

#86

COMPLETE

Collector: Web Link 3 (Web Link)
Started: Monday, November 05, 2018 3:05:31 PM
Last Modified: Friday, November 09, 2018 1:11:41 PM
Time Spent: Over a day

Page 3

Q1 Overall, do you agree or disagree with [standard 1] and proposed commentary? **Agree**

Q2 Please provide any comments on [standard 1] and the proposed commentary.

We agree, but believe that the standard should be changed to:

A person who gives financial advice must place the interests of the client first, always treat clients fairly and act in their interests.

Reason

We believe the intention behind the legislation is to put client's interest first and be consumer centric.

This addition of "must place the interests of the client first" sets the tone of the Code.

Putting the client's interests first is a cornerstone behaviour of professionalism, and as such should be reflected in the Professional Code of Conduct.

Page 4

Q3 Overall, do you agree or disagree with [standard 2] and proposed commentary? **Agree**

Q4 Please provide any comments on [standard 2] and the proposed commentary.

We strongly agree - highlighting the importance of integrity in the Professional Code of Conduct will reinforce this essential element of professionalism.

Page 5

Q5 Overall, do you agree or disagree with [standard 3] and proposed commentary? **Agree**

Q6 Please provide any comments on [standard 3] and the proposed commentary.

We agree, but there are four areas we recommend for further consideration.

(1) We would expect the word 'independent' to be covered in either disclosure and /or licencing requirements.

Reason

Historically, there was disputed use of the term 'independent'. The absence of a definition as to what is 'independent advice' is, poses a significant risk to the consumer.

(2) We refer the Code Working Group to FSLAB S431J – Duty to give priority to clients interests. The proposed test for a conflict of interest - 'where practicable' the person must avoid the conflict - is now a lower and less objective test. Under the current Code 5 – an adviser must effectively manage any conflicts of interest that may arise. The 'effective management' meant, that if there was a conflict where the adviser could not place the client's interests first and above their own, then they must decline to act (one way to avoid a conflict).

Reason

CS3 seems to be in direct contradiction to CS1 (even in its current format). By lowering the avoidance threshold to the contingent situation where the conflict needs only to be avoided only if 'practicable', is likely to reduce public confidence and trust where conflicts arise, and weakens the intent of a Financial Advice Code.

(3) The bullet points should be re-ordered, placing 'identify conflicts of interest' first.

Reason

The first step in this standard is for an adviser to recognise where conflicts and potential conflicts may exist. The failure to identify familiar situations as potential conflicts of interest, is a typical 'blind spot' area for many professionals.

The second step is to consider to remove oneself from the conflict where the client's interests cannot be placed first (hence the need to reframe CS1)

(4) Change last bullet point to: 'actively disclose conflicts of interest to clients and record their understanding as such.'

Reason

Conflict of interest needs constant review and monitoring as business practices change, and where conflict occurs it is fundamentally important that the client understands these conflicts.

Page 6

Q7 Overall, do you agree or disagree with [standard 4] **Agree**
and proposed commentary?

Q8 Please provide any comments on [standard 4] and the proposed commentary.

We agree but there are three important areas in which we believe this standard should to be strengthened.

(1) The following should be included in the standard:

A person who gives financial advice must behave professionally in all dealings, communicate clearly, concisely and effectively, and take reasonable steps to ensure that the client understands the financial advice and all material risks and consequences of that advice.

Reason

The Financial Advice Code should include a reference to professional behaviour and Standard 4 is the relevant positioning for this statement.

(2) We have serious concerns there is no reference as to how an adviser needs 'to evidence' their advice.

There has been an argument that such requirements would be 'prescriptive', but we would expect this Financial Advice Code contain the overarching requirements to provide and retain evidence of advice.

Further, we would expect that disclosure regulations contain specific requirements, and that licencing requirements outline the procedures and processes.

Reason

The current Code format could allow an adviser or FAP to provide advice without retaining any record of such advice being – either in written or digital record (such as video recorded advice, audio recorded advice). This seriously leaves the client at risk, with regards to the original communication, the client comprehension of that advice, and their recourse and redress options should that advice prove to be deficient, incomplete, conflicted or risky.

(3) The example be changed to a more appropriate example.

Page 7

Q9 Overall, do you agree or disagree with [standard 5] and proposed commentary?

Agree

Q10 Please provide any comments on [standard 5] and the proposed commentary.

We agree, but there are three areas in which we believe the standard should be strengthened.

(1) In the standard (bullet point 2) change the words to: 'each financial advice product, recommendation or service covered by the financial advice.'

Reason

Advice is not limited to product. Advice may actually be a course of action or service.

(2) In the commentary change the word 'the product or plan' to 'recommendation or service'

Reason

Advice is not limited to product. Advice may actually be a course of action or service.

(3) Suitability is a crucial component of quality financial advice, and acting in a professional client-first manner. We believe it is fundamentally important the following commentary is not amended in any way.

"If the nature and scope of the financial advice includes an actual or implied comparison between two or more financial advice products, the financial advice should be based on an assessment and comparison of each. This includes, for example, where an existing product held by the client is being replaced by a new product which provides similar features or benefits."

Page 8

Q11 Overall, do you agree or disagree with [standard 6] and proposed commentary? **Agree**

Q12 Please provide any comments on [standard 6] and the proposed commentary.

We agree - protecting the personal information of clients is – in the digital age – an increasingly important responsibility of any professional. It is good to see this reinforced by the Code.

Page 9

Q13 Overall, do you agree or disagree with [standard 7] and proposed commentary? **Agree**

Q14 Please provide any comments on [standard 7] and the proposed commentary.

We agree, however, to ensure there is some substance in the complaints process, we believe the 'arrangements' must be included in either disclosure and/or licencing requirements and will need to be extensively more comprehensive.

A defined, external disputes resolution process that is a clearly communicated with clients from the outset, is essential to building public confidence and trust in the professionalism of financial advisers.

Page 10

Q15 Overall, do you agree or disagree with [standard 8] and proposed commentary? **Agree**

Q16 Please provide any comments on [standard 8] and the proposed commentary.

We agree - the new Financial Advice Code will be an essential milestone in reinforcing the professional behaviours required of financial advisers, and that all advisers are operating as a representative of the whole 'community'

Page 12

Q17 Overall, do you agree or disagree with [standard 9] **Disagree** and proposed commentary?

Q18 Please provide any comments on [standard 9] and the proposed commentary.

We disagree and urge the Code Working Group to reconsider this standard – our recommendations and rationale are outlined below:

(1) We believe that all persons involved in the provision of a financial advice service should be required to have attained the minimum qualification of the New Zealand Certificate in Financial Services, or be able to demonstrate through an approved Recognised Prior Learning process that they have the knowledge, competence and skills that would be expected of a person who had completed the NZ Certificate in Financial Services, irrespective of the organizational structure they operate under.

Reason

To achieve the standard of general competence, knowledge and skill the following must be obtained:

Knowledge is what an adviser gains through structured study, training and research exercise - and is formalised through a moderated assessment - which leads to the attainment of a qualification awarded at a particular time. You cannot re-attain a qualification. (RPL process could lead to the same qualification outcome).

Competence is an adviser's ability to do something efficiently and successfully. Adviser competence therefore requires an ongoing commitment to maintaining knowledge and keeping up-to-date with developments relevant to them (the descriptor in the old Code 18) with the "the ability to perform the activities within an occupation to the required standard, consistently and over time" (Source: FPSB). The commitment to this process is called 'continuing professional development' or 'CPD'. The international definition of 'structured' CPD is a 'learning activity which tests the acquisition and/or application of abilities, professional skills and knowledge'.

Skill points to personal aptitude, proficiency and mastery in an adviser's financial particular advice area – in other words applying all their knowledge and competencies (gained through CPD and experience) to the dynamic circumstances of the client's situation.

(2) New Code 9 states: 'the minimum standards of general competence, knowledge and skills are the general qualification outcomes of the NZ Certificate in Financial Services Level 5'. That poses a fundamental confusion.

Reason

The 'qualification outcomes' and 'graduate outcomes' of NZFSL5 are standards of minimum KNOWLEDGE attainment for an individual – and are not measures of competence and skills gained through experience and CPD.

Further, it is impossible for organisational 'capability' to be measured by personal qualification outcomes.

The analogy has been made of hospitals employing the most stringent procedures, systems and expertise to reduce patient risk and enhance patient health outcomes. However those providing patient care (nurses) are also required to be highly trained, AND qualified. The example has been given that 'bank tellers' do not require to be qualified under the proposed Code. We agree, that if they are not giving regulated financial advice, 'bank tellers' need only the basic knowledge in privacy and consumer protection law; just like nurse aids need instruction in hygiene and patient safety. However, if giving regulated financial advice, all consumers deserve to have someone qualified to provide that advice – relevant to their role.

MBIE during their consultation of the new legislation was at pains to establish a new regime on the advice-sector's call for an 'even

Code Working Group - Online Submission Form

playing field'. This Code provides a waiver for nominated representatives to be qualified, contrary to the intent of the new regime.

We believe this direction is a serious departure from international trends and a major departure from the UK and Australia codes where advisers are required to have minimum qualifications.

In addition to this the recently released Bank Conduct and Culture Report highlighted that 'all banks need to focus on strengthening the frameworks, processes and controls that prevent, detect and manage conduct and culture issues'.

This report we believe may require the Code Working Group to review Standard 9 and the reliance, which is placed on FAP's for the procedures, systems and expertise and resulting outcomes for consumers.

(3) The proposed code will set up a two-tiered system of advisers in NZ: mandatory qualification for 'individual' financial advisers, and 'equivalence' for nominated representative.

Reason

The Industry Training Act allowed vocational qualifications to be developed by the Industry Training Organisation Skills Org. This Code mandates the personal attainment of a qualification for one group and uses the 'outcomes' in that same qualification to provide a standard to evidence 'equivalence'. However, that was not the intended use of NZQA qualifications.

The consequences of excluding nominated representatives from obtaining qualifications is that 'nominated representative' employees will: be trained and yet unqualified; have no formal NZQA record of learning;; have reduced job mobility which would limit career prospects and arguably remuneration prospects.

(4) Overseas and alternative qualifications are allowable: advisers must be able to 'demonstrate equivalence' in an objective measureable and independently verifiable manner". We believe the FMA should be resourced to outline at what level this 'equivalence' is required and what requirements they would waive (if any).

Reason

The matching of overseas qualifications to the NZCFSL5 in many cases is difficult and cost prohibitive. It would be desirable for the Code to have a list of commonly accepted alternatives to the graduate outcomes so as to lower the barriers for qualified overseas advisers. Further it would be good to have the graduate outcomes that would NEVER be waived, e.g. attainment of Unit standard U26360 (or the current equivalent)

(5) We recommend that the Code Committee also signal an intention to review the knowledge, competence and skills required for advisers providing Business Risk advice to private businesses, and to consider the requirement for a higher level of qualification for advisers who are providing risk advice to this sector, on the basis that the current unit standards in the Life & Health strand are related to Personal Risk advice only.

Comment: A key objective of the new regime is to build public confidence and trust in the financial services sector: ensuring that New Zealanders deal with qualified people is an absolutely crucial component in this. Moreover, qualifications across the sector will play a crucial role in lifting the professionalism of the industry and creating career pathways.

Page 13

Q19 Overall, do you agree or disagree with [standard 10] and proposed commentary? **Disagree**

Q20 Please provide any comments on [standard 10] and the proposed commentary.

We disagree and urge the Code Working Group to reconsider this standard.

We believe that a minimum number of 15 hours p.a. should be required, a professional development plan be in place and updated every year, and a CPD log maintained.

In addition, the definition of structured and unstructured CPD ought be added to the Code.

Reason

We would argue CPD obligations are personal requirements (how can a FAP do CPD?) and therefore it is inappropriate to put CPD standards into licencing requirements.

A commitment to ongoing professional development is a cornerstone of professionalism. It is fundamental that an adviser have a professional development plan to ensure they keep their key competencies and knowledge up-to-date. The Code ought to have a minimum level AND require 'any additional CPD' to maintain their competency as per the current Code of Conduct.

We support the Level 5 unit standard that includes understanding of the regulatory framework for financial advice in New Zealand. This requirement and adding minimum annual hours of CPD will retain consistency of attainment across the advice sector.

Page 14

Q21 Overall, do you agree or disagree with [standard 11] and proposed commentary? **Disagree**

Q22 Please provide any comments on [standard 11] and the proposed commentary.

We disagree and urge the Code Working Group to reconsider this standard. Our key recommendations and rationale are outlined below:

(1) We believe that all persons involved in the provision of a financial advice service should be required to have attained the minimum qualification of the New Zealand Certificate in Financial Services, or be able to demonstrate through an approved Recognised Prior Learning process that they have the knowledge, competence and skills that would be expected of a person who had completed the New Zealand Certificate in Financial Services, irrespective of the organizational structure they operate under.

(2) We believe the 'interim standard' for an investment plan needs to be reviewed with urgency and would like to be part of these discussions.

(3) There needs to be consideration of where KiwiSaver advice sits within the Investment Plan spectrum. Currently, a range of financial advisers provide product advice on KiwiSaver, which would be considered to be outside of providing an investment plan.

It is proposed a minimum for providing KiwiSaver advice is qualification outcomes under the Investment strand of the New Zealand Certificate in Financial Services (Level 5), approved by the New Zealand Qualifications Authority in September 2014 (NZQA reference 2315).

(4) The terms relating to alternative qualifications needs to be included in this section as per CS9.

As per CS9, ensuring that New Zealanders only deal with qualified individuals is essential in supporting professionalism across the sector.

Page 15

Q23 Overall, do you agree or disagree with [standard 12] and proposed commentary? **Disagree**

Q24 Please provide any comments on [standard 12] and the proposed commentary.

We disagree and urge the Code Working Group to reconsider this standard. Our key recommendations and rationale are outlined below:

(1) We believe that all persons involved in the provision of a financial advice service should be required to have attained the minimum qualification of the New Zealand Certificate in Financial Services, or be able to demonstrate through an approved Recognised Prior Learning process that they have the knowledge, competence and skills that would be expected of a person who had completed the NZ Certificate in Financial Services, irrespective of the organizational structure they operate under.

Reason

To achieve the standard of general competence, knowledge and skill the following must be obtained:

Knowledge is what an adviser gains through structured study, training and research exercise - and is formalised through a moderated assessment - which leads to the attainment of a qualification awarded at a particular time. You cannot re-attain a qualification. (RPL process could lead to the same qualification outcome).

Competence is an adviser's ability to do something efficiently and successfully. Adviser competence therefore requires an ongoing commitment to maintaining knowledge and keeping up-to-date with developments relevant to them (the descriptor in the old Code 18) with the "the ability to perform the activities within an occupation to the required standard, consistently and over time" (Source: FPSB). The commitment to this process is called 'continuing professional development' or 'CPD'. The international definition of 'structured' CPD is a 'learning activity which tests the acquisition and/or application of abilities, professional skills and knowledge'.

Skill points to personal aptitude, proficiency and mastery in an adviser's financial particular advice area – in other words applying all their knowledge and competencies (gained through CPD and experience) to the dynamic circumstances of the client's situation.

(2) New Code 9 states: 'the minimum standards of general competence, knowledge and skills are the general qualification outcomes of the NZ Certificate in Financial Services Level 5'. That poses a fundamental confusion.

Reason

The 'qualification outcomes' and 'graduate outcomes' of NZFSL5 are standards of minimum KNOWLEDGE attainment for an individual – and are not measures of competence and skills gained through experience and CPD.

Further, it is impossible for organisational 'capability' to be measured by personal qualification outcomes.

The analogy has been made of hospitals employing the most stringent procedures, systems and expertise to reduce patient risk and enhance patient health outcomes. However those providing patient care (nurses) are also required to be highly trained, AND qualified. The example has been given that 'bank tellers' do not require to be qualified under the proposed Code. We agree, that if they are not giving regulated financial advice, 'bank tellers' need only the basic knowledge in privacy and consumer protection law – just like nurse aids need instruction in hygiene and patient safety. However, if giving regulated financial advice, all consumers deserve to have someone qualified to provide that advice – relevant to their role.

MBIE during their consultation of the new legislation was at pains to establish a new regime on the advice-sector's call for an 'even playing field'. This Code provides a waiver for nominated representatives to be qualified, contrary to the intent of the new regime.

We believe this direction is a serious departure from international trends and a major departure from the UK and Australia codes where advisers are required to have minimum qualifications.

In addition to this, the recently released Bank Conduct and Culture Report highlighted that 'all banks need to focus on strengthening the frameworks, processes and controls that prevent, detect and manage conduct and culture issues'.

Code Working Group - Online Submission Form

This report we believe may require the Code Working Group to review Standard 9 and the reliance on FAP's for the procedures, systems and expertise and resulting outcomes for consumers.

(3) The proposed code will set up a two-tiered system of advisers in NZ: mandatory qualification for 'individual' financial advisers, and 'equivalence' for nominated representative.

Reason

The Industry Training Act allowed vocational qualifications to be developed by the Industry Training Organisation Skills Org. This Code mandates the personal attainment of a qualification for one group and uses the 'outcomes' in that same qualification to provide a standard to evidence 'equivalence'. However, that was not the intended use of NZQA qualifications.

The consequences of excluding nominated representatives from obtaining qualifications is that 'nominated representative' employees will be: trained and yet unqualified; have no formal NZQA record of learning; have reduced job mobility which would limit career prospects and arguably remuneration prospects.

(4) Overseas and alternative qualifications are allowable – advisers must be able to 'demonstrate equivalence' in an objective measurable and independently verifiable manner". We believe the FMA should be resourced to outline at what level this 'equivalence' is required and what requirements they would waiver (if any).

Reason

The matching of overseas qualifications to the NZCFSL5 in many cases is difficult and cost prohibitive. It would be desirable for the Code to have a list of commonly accepted alternatives to the graduate outcomes so as to lower the barriers for qualified overseas advisers. Further it would be good to have the graduate outcomes that would never be waived, e.g. attainment of Unit standard U26360 (or the current equivalent)

(5) We recommend that the Code Committee also signal an intention to review the knowledge, competence and skills required for advisers providing Business Risk advice to private businesses, and to consider the requirement for a higher level of qualification for advisers who are providing risk advice to this sector on the basis that the current unit standards in the Life & Health strand are related to Personal Risk advice only.

Comment: A key objective of the new regime is to build public confidence and trust in the financial services sector; ensuring that New Zealanders deal with qualified people is an absolutely crucial component in this. Moreover, qualifications across the sector will play a crucial role in lifting the professionalism of the industry and creating career pathways.

Page 16

Q25 Is there anything missing from the draft Code? **Yes**

Q26 If you answered yes, what is missing?

We have included this in the body of the submission.

Q27 Do you have any feedback on the examples, or suggestions on other examples that should be included in the draft Code?

Respondent skipped this question

Q28 Is there anything else you want to say?

A key objective of the new regime is to build public confidence and trust in the financial services sector; ensuring that New Zealanders deal with qualified people is an absolutely crucial component in this. Moreover, qualifications across the sector will play a crucial role in lifting the professionalism of the industry and creating career pathways.

Page 17

Q29 Name

Katrina Shanks

Q30 Your role or professional title

Chief Executive Officer

Q31 Individual or organisational submission

This is a submission on behalf of an organisation (eg employer)

Q32 If you give financial advice...

I am not an AFA, RFA or QFE adviser

Q33 My organisation or I give the following types of advice...

My organisation or I do not give financial advice

Q34 Organisation Name

Financial Advice New Zealand

Q35 Type of organisation

Industry body,

Other (please specify):

We have 1680 members

Q36 Size of organisation

Small firm (1-10 staff)

Q37 If there are other things we should know about you or your business that would provide context to your answers, please provide details below.

Respondent skipped this question

Q38 Please indicate whether your submission contains any information that is confidential or whether you do not wish your name or any other personal information to be included in a summary of submissions.

Respondent skipped this question

Q39 Please provide your contact details (email and/or phone number) This is the only question that requires an answer. This information would not be released publicly. We may get in touch with you in order to help us understand particular points from your submission.

s 9(2)(a)

RELEASED UNDER THE
OFFICIAL INFORMATION ACT