are depleted. The company resumes accumulating debt. The director ends up having paid twice. The right answer is structural change, not personal infusion of funds.

What the Right Help Looks Like

The right help with ATO debt has specific features. It starts with an honest assessment of the actual position, not an optimistic one. It involves direct engagement with the ATO, not online applications submitted in hope. It addresses underlying causes, not just symptoms. It produces an outcome the company can sustain, not one that defaults in three months.

It produces an outcome the company can sustain, not one that defaults in three months. It coordinates the ATO position with the broader structural picture, accounting for personal exposures, trust structures and asset positions, so nothing is inadvertently handed to the ATO in the process.

The right help doesn't promise miracles. There are situations where the debt is too large, the company isn't viable, or the structure is too compromised for any clean outcome. In those situations, the right help is honest about that and helps the director plan an exit that minimises personal damage. The exit might be voluntary administration, controlled liquidation, or a negotiated wind-down. The point is that the situation is being actively managed, not allowed to drift into the worst possible outcome.

Mark's situation, after the meeting, is being actively managed. The adviser begins the work that will produce a properly structured payment arrangement application within the next ten days. Mark stops sending random partial payments and starts holding the cash for the proposed schedule. The conversation with the ATO is being re-set on a different basis. The outcome isn't certain. The path is now coherent, where before it was scattered.

A Question for You

If you were proposing a payment arrangement to the ATO tomorrow, what would your proposal say beyond the dollar amount and the schedule? If your honest answer is "not much", that's the gap. The dollar amount and the schedule are the ending of the proposal, not the substance of it. The substance is what happened, what's been done about it, what's changed and why this arrangement will succeed where previous attempts didn't. Without that substance, the proposal is a transaction. Transactions get declined. Proposals get considered.

If your honest answer is "not much", the A13 is the structured way to build the substance your proposal would need. 13 questions. Free. Start at riskprotector.com.au.

Chapter 12.
Stop ATO Garnishment

It's a Monday morning, weeks later. A different director is sitting in the conference room. Her name is Linda. She runs a hospitality business in inner Brisbane. She walked in this morning carrying a printed copy of an email her bookkeeper sent her over the weekend. The email says her business bank account has been frozen. Pay runs scheduled for Tuesday won't go through. Suppliers due to be paid Wednesday will bounce. The ATO has issued a garnishee notice to her bank. Linda hadn't seen any of this coming.

A garnishee notice is the ATO's most disruptive enforcement tool against a company that's still operating. Most directors who hear about garnishee orders imagine them happening to someone else, late in the process, only after multiple warnings. The reality, in many cases, is faster and quieter. By the time the director finds out, the bank account is already locked and the immediate operational crisis is already underway. This chapter is about what to do when that happens and how to stop it before it happens to you.

What a Garnishee Actually Is

A garnishee notice is a legal direction issued by the ATO to a third party who holds money for you, or owes money to you, requiring that third party to pay the money directly to the ATO instead of to you. The third party is typically your bank, but it can also be your employer, a customer who owes you a substantial debt, a property settlement agent, or any other party that holds funds on your behalf or owes you money.

The notice has immediate legal effect. The third party doesn't need to verify the underlying debt, doesn't need a court order and doesn't need your consent. They receive the notice from the ATO, they comply with it. Failure to comply makes the third party personally liable for the amount the ATO was entitled to receive. So banks comply. Employers comply. Property settlement agents comply. The legal incentive to comply is overwhelming.

The amount specified in the notice is set by the ATO based on its assessment of the debt owing. The notice can capture all funds in the account up to that amount, or it can be a continuing notice that captures funds as they arrive in the account. A continuing notice is particularly disruptive, because it doesn't just freeze a single transaction. It captures every subsequent deposit until the amount is satisfied or the notice is withdrawn.

The notice is given to the third party, not necessarily to you. You may not be aware the notice has been issued until the third party tells you, or until you try to make a payment that doesn't go through. By that point, the freezing has already happened. The notice has done its work.

Why the ATO Uses Garnishees

The garnishee is the ATO's preferred enforcement tool when administrative options have run their course. It's faster than court action. It doesn't require the company to do anything, which means the company can't delay it through procedural manoeuvring. It produces an immediate result, which is cash flowing to the ATO. The third party is usually a bank, which means the cash is already there and accessible.

From the ATO's perspective, garnishees serve a particular purpose. They concentrate the company's mind. A company that has been letting tax debts drift through reminder phases without acting is forced, by the garnishee, to engage immediately. The bank account is locked. Pay runs can't go through. Suppliers can't be paid. The director who's been finding reasons to put the matter off can no longer put it off. The matter is now operational, not theoretical.

The ATO doesn't issue garnishees as a first step. They follow earlier escalation. Demand letters that weren't responded to. Payment arrangements that defaulted. Repeated correspondence that didn't produce engagement. The garnishee is the response to non-engagement. By the time it's issued, the ATO has typically formed the view that softer approaches won't work and that direct action is needed.

Linda's situation, as she sits in the conference room reading the email, fits the pattern. Her bookkeeper has been receiving ATO correspondence at the registered office for the last fourteen months and. Linda has seen most of it. The bookkeeper has been making partial payments, hoping the matter would resolve itself. Linda has been unaware that the ATO has been escalating. The garnishee is the moment the gap between what's been happening and what she's known closes, abruptly.

What to Do Inside the First Twenty-Four Hours

When a garnishee is in place, the first 24 hours matter more than any other window. The work in those 24 hours sets the trajectory. Done well, the garnishee can sometimes be lifted within days. Done badly, the garnishee can run for weeks while the business deteriorates around it.

The first step is to understand exactly what's been frozen. Not the rough version. The precise position. Which account. Whether it's a one-off or a continuing notice. What the specified amount is. What payments are about to bounce. What payments can still be made from other accounts that aren't subject to the notice. This information has to come from the bank directly. Often the bookkeeper or accountant has only partial information. The director needs the full picture.

The second step is to engage a structural adviser who deals with these situations routinely. Not after the ATO call. Before it. The adviser's role is to map the broader structural picture first, including personal exposures, trust structures and asset positions, and to identify anything that shouldn't be volunteered in the conversation that follows. That analysis shapes everything. What gets said, what gets asked, and what stays off the table entirely.

The third step is to contact the ATO directly. Not by online portal. Not by email. A direct phone call with someone who has authority over the matter. By this point the director knows what they're trying to establish, what may cause the garnishee to be lifted, what the ATO needs to see and what the realistic resolution options are. The director isn't disputing the debt at this stage. They're finding the path to a resolution. The difference between that conversation going well and going badly is almost always preparation.

The fourth step is to communicate with affected parties. Employees who weren't paid on Tuesday need to know what's happening and when payment will come through. Suppliers whose payments have bounced need to know the situation, briefly and professionally and need to know when the matter will be resolved. Reputation management in these moments is hard but it matters. A director who handles the communication with composure preserves relationships that a director who panics doesn't.

What Lifts a Garnishee

A garnishee can be lifted in several ways. Each requires different work. The right path depends on the underlying situation.

Payment of the full amount specified lifts the garnishee. If the company has the cash to pay, this is the cleanest option. The notice is satisfied. The account is unlocked. Trading resumes. This option is usually impractical, because companies that had the cash to pay didn't usually let things escalate to a garnishee in the first place.

An approved payment arrangement can lift the garnishee. The ATO will sometimes agree to lift the notice as part of an approved arrangement, particularly where the company can demonstrate that the garnishee itself is preventing the company from generating the cash flow needed to make the arrangement work. The proposal has to be properly structured. The same principles from Chapter 11 apply, with even greater urgency.

Voluntary administration ends the garnishee, because the appointment of an administrator triggers a moratorium on enforcement actions. The administrator becomes the relevant decision-maker for the company's affairs. The ATO can no longer act on a garnishee against company funds while the administration runs. This option is significant. It changes the situation fundamentally. It also has all the consequences described in Chapter 9. It isn't the right answer for every situation, but it's the right answer for some.

A successful negotiation with the ATO about the underlying debt position can also lift the garnishee. This is less common but it happens. Where there's a genuine dispute about the amount of the debt, where the company has compelling new information that changes the picture, or where the ATO accepts that an alternative path will produce a better outcome, the garnishee can be replaced with a different mechanism. The negotiation is hard, the success rate is mixed, but the option exists.

How to Avoid a Garnishee in the First Place

The best response to a garnishee is preventing it from being issued. Several practical steps make a garnishee less likely.

Engage with ATO correspondence as it arrives. The reminders, the demand letters, the formal notices. Each one is an opportunity to engage before escalation. Engagement doesn't always produce immediate resolution. It does, in most cases, slow the escalation pattern. Directors who engage rarely end up with garnishees. Directors who don't engage often do.

Lodge BAS forms on time, every quarter, regardless of payment capacity. The reasons for this go beyond the DPN regime discussed in Chapter 7. Timely lodgement keeps the company on the ATO's compliance radar in a positive way. It demonstrates that the company is engaging with its obligations even when payment is difficult. It preserves options that late lodgement closes.

Maintain bookkeeper communication that flows through to the director. Many directors don't see ATO correspondence because it's directed to the bookkeeper at the registered office and stays there. Establishing a protocol that ensures any ATO correspondence is escalated to the director immediately, in real time, prevents the gap between what's happening and what the director knows. The garnishee that lands without warning is almost always preceded by months of correspondence the director didn't see.

Act on demand letters within days. As discussed in Chapter 10, the demand letter is the warning shot before formal enforcement. Acting on it changes the trajectory. Filing it doesn't. The directors who handle ATO debt well are the ones who treat demand letters as urgent items, not as routine correspondence.

What Happens to Linda

Linda spends Monday afternoon working through the steps with the adviser. The bank confirms the garnishee specifies $186,000 and is a continuing notice. Tuesday's pay run for $42,000 hadn't yet been processed when the notice was given. Wednesday's supplier payments would have amounted to $58,000. The adviser helps Linda contact the ATO debt collection line. The conversation is direct. The ATO officer agrees to consider a payment arrangement application that would include lifting the garnishee, subject to terms.

Tuesday morning, the proposal goes in. It's properly structured. It explains what happened. It demonstrates the company's underlying viability. It proposes an arrangement that the company can sustain. It addresses the bookkeeper communication failure that led to the escalation. By Wednesday afternoon, the ATO has approved the arrangement and lifted the garnishee. The Tuesday pay run goes through Wednesday evening. Wednesday's supplier payments go through Thursday morning, with apologies. Suppliers accept the apology. The business continues.

Linda's situation isn't typical in the speed of the resolution. Engagement, structured proposal, direct contact with the ATO, support from a structural adviser who knew the path. The ingredients are repeatable. The outcome isn't guaranteed in every case, but the approach increases the chance of a workable outcome substantially.

A Question for You

If a garnishee landed on your business bank account tomorrow morning, what would you do in the first hour? If your honest answer involves panic, calling people who can't help, or hoping the situation will somehow reverse itself, that's the gap. The first hour matters. Knowing what to do in that first hour and who to call, is the kind of preparation that no director ever does until they need to. The ones who've done it in advance handle the situation. The ones who haven't, struggle. The cost of preparation is small. The cost of unpreparedness is large.

If you don't have a plan for the first hour, the A13 is the work that builds that plan, before the situation arrives. 13 questions. Free. Start at
riskprotector.com.au.

PART FOUR

Structural Protection

Part Four explains why structural protection is the first line of defence and which structural tools genuinely work in Australian conditions.

Chapter 13.
Why Structural Protection Is the First Line of Defence

Six months have passed. The DOCA is producing the outcome the adviser predicted. The company is paying down its restructured obligations on schedule. Mark's payment arrangement is holding. Linda's garnishee is a memory. David is back in the conference room, on a different morning, for a different reason. He's there to talk about what comes next. The crisis has been managed. The structure that allowed the crisis to develop hasn't been rebuilt. That's the work of the next nine months. That's the work that should have been done years ago, before any letter ever arrived. That's structural protection.

Most directors meet structural protection in reverse. They meet it when the structure has already failed and the consequences are unfolding. They wish they'd built the structure earlier. They didn't, because no one told them to, no one explained how and the work felt unnecessary while everything was running smoothly. This chapter is about why structural protection is the first line of defence, why it has to be in place before trouble arrives and why the cost of putting it in place is small compared to the cost of not having it when you need it.

What Structural Protection Actually Is

Structural protection is the deliberate arrangement of your business and personal assets so that the assets sit beyond the reach of the threats that could arrive against you. It isn't hiding assets. It isn't avoiding tax. It isn't moving things around at the last minute to defeat a known creditor. All of those are different things, with different legal status and most of them don't work.

Structural protection is the architecture of your affairs. Where the trading risk sits. Where the assets sit. How they're held. Who controls them. What happens when control passes. How the structure responds when something goes wrong. A structure that's been built properly continues to do its job whether the threat that arrives is a Director Penalty Notice, a personal guarantee being called, an insolvent trading claim, a relationship breakdown or any other source of pressure on personal assets.

What makes structural protection effective is that it operates as a complete framework. Each piece supports the others. The trading entity carries the trading risk. A separate holding entity holds the assets that need to be protected. Trust structures hold the family assets in a way that survive bankruptcy or divorce. Personal guarantees are managed against a known asset base. Each component is correctly drafted, properly executed and regularly reviewed. The whole structure is greater than the sum of its parts.

Why It Has to Be Built Before Trouble Arrives

Every component of effective structural protection has to be in place before any threat arrives. Once a threat is on the horizon, the law and the relevant regulators treat any new arrangement with suspicion. Transfers become voidable. Trusts become subject to scrutiny. Personal arrangements between spouses get questioned. The freedom to build the structure depends on doing it during a period when nobody has any reason to question your motives.

This was the heart of David's problem in Chapter 3. The home transfer to Megan, made six months before the DPN arrived, was caught by the voidable transaction provisions. The same transfer made five years earlier, with no creditor pressure on the horizon, would probably have stood. The mechanics of the transfer were the same. The legal status was completely different, because the timing was different.

The same logic applies across the rest of the structural picture. A trust set up when the business is stable, properly settled, properly managed, with the appointor and trustee roles correctly assigned, becomes part of the structural fabric. The same trust set up two years before insolvency, with assets transferred at the last minute, gets pulled apart. The structures that work are the ones that have been part of the picture for long enough that no one can reasonably claim they were built to defeat a particular creditor.

The implication is that structural protection is preventive medicine. It has to be put in place during the period when you don't think you need it. By the time you think you need it, putting it in place is much harder and the protection it provides is much weaker. The directors who get this right are the ones who treat structural protection as routine business hygiene, like insurance, like backup systems, like documented processes. Something you maintain because the cost of maintenance is small and the cost of not having it when you need it is potentially everything.

What Structural Protection Doesn't Do

Structural protection isn't a magic wand. It doesn't make tax debts disappear. It doesn't extinguish personal guarantees. It doesn't override statutory liability that's been triggered. It doesn't reverse director conduct that's already exposed. The work of the structure is to limit the damage that any of those threats can do, not to prevent the threats from arising in the first place.

A director with a properly built structure who then receives a Director Penalty Notice still has to deal with the DPN. The structure doesn't make the DPN go away. What the structure does is ensure that, while the director is dealing with the DPN, the family home isn't on the table, the family trust isn't exposed, the personal asset position isn't catastrophically thin. The structure preserves the ability to handle the threat without losing everything in the process.

A director with a properly built structure who has signed personal guarantees still has the guarantee exposure. The structure doesn't cancel the guarantee. What the structure does is ensure that the assets the guarantee creditor can reach are limited to the assets that were always at risk, not the family base that the structure has held outside the reach of the trading exposure. The guarantee is paid, if it's called, from a different pool than the family pool.

Understanding what structural protection doesn't do is part of using it properly. The directors who use it well are the ones who understand its limits. They use it to manage the threats that exist, not to pretend the threats can be eliminated. They combine it with other tools, including good trading practice, prudent borrowing, properly negotiated guarantees and active engagement with regulators when issues arise. Structure is the foundation. Other tools sit on top of the foundation.

What a Properly Built Structure Looks Like

A properly built structure has several identifiable features. It separates trading risk from non-trading assets. The trading company carries the operational risk. The non-trading assets, including the family home, the investment properties, the long-term wealth, sit somewhere else, where the trading exposures can't reach them.

It uses appropriate legal entities. Discretionary family trusts for assets that need to be held outside the bankruptcy estate. Holding companies where there's a benefit to corporate structure. Joint or sole ownership of personal assets where the marital and family circumstances support it. The choice of entity follows the function, not the other way around.

It documents the relationships properly. Every transfer, loan or transaction between related entities is documented at the time it happens, with appropriate consideration, with proper resolutions where required. The paper trail supports the structure under any subsequent examination. The documentation is the structure as much as the entities are.

It identifies the appointor and trustee roles deliberately. A trust is only as protective as its appointor protocol. If the appointor is the director personally and the director is bankrupted, the trust becomes vulnerable. A properly built structure puts the appointor role in hands that are insulated from the director's personal exposure, with succession arrangements that survive any single director event.

It's reviewed regularly. The structure that worked five years ago might not work today. Legislation changes. Personal circumstances change. The business changes. A structure that isn't maintained becomes a structure that's outdated. Regular review, at least every two or three years, keeps the structure aligned with the current threats and the current legal landscape.

What David Is Going to Build

The adviser lays out the work that needs to happen across the next nine months. The trust deed needs to be amended to address the appointor vulnerabilities the original deed contained. The trading company needs to be separated from the asset-holding company through a properly executed restructure. The home will need a fresh strategy, given the existing transfer is now compromised. The personal guarantees need to be reviewed one by one and either varied, replaced or matched against asset positions that can sustain them. The wishes memorandum needs to be drafted. The succession arrangements for the appointor role need to be put in place.

Done properly, with the right professionals, in the right order, the total cost across the nine months is probably $25,000 to $45,000 in fees, depending on the complexity of the various pieces. That's a substantial sum. It's also small compared to what David has paid the ATO under the DOCA, the legal fees during the administration, the lost trading capacity during the immediate crisis. The structural work, done five years earlier, would have cost a similar amount and might have prevented the crisis entirely.

David doesn't need to be told this twice. He'd already understood it when he was sitting at his kitchen table reading the letter for the seventh time. The lesson, expensively learned, is now driving the work of the next nine months. By the time David is finished, his structure will be one that can withstand the next set of threats that will eventually come, in some form, in some year. That's the protection structural work delivers. Not certainty. Not invulnerability. The capacity to absorb threats without losing the things that matter.

A Question for You

When did anyone last review your structure with this question in mind? “What happens if everything goes wrong tomorrow? Not tax efficiency. Not what's working. If the honest answer is that no one has ever asked it, you're in the same position David was in five years before the letter arrived. The work that prevents this isn't urgent until it's too late. The directors who avoid the David situation do it while there's still nothing to panic about. That's the only window in which it's fully effective.

> If no one has ever asked that question of your structure, the A13 is the question being asked in writing, in 13 parts. 13 questions. Free. Start at riskprotector.com.au.

Chapter 14.
The Structural Tools That Work

It's a Tuesday morning, three months into David's nine-month rebuild. The adviser has set a folder on the table. Inside the folder, separated by tabs, are draft documents for the various structural tools that will, together, form David's new structure. Some are ready for execution. Some are still in draft. Some are waiting on information from David. The adviser opens the folder, points at the tabs and says "Each one of these is a tool. Each tool does a specific job. Together they make a structure. Let me walk you through what each one is and why it's in this folder."

This chapter is a tour of the structural tools that actually work in Australian conditions. Not theoretical concepts. Real legal instruments, with real names, used in real engagements every day. The tools that follow are the ones a structural adviser will reach for in the right circumstances. They aren't the only tools that exist. They're the ones that have been tested across enough situations to be reliable. The right combination depends on the situation. The fact that the tools exist and what they do, is the foundation of everything else.

Tool One. The Discretionary Family Trust

The discretionary family trust is the workhorse of Australian asset protection. It's a legal arrangement under which assets are held by a trustee for the benefit of a class of beneficiaries, with the trustee having discretion about which beneficiaries receive distributions and in what amounts. The structure is well established in Australian law. The principles have been tested repeatedly in courts and the core framework is sound. It's recognised in Commonwealth and state legislation. When it's set up properly, it does its job.

What makes the discretionary family trust effective for asset protection is that no individual beneficiary has a fixed entitlement to the trust assets. The trustee can distribute to any beneficiary, all beneficiaries, or none. Because no individual beneficiary owns a defined share, a creditor of any individual beneficiary can't seize a share that doesn't exist. The trust assets sit outside the bankruptcy estate of any single beneficiary.

The trust isn't bulletproof. The settlor of the trust, the original person who set it up, is treated differently from the beneficiaries. The trustee, if it's a corporate trustee, has its own rules about director liability. The appointor, the person who can appoint or remove trustees, is a critical role that needs careful structuring. A poorly drafted trust deed can collapse the protection a properly drafted deed delivers. The work is in the detail.

For David, the discretionary family trust is being established to hold the long-term family assets going forward. The trust deed has been drafted with attention to the appointor protocol, the succession arrangements, the distribution clauses and the wind-up provisions. Each clause has been considered against the various threats that could arrive. The drafting alone is taking three to four weeks of structured work. That's the right amount of time for work that has to last decades.

One structural protection built into the riskprotector.com.au framework is worth naming directly. A liquidator or trustee in bankruptcy cannot step into the shoes of the director of a corporate trustee. Nor can they step into the shoes of an individual trustee.

This is a key feature of the structure. It means that even if a creditor or regulator pursues the director personally, that pursuit does not give them control over the trust or its assets. The trust continues to be administered by its trustee. The separation holds. This is not an accident of the structure. It is a design feature, and it is one of the reasons the corporate trustee arrangement is used in preference to individual trustee arrangements in structures built for asset protection purposes.

Tool Two. The Holding Company

The holding company sits between the trading company and the asset base. It owns the trading company. It can also own other assets that need to sit at arm's length from the trading risk. Its function is to be the single point of ownership above the operational level, with its own constitution, its own directors, its own structural protections.

Why use a holding company at all? Because separating the trading risk from the asset position is one of the central principles of structural protection. A trading company carries the operational liabilities. A holding company carries the ownership of long-term value.

If the trading company gets into difficulty, the holding company's assets aren't directly exposed. The structural separation means a creditor of the trading company can't reach into the holding company's assets without specific legal grounds, which usually don't exist when the structure is properly maintained.

Holding companies also provide flexibility for future planning. They can issue different classes of shares. They can be the vehicle for bringing in new shareholders without disturbing the trading entity. They can hold investments and accumulate wealth at the ownership level, separate from the operational risks below. They make the ownership structure more durable and more adaptable than a single-company structure ever can be.

David is currently the sole director and shareholder of his trading company. That means he owns it directly and every risk the business carries sits against him personally. The rebuild changes that. A holding company is established, owned by the trust. The holding company then owns the trading entity.

David remains the director of but he is no longer the direct owner of anything. The trading entity carries the operational risk. The holding company holds the long-term value. The trust holds the family interests. Each layer does a specific job and David's personal exposure is removed from the chain entirely

Two further documents belong alongside the holding company structure and are often overlooked.

The first is an IP transfer agreement. Any intellectual property that the founder has developed, brand, systems, processes, methodologies, software, trade secrets, needs to be formally transferred from the founder's personal ownership to the holding company. This is a separate legal instrument. It cannot be assumed. Without it, the IP remains personally owned by the founder and is exposed to whatever personal threats arrive. With it, the IP sits at the holding layer, protected from trading-layer risk.

The second is an IP licence agreement between the holding company and the trading entity. Once the holding company owns the IP, the trading entity needs a formal licence to use it. That licence is granted by the holding company on defined terms.

If the trading entity gets into serious difficulty, the holding company can terminate the licence and grant a new one to a successor trading entity. The business continues. The IP is preserved. The damage stays at the trading layer where it belongs. Without this agreement in place, the structural separation between the holding company and the trading entity is incomplete.

Tool Three. The Wishes Memorandum

A trust deed sets out the legal framework. A wishes memorandum sets out how the settlor or appointor wants the trust to be administered in practice. The wishes memorandum isn't a legal document in the strict sense. It's a written statement of intent. The trustee is expected to give weight to the wishes when exercising discretion, although the trustee isn't legally bound by them in the way they would be by a clause of the deed.

Why does this matter? Because in Queensland a discretionary trust can run for up to eighty years. It will outlive the people who set it up. The settlor will eventually die. The original appointor will eventually pass on the role. The original trustees may be replaced. Without a wishes memorandum, the trust runs on the bare framework of the deed alone and the people exercising discretion ten or twenty years from now have to guess what the original intent was.

A properly drafted wishes memorandum addresses several questions. Who are the intended primary beneficiaries and what are the intended principles for distributions among them? What are the contingencies under which distributions should be conservative versus generous?

How should the trust respond to events such as a beneficiary's bankruptcy, marriage breakdown or significant illness? What are the principles for capital preservation versus income distribution? Each of these is something a thoughtful settlor cares about. None of them is necessarily covered by the deed itself in operational detail.

David and Megan’s wishes memorandum is being drafted in parallel with the trust deed. It runs to about twelve pages. It sets out, in plain language, what the trust is meant to achieve, who’s meant to benefit, what kind of conduct should change distributions and what the long-term strategic goals are. Future trustees, future appointors and future advisers will read this document and understand what David and Megan intended. That’s the documented intent the structure depends on.

A question that arises in more complex structures is whether a second trust should be established to hold the business assets including the IP, separate from the trust holding the family assets. The answer depends on the situation. Where the business assets are substantial, where the IP carries significant value, or where there is a meaningful distinction between the business interests of the founder and the family interests of the broader beneficiaries, a second trust can be warranted.

It creates an additional layer of separation and allows the business and family structures to be governed independently, with different trustees, different beneficiary schedules and different wishes memoranda if appropriate. Where the structure is simpler and the assets are less distinct, one trust is often sufficient. The structural adviser needs to assess this question specifically. It is not a default decision in either direction.

Tool Four. The Appointor Protocol

The appointor of a trust holds significant power. The appointor can typically remove a trustee and appoint a new one. The appointor's identity and the rules around appointor succession are, in many trusts, the single most important determinant of whether the trust will retain its protective character through challenging events.

The fundamental problem with a trust where the appointor is a single individual, often the original settlor, is that the appointor's personal exposure flows through to the trust. If the appointor is bankrupted, the appointor's interest in the role can be argued to vest in the Trustee in Bankruptcy. If the appointor dies without a valid succession, the role can fall into a default position that doesn't serve the trust's purpose. If the appointor becomes incapacitated, decisions can be paralysed at exactly the moment they need to be made.

A properly built appointor protocol addresses these vulnerabilities. The role can be held by a committee of multiple individuals, with majority decision-making, so that no single individual's circumstances can compromise the role. The succession to the role can be defined in advance, with clear rules about how new appointors are appointed when existing ones step down. The role can be insulated from any individual's bankruptcy estate through specific drafting techniques that have been tested in Australian courts.

David's appointor protocol uses a three-person committee. The committee includes David, an independent professional trustee chosen for the role and a family member of Megan's, all bound by a written protocol that requires majority approval for any significant decision. The protocol survives any individual circumstance affecting any single committee member. The trust continues to be administered by competent appointors regardless of what happens in any one life.

Tool Five. The Personal Asset Allocation

Not every asset belongs in a trust. Some assets work better held personally, some in joint names with a spouse, some in a holding company, some in a trust. The right allocation depends on the asset, the threats it might face and the broader structural picture. Getting the allocation right is half the work of building a structure that actually protects.

The family home is the asset most directors think about first. The right answer for the family home varies. Sometimes joint tenancy with a spouse is the best protection. Sometimes a trust holding is better. Sometimes a separate ownership structure is needed. The choice depends on the marriage's stability, the spouse's own exposure profile, the state-based stamp duty implications and the long-term plans for the property.

Investment properties, financial assets, business interests, vehicles, intellectual property, all need their own consideration. A blanket approach that puts everything in one entity is usually wrong. A considered approach that asks the right questions about each asset usually produces a structure where each asset sits in the right place for its specific characteristics.

David's allocation is being mapped in a spreadsheet that the adviser has been building across the rebuild. Each significant asset is listed, with its current ownership, its proposed ownership and the reasons for the proposed location. The spreadsheet runs to about forty rows.

Some of the proposed moves are simple. Some require careful sequencing to avoid stamp duty or capital gains consequences. The work is methodical and, when it's done, the allocation is documented in a way that can be reviewed and updated as circumstances change.

Tool Six. The Personal Guarantee Strategy

Personal guarantees have featured throughout this book because they're one of the most common sources of personal exposure. The structural response to personal guarantees has several components. Mapping the existing guarantees, in writing, with copies. Identifying which guarantees can be cancelled, varied or replaced under the new structure. Establishing rules for any new guarantees being signed in the future. Maintaining a register that tracks guarantees through their lifecycle.

The mapping work is unglamorous but essential. Most directors don't have a complete record of the guarantees they've signed. Reconstructing the record requires going through old loan documents, lease agreements, supplier accounts and any other arrangements where credit was extended to the company. Banks and major suppliers will provide copies of the guarantees they hold if asked, although this can take time.

Once mapped, each guarantee can be assessed. Some are old and relate to debts that have been paid. Those can often be released by request to the original credit provider. Some relate to current arrangements where the underlying contract is being renewed. Renewal is the moment to renegotiate the guarantee, often by capping it, limiting its scope or replacing it with security of a different kind. Some are firmly in place and can't be moved. Those need to be quantified, factored into the personal exposure picture and managed.

The goal isn't necessarily to eliminate all personal guarantees. That's rarely possible. The goal is to know exactly what guarantees exist, why they exist and to have a structural picture in which any guarantee that's called can be paid from a defined pool of resources without disturbing the family base. That's a workable position. The unworkable position is the one most directors are in, which is having signed many guarantees over the years without knowing the cumulative exposure or having a plan for how it would be managed if multiple guarantees were called at once.

How the Tools Fit Together

Each tool on its own is a useful piece of legal architecture. None of them, on their own, is a complete answer. The strength of structural protection comes from the way the tools combine. The trading company carries the trading risk. The holding company holds the value above the trading entity.

The trust holds the family interests above the holding company. The appointor protocol protects the trust against any single individual event. The wishes memorandum guides discretion across decades. The personal asset allocation places each asset where it best resists the threats that could arrive against it. The personal guarantee strategy maps and manages the exposures that remain after the structure has done everything it can.

A director with all of these tools in place, properly drafted, properly executed, properly documented, regularly reviewed, has a structure. A director with two or three of them in isolation has fragments of a structure that may or may not survive a real test. The difference, when the test arrives, is enormous.

What David is building, over the nine months, is a complete structure. Not a perfect one. Not an unbreakable one. A complete one, in the sense that every piece is in place, every piece is doing its job and every piece is documented in a way that supports the others. The structure won't prevent every threat. It will limit the damage of every threat that arrives. That's the work structural protection delivers.

A Question for You

Of the six tools described in this chapter, which ones are currently in your structure? If your honest answer is "two or three", you have fragments. If it's "none", you have no structure at all, only a default position. The structural rebuild David is going through wasn't optional once the crisis arrived. It would have been optional five years earlier. Whether it's optional for you, today, depends on whether the crisis has arrived yet. Either way, the time to start is now.

> If you have fragments rather than a complete structure, the A13 will tell you, plainly, which pieces you're missing. 13 questions. Free. Start at riskprotector.com.au.

PART FIVE

Crisis Response

Part Five is for directors already in crisis. It covers what to do when you're already in trouble, the asset protection framework as a system for lifelong protection and the A13 Structural Exposure Assessment as the entry point to working with Risk Protector.

Chapter 15.
If You're Reading This Because You're Already in Trouble

It's possible that you didn't pick this book up to learn about structural protection in advance. It's possible you picked it up because something has already happened. A letter has arrived. A demand has been made. A bank account has been frozen. A creditor has called. Someone has used a phrase you didn't fully understand and the conversation that followed left you feeling like you don't know what's coming next. If that's why you're reading, this chapter is for you.

The previous fourteen chapters have been written for directors who have time. Time to read, time to consider, time to build the structure before the threat arrives. This chapter assumes you don't have that time. You're already inside the situation. The work that needs to happen is the work of dealing with what's in front of you, with the structure you have, with the assets where they are, in the days you've got. The path is narrower. It's also still a path.

First. Stop and Breathe

The first thing to do, if you're already in trouble, is to stop. Not literally stop the work that needs to be done. Stop the panic. Stop the flurry of phone calls that aren't producing results. Stop the action that's being taken without information. Sit down for an hour. Get out a piece of paper. Write down what you actually know. Write down what you don't know. The clarity you build in that hour will determine the quality of every decision you make over the next 21 days, the next month, the next quarter.

The second thing is to recognise that the situation you're in, however bad it feels, has been seen before. Other directors have been in your exact position. Some of them came out of it intact. Some of them came out of it with significant damage but their family base preserved. Some of them lost almost everything.

The variable that most determined the outcome wasn't the size of the debt or the severity of the threat. It was the order in which they did things and who they did them with. Doing the right things in the right order, with the right people, changes the outcome more than anything else within your control.

The third thing is to give yourself permission not to fix everything in the next 24 hours. Most situations of this kind don't have a single solution that can be reached overnight. They have a series of decisions, made in sequence, each one informed by what was learned in the previous step. Trying to short-circuit that process by reaching for an instant fix is one of the main reasons directors make decisions in this period that they regret for years afterwards.

Map What You Actually Have

The first practical work, before any decision is made, is to map what you actually have. The exact wording of any letter or notice you've received. The dates on any deadlines that are running. The list of assets and where each one sits. The list of personal guarantees you've signed, with whoever you can recall as the relevant credit provider. The trust deed for any trust you're a beneficiary, appointor or trustee of. The current state of your bank accounts, your loan facilities and your trading position.

Most directors in trouble don't have this picture clearly. They have fragments. They know roughly what they own. They know roughly what they owe. They have an impression of where the immediate threats sit. The impression isn't enough. The decisions that come next have to be based on the actual position, not the impression of it.

Building the picture takes a few days of focused work. It involves pulling together documents that may be in several places. It involves contacting banks, suppliers and other parties to confirm what's outstanding and what's been guaranteed. It involves checking the records you have against the records they have and reconciling any differences. It involves writing the picture down in one place so you can see it as a whole.

This work has to be done before any structural decision is made. Decisions made on incomplete information almost always create new problems. Decisions made on a clear picture have a chance of being right.

Find the Right People to Stand With You

If you're in trouble, you can't navigate it alone. The skills required across the next few weeks are skills that no single person has. You need accountancy support to understand the numbers. You need legal support to understand the documents. You need structural support to coordinate the bigger picture. You may need administrator or liquidator support depending on the severity of the situation.

The right people are the ones who do this work routinely. Not the ones who do it occasionally. Not the ones who specialise in something different. The ones whose practices include directors in your position as a regular feature of their work. They've seen it before. They know the patterns. They know which path leads to which outcome. Their advice, even when it's hard to hear, is grounded in experience that's directly relevant to the decisions you're making.

The wrong people are the ones who tell you what you want to hear. The ones who sell certainty when no certainty is available. The ones who quote fees that don't reflect the work involved. The ones who promise outcomes that they can't deliver. Directors in trouble are vulnerable to these people, because the temptation to believe a comforting story is large. The discipline to choose the harder, more honest, more competent path is what separates good outcomes from bad ones.

The structural adviser's role, as described throughout this book, is the coordinating role. Not the only role, but the role that connects the others. A good structural adviser will work with your accountant, your solicitor and any other professional involved in your situation. The structural adviser doesn't replace those relationships. The structural adviser brings them together so that the overall response is coherent rather than fragmented.

Order of Operations

The order in which things get done matters. Most directors in trouble want to deal with the most painful threat first. That's often wrong. The right order is usually different from the most-painful-first instinct.

First, understand the picture. Information before decisions. The mapping work described above. This may take three to five days of focused effort. It can't be skipped, even when the deadline pressure feels overwhelming.

Second, address any immediate time-pressured threats. If a DPN is running, the 21-day window dominates everything else until it's resolved. If a statutory demand is running, the 21 days for that demand dominates. If a court hearing is imminent, that takes priority. Time-pressured threats get attended to as soon as the picture is clear enough to make decisions about them.

Third, address the broader structural issues that the immediate threats have exposed. Voidable transactions that need to be reviewed. Personal guarantees that need to be mapped and managed. Trust deeds that need to be examined for vulnerabilities. This work runs in parallel with the immediate response, not after it.

Fourth, plan the rebuild. Whatever the outcome of the current crisis, the structure that allowed the crisis to develop usually needs to be rebuilt afterwards. Starting to plan that rebuild while the current crisis is still being managed accelerates the recovery on the other side. Waiting until the crisis is fully resolved before starting to plan the rebuild adds months to the overall recovery time.

What to Avoid

Several actions, taken in panic, make a difficult situation worse. They're worth listing because they're tempting and common.

Don't make last-minute transfers of assets to family members. Whatever the original intention, transfers made in proximity to insolvency are voidable. The transfer doesn't protect the asset and it strengthens any subsequent argument that there was an intent to defeat creditors. The legal position becomes worse, not better.

Don't take cash out of the business in unusual amounts or unusual ways. The pattern is visible to a liquidator who reviews the bank statements later. Unusual cash movements in the period leading up to insolvency are routinely pursued and routinely successful in being recovered. The director ends up personally liable for the amounts taken, often plus costs.

Don't sign new personal guarantees unless absolutely necessary. The instinct, when a creditor is threatening to withdraw a facility, is to sign whatever they ask to keep the facility in place. The signed guarantee adds to the personal exposure. If the company fails anyway, the new guarantee comes with the rest. The right answer is usually to negotiate around the guarantee or to accept that the facility will be lost rather than expand the personal liability.

Don't ignore correspondence. The instinct to put difficult letters aside is understandable because its human. It also accelerates enforcement, because the issuing party reads silence as confirmation that escalation is needed. Engaging with correspondence, even minimally, slows the escalation pattern.

Don't make commitments you can't keep, particularly to creditors and regulators. A promise of payment that doesn't get honoured undermines the relationship far more than a realistic discussion about what's actually possible. Creditors and regulators deal with realistic conversations productively. They deal with broken promises punitively.

What to Hold On To

If you're in trouble, hold on to two things across the next few weeks. The first is your composure. The second is your perspective.

Your composure is the single biggest predictor of how the situation unfolds. Composed directors make better decisions, communicate more effectively, attract better support and present better to regulators and creditors. Panicked directors make worse decisions, communicate poorly, alienate support and present in ways that damage their position. Composure isn't about not feeling the stress. It's about not letting the stress drive the decisions.

Your perspective is the recognition that this period of your life is one period, not your whole life. The crisis is real. The consequences are real. The damage may be substantial. None of that defines you, your future capacity, your relationships or what you'll build next. Directors who come through these situations and rebuild are common. The rebuild is harder than the original build, but it's possible. Knowing that, while you're in the middle of the worst of it, helps you act in ways that preserve the option to rebuild on the other side.

What's Possible Even Now

If you're in trouble, hold on to two things across the next few weeks. The first is your composure. The second is your perspective.

Your composure is the single biggest predictor of how the situation unfolds. Composed directors make better decisions, communicate more effectively, attract better support and present better to regulators and creditors. Panicked directors make worse decisions, communicate poorly, alienate support and present in ways that damage their position. Composure isn't about not feeling the stress. It's about not letting the stress drive the decisions.

Your perspective is the recognition that this period of your life is one period, not your whole life. The crisis is real. The consequences are real. The damage may be substantial. None of that defines you, your future capacity, your relationships or what you'll build next. Directors who come through these situations and rebuild are common. The rebuild is harder than the original build, but it's possible. Knowing that, while you're in the

middle of the worst of it, helps you act in ways that preserve the option to rebuild on the other side.

A Question for You

If you're already in trouble, what's the single most important thing you don't yet know about your situation? If you can name it in one sentence, that's the question you take to the right people first. If you can't name it, the work of the next few days is to find what that question is. The clarity to ask the right question is often the difference between a situation that gets worse and a situation that starts to get better.

If you're already in trouble and don't know which question to ask first, the A13 lays out the questions in the right order. 13 questions. Free. Start at riskprotector.com.au.

Chapter 16.
The Asset Protection Framework

It's nine months on from the morning David first got on a call with his adviser. The DOCA has been completed. The structural rebuild is approaching its final stage. The trust is established and operating. The holding company is in place. The wishes memorandum is signed. The appointor protocol is documented. The personal asset allocation is mapped and most of the moves are complete.

The personal guarantee strategy has cancelled three guarantees, varied two and capped one. What David has now isn't just a recovery from a crisis. It's a structure. The adviser opens the final call and says "Now you have what you should have had ten years ago. Let me walk you through what you've actually built and how it all works together. So you understand it. So you can explain it. So you can defend it."

This chapter is the framework that ties the whole picture together. The previous chapters covered specific pieces. This chapter shows how the pieces become a complete system, how the system responds when threats arrive and how a director should think about the whole thing as one integrated piece of architecture rather than a collection of separate components.

What the Framework Does

An asset protection framework, properly built, does four things. It identifies the threats that could arrive against you. It places your assets where each one is best protected against the threats relevant to it. It documents the structure in a way that survives examination. It evolves as your circumstances and the legal landscape change. The framework isn't a single document or a single entity. It's a coordinated system that does these four things continuously.

Identification of threats is the diagnostic work. What are the realistic threats that could arrive in the next five to ten years? Tax debts. Personal guarantees being called. Insolvent trading claims. Marital breakdown.

Disability or illness. Death. Family provision claims. Each director's threat profile is different. Each profile generates a different set of structural priorities.

Asset placement is the architectural work. Once the threats are identified, each significant asset is placed where it's best protected against the threats it faces. The family home goes in one place. The investment property in another. The trading entity in a third. The intellectual property in a fourth. The choices follow the threat analysis, not the other way around.

Documentation is the durability work. A structure that exists only in arrangements undocumented between people, doesn't survive the people. A structure that's documented in deeds, resolutions, registers and memoranda survives generations. The documentation isn't bureaucratic overhead. It's the structural element that keeps the protection alive over time.

Evolution is the maintenance work. The structure that worked five years ago might not work today. New legislation arrives. New case law emerges. Personal circumstances change. The structure must be reviewed, refreshed and adjusted regularly. A structure that isn't maintained becomes a structure that's stale and stale structures fail.

The Three Layers of the Framework

An asset protection framework, when it's built well, operates across three layers. The trading layer. The holding layer. The legacy layer. Each layer does a specific job. The boundaries between the layers are deliberate. The interactions between the layers are carefully designed.

The trading layer is where business activity happens. The trading company. The operational accounts. The day-to-day commercial relationships. Suppliers, customers, employees, regulators. The trading layer carries the operational risk that's inherent in running a business. It's exposed to the threats that come with that risk. Tax debts. Trade creditor claims. Workplace claims. Statutory enforcement. The trading layer absorbs these threats so that the layers above it don't have to.

The holding layer sits above the trading layer. The holding company. The asset holdings that aren't trading-related. The intellectual property. The licences. The long-term value of the business that doesn't sit in the trading entity. The holding layer is where the value lives. Properly structured, it isn't directly exposed to the threats that the trading layer faces. The trading layer can fail without the holding layer being directly compromised.

The legacy layer sits above the holding layer. The discretionary family trust. The family home, where it's structured into the trust or otherwise protected. The personal assets that are intended to be held across generations. The legacy layer is the deepest protection.

It's intended to survive everything that happens at the trading and holding layers. The structure of the legacy layer, including the appointor protocol and the wishes memorandum, ensures that the assets in this layer continue to do the job they were intended to do regardless of events at the lower layers.

The interactions between the layers are deliberately limited. The holding layer doesn't carry trading-layer risk. The legacy layer doesn't carry holding-layer risk. Money moves up the layers through proper channels. Distributions, dividends, loans, all properly documented. Money rarely moves down the layers, because the structural logic is to insulate the upper layers from the lower ones, not the other way around.

How the Framework Responds to Threats

The framework's responses to different threats follow predictable patterns. Understanding the pattern is what makes the framework usable in real situations.

When a tax debt arises against the trading company, the trading layer absorbs it. The company has options. Pay the debt. Enter into a payment arrangement. Restructure the company. Allow the company to fail and replace it with a new trading entity owned by the holding layer. Each option has consequences for the trading layer. None of them, in a properly built framework, directly compromises the holding layer or the legacy layer.

When a personal guarantee is called, the response depends on what the guarantee secured and where the personal assets sit. If the personal assets sit primarily in the legacy layer, the guarantee creditor's reach is limited to whatever sits outside the legacy layer. The personal exposure is real but bounded. The director's ability to settle the guarantee, negotiate it down or absorb it without losing the family base depends on having the structural separation that the framework provides.

When an insolvent trading claim is brought against the director, the same logic applies. The claim is against the director personally. The personal assets that can be reached are the personal assets that haven't been protected by the framework. Where the legacy layer has been properly built, the family base is protected even if the personal liability is established. The director may take a financial hit. The family doesn't lose the home and the long-term wealth.

When a marital breakdown occurs, the framework's response depends on how the marital arrangements have been structured into it. A discretionary trust isn't immune to family law claims, but the way the trust is structured affects how the court treats the trust assets in any property settlement. A properly structured trust, with the right appointor arrangements, with proper documentation of the family intent, is given different weight than a hastily set up trust that looks like an attempt to defeat the spouse's claim.

When death occurs, the framework's response is structured around the wishes memorandum, the appointor succession and the trust deed's terms. The trust continues to operate. The appointor protocol ensures that competent decision-makers continue to control the trust. The wishes memorandum ensures that the new decision-makers understand the original intent. The legacy layer continues to do its job into the next generation.

What the Framework Doesn't Do

It's important to be honest about what the framework doesn't do. It doesn't make the threats stop arriving. It doesn't extinguish liabilities that have already been incurred. It doesn't override statutory provisions that have been triggered. It doesn't reverse director conduct that's already created exposure. The framework limits damage. It doesn't prevent damage that's already occurred.

The framework also doesn't replace good business practice. A director with a properly built framework who runs the business badly, takes on debts the business can't service, signs guarantees without thinking, ignores correspondence and creates conduct exposures, will still find themselves dealing with consequences. The framework gives them a stronger structural position from which to deal with those consequences. It doesn't insulate them from the consequences entirely.

The framework also doesn't operate without maintenance. A structure that's set up and then left alone for ten years becomes outdated. New legislation arrives. New family circumstances develop. New business opportunities and risks emerge. The framework that worked at year one needs review at year three, refresh at year five and possibly significant restructuring at year ten. Maintenance is part of the framework, not separate from it.

Building, Maintaining and Reviewing the Framework

Building the framework is the work of the first six to twelve months when a director engages with structural protection. The work is sequential. The threats are identified first. The asset placement is mapped second. The legal entities are established third. The documentation is drafted and executed fourth. The personal guarantee strategy is implemented fifth. The wishes memorandum is finalised sixth. By the end of this initial period, the framework is in place and operating.

Maintaining the framework is the work that happens between major reviews. Quarterly check-ins on whether anything significant has changed. Annual updates to the appointor records, the trustee resolutions and the asset register. Refreshing the wishes memorandum every two years to ensure it reflects current intent. Confirming that any new personal guarantees, new business arrangements or new asset acquisitions are being routed through the framework rather than around it.

Reviewing the framework is the deeper work that happens every two to three years. The full structure is examined against the current legal landscape. Recent legislative changes are checked. Recent case law is reviewed. The threat profile is reassessed against the director's current circumstances. The structure is adjusted where the review identifies vulnerabilities or opportunities. The review produces a documented report that becomes part of the framework's history.

The combination of building, maintaining and reviewing is what keeps the framework alive. A framework that's built but not maintained becomes outdated. A framework that's maintained but not reviewed becomes complacent. A framework that's reviewed but not maintained between reviews drifts. The three activities together produce a framework that continues to do its job across decades.

What David Has at the End

On this final morning, nine months in, the adviser walks David through the documented framework. The trust deed in its final form. The appointor protocol with the three named appointors and the succession arrangements. The wishes memorandum, signed and witnessed. The asset register showing every significant asset and where it sits.

The personal guarantee register showing each guarantee, its scope and its current status. The holding company structure with its constitution and its directors. The trading entity with its operational role defined. The relationships between each piece, mapped on a single page diagram that makes the whole structure visible at a glance.

David spends an hour going through it. He asks questions. He understands what each piece is and why it's there. He understands what each piece would do if a particular threat arrived. He understands what he himself needs to do to keep the framework operating properly across the next few years. By the end of the hour, the framework isn't a thing the adviser built for him. It's a thing he understands, can defend and is committed to maintaining.

That moment of understanding is the real outcome of the work. Not the documents themselves, although the documents matter. Not the entities, although the entities matter. The director's clear understanding of what they have and how it works. That understanding is what makes the difference when a threat arrives years later. The director who understands their own framework can act on it. The director who doesn't understand has paid for paper that doesn't function when it needs to.

A Question for You

If a threat arrived against you tomorrow, would you know which layer of your framework would absorb it? If your honest answer is that you don't have layers, you have what most directors have, which is a single-layer position with no internal structure. The threat that arrives goes to your personal position directly, because there's nothing else for it to go to. Building the layers, properly, in the right order, is the work that changes the answer to that question.

If you don't yet have layers, the A13 maps where the gaps sit and what your structure needs to look like.

13 questions. Free. Start at riskprotector.com.au.

Chapter 17.
The A13 Structural Exposure Assessment

Throughout this book, you've read the phrase "the A13" at the end of every chapter. You may have wondered what it actually is, what taking it involves and what you get out of it. This chapter answers all of those questions. Plainly. So that by the time you finish reading it, you can decide whether to do the assessment with all the information you'd want to have, rather than having to guess.

The A13 is the entry point to the work this book describes. It's free. It takes about ten to fifteen minutes. It's done online. The output is a written assessment that identifies your specific structural exposures, in plain language, with no obligation to do anything further. Most directors who take it find at least one exposure they didn't know they had. Some find several. The point of the A13 isn't to sell you something. The point is to give you a clear written picture of where you stand.

What the A13 Is

The A13 is the Structural Vulnerability and Risk Exposure Analysis. The name comes from the thirteen questions it asks. Each question maps to a specific area of structural or risk exposure. Together, the thirteen questions cover the major structural vulnerabilities that an Australian director can have.

Tax exposure. Personal guarantee exposure. Asset placement. Trust structure. Conduct exposure. Family base protection. Each question is short. Each one has a yes, no or unsure answer. By the end of the thirteen questions, your picture starts to take shape.

The questions aren't trick questions. They aren't designed to make you look bad or to scare you into action. They're diagnostic. The same questions a structural adviser would ask in the first hour of a face-to-face meeting. The thirteen questions have been refined across many engagements with directors in different industries, different sizes of business and different stages of life. They're the questions that expose what's actually at risk, quickly and without distraction..

What the A13 isn't is a complete structural and risk review. A full review involves reading the trust deed, examining the personal guarantees, reviewing the company financials, mapping the asset register and considering the broader picture. That work, when it happens, takes days not minutes. The A13 is the diagnostic that decides whether the deeper work is needed and where it should focus first.

What You Get From Taking the A13

The output of the A13 is a written assessment that goes to your nominated email address within a short time of completion. The assessment identifies the specific exposures your answers indicate. It explains, briefly, why each exposure matters. It identifies which exposures appear most urgent based on your situation. It suggests what the next step would be, if you choose to take one.

What you don't get is a sales call ten minutes later. The riskprotector.com.au consultancy doesn't operate that way. The assessment goes to you. You decide what to do with it. You might decide to do nothing. You might decide to discuss it with your existing accountant or solicitor. You might decide to engage further with riskprotector.com.au. The choice is entirely yours, with no pressure attached.

Many directors who take the A13 sit with it for weeks before deciding what to do next. Some never engage further but use the assessment as a prompt to raise structural questions with their existing professionals. Some come back six months later when something in the assessment has started to bother them. Some engage immediately because they realise the exposure picture is more serious than they'd thought. All of these responses are valid uses of the assessment.

Why It's Free

The A13 is free for two reasons. The first is that the work of structural protection only begins where there's clarity about the existing position. A director who doesn't know what their exposure looks like can't make sensible decisions about whether to engage with structural work or not. The free assessment lets directors make that decision with information rather than guesswork.

The second reason is that the consultancy is built on a long-term relationship model, not on transactional sales. A director who takes the A13, finds it useful and decides to engage further is a director who's making an informed choice. That's a better foundation for the work that follows than a director who's been pressured into engagement before they understand what's involved. The free assessment is part of how the relationship begins on the right terms.

What this means in practice is that the A13 stands on its own. If it leads to engagement, that's fine. If it doesn't, the assessment was still useful. The director walks away with a written picture of their exposures and the freedom to decide what to do with it. Both outcomes are part of the design.

What the Thirteen Questions Cover

The thirteen questions cover the major structural exposures discussed throughout this book. The first group of questions covers tax exposure. Whether the company has unpaid PAYG, GST or superannuation guarantee. Whether BAS' have been lodged on time. Whether any DPN's or demand letters have been received. These questions identify where you already sit in the ATO enforcement sequence.

The second group covers personal guarantee exposure. Whether you have a complete record of the guarantees you've signed. Whether any guarantees relate to facilities that are no longer required. Whether the cumulative guarantee exposure is known and quantified. These questions identify whether the guarantee picture is mapped or whether there's an information gap that needs to be closed.

The third group covers asset placement. Whether the family home is currently in a position that protects it from creditor claims. Whether significant assets have been transferred between names recently. Whether the asset register is documented. These questions identify whether the family base is protected by structure or by the absence of threats.

The fourth group covers trust and structural matters. Whether you're an appointor of any trust and whether the appointor protocol has been considered. Whether the trust deed has been reviewed against current legislation. Whether the wishes memorandum, where one exists, is up to date. These questions identify whether the existing trust arrangements are operating as protection or as a documented vulnerability.

The thirteenth question is broader. It asks whether anything significant has happened in the last twelve months that could have changed the structural picture. New debts. New guarantees. New arrangements with family members. Changes in the business itself. The catch-all question often surfaces things the earlier questions didn't capture but that the director wants to flag.

What Happens Next

Once you complete the A13 and receive the written assessment, several paths are available. None of them are obligatory. Each one is the right path for some directors and not for others.

Path one is to read the assessment and sit with it. Sometimes the right next step is to absorb what the assessment says without acting on it immediately. The structural picture can take time to digest, particularly if it identifies exposures that the director hadn't been aware of. Sitting with the assessment is a valid choice.

Path two is to take the assessment to your existing accountant or solicitor and raise the questions it's identified. Sometimes those professionals can address the exposures within their own engagement. Sometimes they refer you back to a structural adviser for the work that's outside their scope. Either way, the assessment becomes the basis for a more informed conversation with the people you already work with.

Path three is to engage riskprotector.com.au for further work. This might be a deeper structural review. It might be specific work on a particular exposure the assessment identified. It might be ongoing engagement to build or maintain a complete framework. The fees and scope of further work are agreed before any work begins, with no pressure to commit to anything beyond what makes sense for your situation.

Path four is to address the most urgent exposure independently. Some directors, after reading the assessment, take direct action on a specific issue without engaging further. They cancel an unnecessary guarantee. They raise a question with the ATO. They reach out to a solicitor for a specific piece of advice. The assessment can be the prompt that gets a particular issue moving without any broader engagement.

Whatever path you take, the assessment is yours to use as you see fit. There's no time limit on it. There's no commitment attached to it. It's a written piece of work that captures your structural position at a moment in time and it's available for you to act on whenever and however makes sense.

Why Now Matters

The structural protection that works is the protection put in place before any threat arrives. Every chapter of this book has made that point in different ways. The A13 is the first step in that work. Taking it before any threat arrives means the assessment is being made in calm conditions, with no time pressure, with the freedom to consider any path and to choose the right one.

Taking the A13 after a threat has arrived is also useful, but the available paths are narrower. Decisions get made under pressure. Actions that should have happened years earlier have to happen in days or weeks. The work is harder and the outcomes are less complete. The A13 still helps in those situations, but it helps more if it's done before the situations arise.

The directors who get the most out of the A13 are the ones who take it during calm periods, when nothing is pressing, when the exercise is preventive rather than reactive. The ten to fifteen minutes spent on the assessment, in those conditions, often saves the months of crisis work that would otherwise have followed the next threat that arrived. That's the case for taking it now, while you're reading this book, while you have time, while no letter has yet arrived in your letterbox demanding action by a particular date.

The End of the Main Book

This is the last chapter of the main body of the book. The bonus chapter that follows covers the SWANS Framework, which is an advanced estate protection structure relevant to readers who want to think beyond their lifetime to how their assets pass to the next generation. It's optional reading. The structural protection covered in the main chapters stands on its own.

Whatever you do next, the work of this book has been to give you the picture that almost no one else gives directors in plain language. The threats, the structures, the framework, the path through. You now know what most directors don't know. What you do with that knowledge is the next chapter of your own story, not David's. The choice, from here, is yours.

A Question for You

Of everything you've read in this book, what's the one thing that's bothering you most right now? If you can name it, that's where to start. The A13 is the structured way to take that one thing and put it into the broader picture. The picture that tells you what other things sit alongside it, what the priorities are and what the path forward looks like. The fifteen minutes it takes is the smallest investment you can make in the structural picture this book has been describing.

Whatever's bothering you most, the A13 is the place to start. No obligation, no sales call, just a written assessment of where you stand. 13 questions. Free. Start at riskprotector.com.au.

BONUS CHAPTER

The SWANS Framework

The Most Complete Estate Protection Structure Currently Available Under Australian Law

The SWANS Framework

The SWANS Framework bonus chapter covers the most advanced estate protection structure available under Australian law. It isn't in the main body because it requires everything that comes before it. Read the entire book from the beginning first. Then read the bonus chapter. The order matters.

Who This Chapter Is For

The SWANS Framework was built for one specific situation. You have assets. You know exactly who you want to receive them when you're gone. And you know, with equal certainty, who you don't want to receive them.

A standard will doesn't protect that decision. A will can be challenged. It can be contested by family members who feel entitled to a share of what you built, regardless of what you actually wanted. Courts have significant discretion to override your wishes under family provision legislation and that discretion is exercised regularly.

Directors and business owners who've spent decades building something of value are particularly exposed. The assets are real and significant. The incentive to challenge is high. A will, on its own, isn't enough.

The SWANS Framework addresses that vulnerability at the structural level.

How It Works

Every asset you place inside properly structured discretionary trust ceases to be your personal property from the moment it enters. It doesn't matter whether those assets are cash, real property, investments, business interests, shares, bank accounts or intellectual property. Once inside a discretionary trust drafted with the specific protective features described, they belong to the trust. Not to you. Not to your estate. Not to anyone who might wish to claim them after your death.

This single fact is the foundation of everything. Under Australian law, a family provision claim, a challenge to a will or a creditor claim can only attach to assets that form part of your personal estate at the time of death. If your assets are inside a properly structured discretionary trust, they're not in your estate. There's simply nothing for a challenger to reach.

The discretionary trust deed itself names exactly who you want to benefit and who you don't. The Corporate Trustee, operating under an additional Memorandum of Wishes, distributes to those you've nominated and to no one else. If someone you've excluded doesn't like that outcome, they face the reality that challenging it means taking on an additional five-layer legal structure specifically designed to make that challenge prohibitively expensive, legally complex and almost certainly unsuccessful.

The Five Layers

The SWANS Framework operates through five compounding layers of protection working simultaneously. Each layer alone is significant. Together they create a structure that most solicitors will advise a would-be challenger isn't worth attempting.

S | Select Director

The first S stands for Select Director. This is the person who'll control the Discretionary Trust after your death. They step into the role of director of the Corporate Trustee and from that position they control every decision the trust makes, including who receives distributions and who doesn't.

The person you select isn't appointed by a court. They're not chosen by your family. They're not decided by competing interests after your death. You chose them. You documented that choice. You prepare them in advance so they understand exactly what you want and what their obligations are before you die, not after. The preparation is part of the protection.

How to apply it: identify a specific person you trust completely to carry out your intentions without interference or deviation. This can't be someone with a conflict of interest or someone who might be pressured by other family members. Once identified, their appointment is documented formally in the trust deed and in supporting instruments.

W | Wishes Memorandum

The Wishes Memorandum is a private document, separate from the trust deed, that tells your successor director precisely what you want done with the trust assets after your death. It names who you want to receive distributions, in what proportions and under what conditions. It also names who you don't want to receive anything and why.

It's not a legally binding instrument in the same way the trust deed is, but it creates a clear and documented record of your intentions that any court would find extremely difficult to set aside. A successor director who acts against it does so at serious legal and reputational risk.

How to apply it: the Memorandum of Wishes needs to be detailed, specific and unambiguous. Vague instructions create room for challenge and misinterpretation. Name people by full legal name. Specify amounts, proportions or conditions clearly. Explain your reasons where the decisions may be contested. Review and update it whenever your circumstances or intentions change. An outdated Memorandum of Wishes is a gap a challenger will exploit.

A | Appoint Beneficiaries and Appointors

(a) Appoint Beneficiaries

The Appoint Beneficiaries layer is where your intentions are embedded directly into the trust deed itself. The deed specifies who has the potential to benefit from the trust and, critically, who doesn't. Under Australian trust law, a person who isn't named as a beneficiary in a discretionary trust generally has no direct legal standing to demand a distribution from that trust. They can't go to a court and argue they should receive something from a trust they have no interest in. This is fundamentally different from a will, where any eligible person can make a family provision claim regardless of what the will says.

Important: some Australian states, notably New South Wales, have notional estate provisions under section 80 of the Succession Act 2006 (NSW) that can in certain circumstances reach assets transferred to trusts before death for the purpose of a family provision claim. Other states have related claw-back or anti-avoidance provisions that operate differently. The framework's effectiveness varies depending on the state of residence, the timing of asset transfers and the specific facts. Independent legal advice from a qualified solicitor experienced in succession law for your state is essential before relying on this structure.

How to apply it: work with your adviser to ensure the beneficiary schedule in the trust deed reflects exactly who you want to be capable of receiving distributions. The people you want to exclude must not appear in that schedule under any description. This needs to be done at the time the trust is established or amended formally through a deed of variation.

(b) The Appointor Committee

The Appointor Committee is one of the most powerful and least understood elements of a Discretionary Trust. It consists of three independent members whose role is to oversee the trustee and, if necessary, replace the trustee if they fail to act in accordance with the trust deed and the Memorandum of Wishes.

A determined challenger's first move is often to try to influence or remove the trustee so they can install someone more sympathetic to their cause. The Appointor Committee makes that move almost impossible. Three independent members, each with equal standing, must agree before any change to the trustee can be made. No single person can be pressured, bought off or legally maneuvered into handing control of the trust to someone you didn't choose.

The committee also acts as a structural signal to any would-be challenger. When a solicitor assesses the prospects of a challenge and sees that the trustee is protected by three independent appointors, they understand immediately that removing or overriding the trustee isn't a realistic pathway. That assessment, made before proceedings even commence, is often what stops a challenge before it starts.

How to apply it: the three Appointor Committee members need to be chosen with the same care as your successor director. They must be independent of each other, independent of the trust's beneficiaries and free from any conflict of interest that a challenger could exploit. Their appointment is documented formally in the trust deed.

N | Neutralise Gaps

The Discretionary Trust can hold most of your significant assets but it can't hold everything. Some assets can't practically be transferred into the trust. Others may be acquired after the trust is established and not yet moved into it. Your will exists to catch everything that falls outside the trust at the time of your death.

The Neutralise Gaps layer is about making sure your will and your trust work together as a single consistent system, with no contradictions, no inconsistencies and no gaps that a challenger can exploit.

How to apply it: your will needs to be drafted with full knowledge of your trust structure so the two instruments are consistent. Your executor should understand the trust. Any assets not in the trust at the time of your death should be dealt with in the will in a way that's consistent with your Memorandum of Wishes. Review both documents together whenever either one changes.

S | Statutory Declaration

The second S stands for Statutory Declaration. This is your signed, witnessed statement explaining in your own words precisely why you've made the decisions you've made. Why certain people are included. Why others are excluded. What your reasons are and what your thinking was at the time.

Under Queensland's Succession Act, a court assessing a family provision claim is required to consider this document. A clear, detailed and well-reasoned statutory declaration makes it significantly harder for a challenger to argue they were unfairly left out, because you've already addressed that argument directly and on the record.

How to apply it: the statutory declaration needs to be drafted carefully, signed in front of an authorised witness and stored securely with your other estate documents. Address each excluded person individually where possible and explain your reasoning in plain, specific language. A statutory declaration that says "I have my reasons" provides far less protection than one that names the person and explains exactly why they've been excluded.

What It Means in Practical Terms

Any person wishing to contest your estate faces all five of these obstacles simultaneously. They must establish legal standing against your personal estate rather than the trust. They must prove adequate provision wasn't made despite your statutory declaration of reasons.

They must overcome the discretionary trust structure where no beneficiary has a fixed interest and no court can force a distribution. They must overcome three independent Appointor Committee members who have no obligation to act in their interests. And they must overcome the Memorandum of Wishes, which creates a clear documented record that any court would find extremely difficult to ignore or override.

Each of these obstacles alone would give most solicitors pause. Together they present a picture that the overwhelming majority of would-be challengers, on legal advice, will walk away from before spending the money to commence proceedings. That deterrence is itself a form of protection. Challenges that never commence can't succeed.

The structures riskprotector.com.au implements are built on a framework that Australian courts have recognised and upheld. Your wishes aren't merely documented. They're enforceable.

This Is Not a Structure for Everyone

The SWANS Framework is for people who've made a deliberate, considered decision about their legacy and who want that decision enforced, not just documented. It's for people who understand that the law provides a pathway to challenge a will and who've chosen to close that pathway structurally rather than hope it's never used.

No structure under Australian law can guarantee your wishes will never be challenged. What the SWANS Framework does is make a successful challenge so difficult, so expensive and so legally complex that it acts as a powerful deterrent before any challenge commences and a formidable defence if one proceeds.

When the framework operates as intended, those you nominate receive what you intend and those you exclude receive nothing. The framework is designed to protect that outcome to the fullest extent Australian law permits.

Read the main body of this book first. Then proceed to The SWANS Framework Explained below. While some points are revisited, grasping the entire picture requires seeing each layer in context before seeing how they work together.

The SWANS Framework Explained

The overview you've just read tells you what the SWANS Framework is and what it achieves. This section tells you how it actually works under the surface, why each layer carries the legal weight it does and exactly what you need to do to put the structure in place properly. This is where the framework goes from concept to protection.

Start Here: The Foundation That Makes Everything Else Work

Before you can understand why the SWANS Framework is so difficult to challenge, you need to understand one fundamental principle of Australian trust law. A discretionary trust isn't an extension of you. It's a separate legal relationship with its own trustee, its own deed, its own beneficiaries and its own assets. When assets move into the trust, they stop being yours. They belong to the trust and are held by the trustee on behalf of the beneficiaries.

This matters because every legal mechanism that a creditor, a family member or the ATO can use against you personally, a Director Penalty Notice, a judgment debt, a family provision claim, a bankruptcy, all of these operate against your personal estate. They can only reach what you personally own. If you don't personally own it, they can't reach it.

The Discretionary Trust is the structure that makes that separation real, legal and durable. That's the foundation. Everything in the SWANS Framework builds on it. Now let's go through each layer and explain exactly how it works and what you need to do to make it effective.

S | Select Director. How it Works

The Select Director layer is the control layer. It determines who has their hands on the trust after you're gone. Most poorly drafted estate plans fail at this exact point. A will appoints an executor. An executor completes their task and stands down. The trustee of a trust, however, continues to exercise discretion indefinitely. The director of the Corporate Trustee makes ongoing decisions about distributions, investments and the management of trust assets, potentially for decades.

The person you select isn't just a name on a document. They're the person who will sit in a meeting room, face pressure from family members and decide, over and over again, who gets what and when. They need to understand your intentions. They need to have no conflict of interest. They need to be someone whose judgment you trust completely and whose personal circumstances make them resistant to the kind of pressure that challenging family members will inevitably bring.

The Select Director also needs to be prepared in advance. Their appointment should be documented in the trust deed. Their role should be explained to them while you're alive. The Memorandum of Wishes should be discussed with them so there's no ambiguity when the time comes. Preparation during your lifetime is what makes the selection effective after your death.

W | Wishes Memorandum. How it Works

The Wishes Memorandum is the bridge between the legal framework and your human intentions. The trust deed creates the structure. The Memorandum of Wishes populates it with your specific goals. A well-drafted memorandum can run to twenty or thirty pages. It doesn't have to be long. It has to be specific.

The memorandum should address the people you want to benefit and the people you don't. It should explain the reasoning behind any decision that might be questioned. It should address contingencies: what happens if the primary beneficiary dies before you? What happens if a beneficiary becomes bankrupt? What happens if a beneficiary's marriage breaks down and a former spouse attempts to reach trust distributions?

The memorandum should also address the investment philosophy you want the trust to follow. Is capital preservation the priority? Is income generation more important? Are there particular assets that should be kept intact? These questions seem abstract when you're alive. They become urgent when you're not.

The memorandum is updated over time. It's not a document you draft once and file. It's a living record of your intentions that evolves as your family and financial circumstances change. The memorandum that was accurate five years ago may be out of date today. Regular review, every two to three years, keeps it relevant.

(a) | Appoint Beneficiaries. How it Works

The beneficiary schedule in the trust deed determines who has the potential to receive distributions. In a standard discretionary trust, the schedule is typically broad. It might include the settlor's spouse, children, grandchildren and a range of related entities and persons. The breadth is usually by design. It gives the trustee flexibility.

In a SWANS Framework trust, the beneficiary schedule is drafted with the specific intent of the person establishing the trust in mind. The people you want to have the potential to benefit are included. The people you don't are deliberately excluded. The schedule is not an accident of standard drafting. It's a considered statement about who sits inside the circle and who doesn't.

The exclusion of someone from the beneficiary schedule doesn't prevent them from trying to challenge the trust. But it means they have no standing as a beneficiary. Their challenge has to proceed on different grounds, which are significantly harder to establish. The challenge isn't impossible, particularly in states with stronger notional estate provisions. But the absence from the schedule is one more layer of structural resistance.

(b) | The Appointor Committee. How it Works

The Appointor Committee is the governance layer that protects the trust's ongoing integrity. It does this in two ways. First, it prevents any single person from having unilateral power over the trustee. Second, it creates a documented accountability structure that any challenger can see.

When a solicitor is advising a potential challenger on the merits of their case, one of the first things they'll look at is the trust's governance structure. A trust with a sole individual appointor who can be pressured or replaced through a court application is a structurally weak trust. A trust with an Appointor Committee of three independent members, governed by a written protocol, is a structurally strong trust. The solicitor's advice will reflect that difference.

The three members of the Appointor Committee need to be genuinely independent. Independence means no financial relationship with the trust's beneficiaries. It means no close family relationship with anyone who might benefit from challenging the trust. It means no conflict of interest that a challenger could argue compromises the committee member's judgment. The selection of committee members deserves as much care as the selection of the successor director.

N | Neutralise Gaps. How it Works

The gap-neutralising function of the SWANS Framework is about ensuring that no asset falls outside the structure inadvertently. The trust can hold most assets.

But assets acquired after the trust's establishment may not be in the trust. Assets that can't practically be transferred into the trust, superannuation being the most common example, need to be dealt with by other means.

The will that's drafted as part of the SWANS Framework has a specific function. It isn't the primary vehicle for asset distribution, because most of the assets are in the trust. It's the safety net that catches everything outside the trust and directs it in a way that's consistent with the rest of the structure.

The will and the trust need to be drafted in the same transaction, by advisers who understand both instruments. A will drafted without reference to the trust and a trust established without reference to the will, can create conflicts and inconsistencies that a challenger will exploit. The two documents need to be read together as a single system.

S | Statutory Declaration. How it Works

The statutory declaration is the human face of the structure. Everything else is legal architecture. The statutory declaration is where you speak directly to any future court about your intentions and your reasons.

Queensland courts are required to consider a statutory declaration of testamentary intentions when assessing a family provision claim. The weight given to the declaration depends on its specificity, its credibility and the circumstances under which it was made. A declaration made years before death, by someone who was clearly of sound mind and acting without duress, carries far more weight than one made in the final months of life when the circumstances are ambiguous.

The declaration should be drafted with the assistance of an experienced adviser. It should address each excluded person individually. It should explain, in your own words, why you've made the decisions you've made. It should be specific enough that a court reading it years later can understand not just what you decided but why you decided it and that the decision was deliberate, considered and made in full knowledge of the person you were excluding.

The declaration is signed before an authorised witness. It's stored with your other estate documents. It's reviewed and updated whenever your circumstances or intentions change. It's one of the most important documents in the entire structure, because it's the one that speaks in your voice after you're no longer able to speak for yourself.

How the Five Layers Work Together to Defeat a Challenge

Understanding each layer individually is one thing. Understanding how they work together is what makes the SWANS Framework genuinely powerful. Consider what a person attempting to challenge your estate would actually face.

First, they'd need to establish that they have a claim against your personal estate. But most of your assets are in the Discretionary Trust and aren't part of your personal estate at all. There's very little to make a claim against.

Second, if they try to argue inadequate provision, they're immediately met with your statutory declaration, a signed document in your own words explaining your reasons. Queensland courts take this seriously. Overriding it requires the challenger to prove not just that they feel hard done by but that your documented reasoning was somehow wrong or unreasonable.

Third, they'd need to overcome the trust structure itself. The Discretionary Trust is a discretionary trust. No beneficiary has a fixed entitlement. No court can force the trustee to distribute to someone who isn't a beneficiary.

Fourth, they'd need to somehow remove or override the Appointor Committee, three independent members whose role is to protect the integrity of the trust and who have no obligation whatsoever to act in the challenger's interests.

Fifth, they'd need to overcome the Memorandum of Wishes, a detailed documented record of your intentions that any court would find extremely difficult to set aside without compelling evidence that your wishes were somehow invalid.

Each of these obstacles alone would give most solicitors pause. Together they present a picture that the overwhelming majority of would-be challengers, on legal advice, will walk away from before spending the money to commence proceedings. That deterrence is itself a form of protection. Challenges that never commence can't succeed.

When to Put the Structure in Place

The most common mistake people make with the SWANS Framework and with asset protection generally, is waiting until they need it. By the time you're aware that someone might challenge your estate, or that creditors might be moving, the window to act may already have closed.

The SWANS Framework needs to be put in place while you're healthy, solvent and under no immediate threat. Trust transfers made while you're insolvent or under creditor pressure can be challenged as voidable transactions.

A Memorandum of Wishes written at the last minute carries less weight than one written years in advance when your decisions were clearly considered and voluntary.

A statutory declaration drafted calmly and in detail years before your death is far more persuasive than one drafted hastily when a dispute is already visible on the horizon.

The right time to build this structure is now, before the situation that makes you need it has arrived. That's not alarmist. It's the same logic that applies to every form of structural protection this book covers. The window is open. Use it.

What You Need to Get Started

The SWANS Framework isn't something you implement yourself. It requires a qualified solicitor to prepare the trust deed and formal instruments.

What riskprotector.com.au provides is the strategic architecture, the structural design, the Memorandum of Wishes drafting support, the statutory declaration drafting support and the guidance on how to brief your solicitor so the legal documents do what you need them to do.

The starting point is understanding your current position. What assets do you have and which are currently in your personal name? Who do you want to benefit from your estate and who specifically do you want to exclude? Who do you trust to act as your successor director?

Once you have those answers, the structure can be built around them. The Discretionary Trust deed is prepared. The Memorandum of Wishes is drafted. The beneficiary schedule is confirmed. The Appointor Committee is established.

The statutory declaration is prepared and signed. Your existing will is reviewed and aligned. And the assets are transferred into the trust in the legally correct sequence and timeframe.

Done properly, this is a structure that stands. Done incompletely or informally, it's a structure with gaps that a determined challenger will find. riskprotector.com.au's role is to make sure it's done properly.

The Bottom Line

The SWANS Framework isn't a trick. It isn't a loophole. It's a legitimate, lawful use of structures that have existed in Australian trust law for decades.

What makes it powerful is the combination of those structures in a deliberate, documented and legally consistent way that addresses every avenue through which your wishes could be challenged or overridden.

What you want to happen to your assets is what should happen. You've spent a lifetime building what you have. You've earned the right to decide where it goes. The SWANS Framework is the structure that protects that right, not just on paper but in practice, against real legal challenges brought by real people with real lawyers.

That's what it does. That's how it works. And if it's the right structure for your situation, the next step is an A13 Structural Vulnerability and Risk Exposure Analysis so we can assess your specific position and tell you exactly how to build it around your assets, your wishes and your circumstances.

A Final Word

If you've read this far, you've taken the first step that most directors never take. You've sat with the structural picture in plain language. You've seen what your existing advisers couldn't tell you, not because they were hiding anything but because their engagement scope didn't extend to it. You've followed one fictional director through territory that's much closer to your own situation than most directors realise.

What happens next is the part of the story that isn't fictional. It's yours.

The directors who get the most out of this book are the ones who close it and act. Not next quarter. Not when something forces them to. Now, while the threats are still hypothetical, while the choices are still wide open, while the structural work can be done in calm conditions rather than under pressure.

The first step is the A13. Thirteen questions. Free. About fifteen minutes. The output is a written assessment that identifies your specific structural exposures, sent to your nominated email address, with no obligation to do anything further.

Beyond the A13, the path is whatever makes sense for your situation. Some readers will use the assessment to raise structural questions with their existing accountant or solicitor. Some will engage riskprotector.com.au for further work.

Some will sit with the assessment and act on a single specific issue independently. All of these are valid responses. The point is that something happens between closing this book and the day a letter arrives in your letterbox demanding action by a particular date.

Whatever you decide to do, thank you for reading.

Take the A13 Now

If anything in this book has raised a question you don't yet have an answer to, the A13 is the place to start. 13 questions. Free. Start at riskprotector.com.au.

The Risk Protector.com.au Advisory Team

riskprotector.com.au

admin@riskprotector.com.au

The Street-Smart Advisory Team

Specialist structural and strategic consultancy for directors and business owners operating as riskprotector.com.au. Structural architecture, strategic mentoring and draft document preparation only. General information only, not legal, financial or taxation advice. Start with a free A13 at riskprotector.com.au then get independent professional advice.

The structural protection of your assets is either properly in place right now or it isn't.