

Code of Professional Conduct for Financial Advice Services

Submission Template

Submissions close Monday 30 April 2018

Please send submissions to:

code.secretariat@mbie.govt.nz or

Code Working Group
c/o Code Secretariat (Poppy Haynes and Max Lin)
Ministry of Business, Innovation & Employment
PO Box 1473
Wellington 6140
New Zealand

Submissions process

The Code Working Group (CWG) seeks written submissions on the issues raised in this document by **5pm on Monday 30 April 2018**

We welcome submissions on any or all consultation questions. You are welcome to comment only on the issues most relevant to you.

Where possible, please include evidence to support your views, for example references to independent research, facts and figures, or relevant examples.

Please direct any questions that you have in relation to the submissions process to code.secretariat@mbie.govt.nz.

Use of information

The information provided in submissions will be used to inform the CWG's development of the draft Code. We may contact submitters directly if we require clarification of any matters in submissions.

Release of information

The CWG intends to upload PDF copies of submissions received to MBIE's website at www.mbie.govt.nz. The CWG will consider you to have consented to publication of your submission, unless you clearly specify otherwise in your submission.

If your submission contains any information that is confidential or you otherwise wish us not to publish, please:

- indicate this on the front of the submission, with any confidential information clearly marked within the text
- provide a separate version excluding the relevant information for publication on our website.

Submissions remain subject to request under the Official Information Act 1982. Please set out clearly in the cover letter or e-mail accompanying your submission if you have any objection to the release of any information in the submission, and in particular, which parts you consider should be withheld, together with the reasons for withholding the information. The CWG will take such objections into account and will consult with submitters when responding to requests under the Official Information Act 1982.

Private information

The Privacy Act 1993 establishes certain principles with respect to the collection, use and disclosure of information about individuals. Any personal information you supply to the CWG in the course of making a submission will only be used for the purpose of assisting in the development of the draft code. Please clearly indicate in the cover letter or e-mail accompanying your submission if you do not wish your name, or any other personal information, to be included in any summary of submissions that the CWG may publish.

Information about you

<i>Share your details</i>	
i.	Please provide your name and (if relevant) the organisation you represent Glen Marsh
ii.	Please provide your contact details
iii.	Please provide any other information about you or your organisation that will help us understand your perspective (e.g. the financial advice situations you have experience with) Am an independent adviser / director. Sole adviser
iv.	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. (See page 2 of this document)

Principles for drafting the Code

<i>Share your views</i>	
A.	What comments do you have regarding the overarching theme of “good advice outcomes” and the underlying principles? I think this whole review process is a positive one. Ensuring the client’s best interests are adhered to is paramount. Overall, ensuring there is a common structure that drives positive outcomes while also ensuring the industry is not compliance bound (within reason) with high costs is crucial.
B.	Are there any further principles that should be included, or existing principles that should be removed?

Ethical behaviour

Act with honesty, fairness and integrity

<i>Share your views</i>	
C.	<p>Do you agree with a requirement to act with honesty, fairness and integrity? If not, please set out your reasoning.</p> <p>Of course – this is a no brainer. I do not understand why the FMA have yet to come down on advisers that churn when they know who they are.</p>

Keep the commitments you make to your client

D.	<p>Should minimum standards for ethical behaviour for the provision of financial advice extend beyond strict legal obligations, to include meeting less formal understandings, impressions or expectations that do not necessarily amount to strictly legal obligations? If no, please give reasoning. If yes, please propose how a standard for such commitments might be framed.</p> <p>As stated, there should be clear boundaries / standards while ensuring common sense is also adhered to meaning the industry remains efficient, with the focus on providing value add propositions to the market place.</p>
E.	<p>If there was a minimum standard requiring Financial Advice Providers – or Financial Advice Providers in some situations – to have their own code of ethics in addition to the Code, how would you frame the requirement for it to deal with keeping commitments?</p> <p>I believe there should be an overall ethics code that sets the minimum level required.</p> <p>I don't believe adding an additional level adds any value.</p>

Manage and fully disclose conflicts of interest

F.	<p>Should the Code include a minimum standard on conflicts of interest in addition to the legislation? I believe that any conflict of interest should totally be disclosed – again, I'm not too sure what adding another level on top of the legislation will achieve.</p>
----	--

Do no harm to the client or the profession

G.	<p>Do you agree that a person who gives financial advice must not do anything or make an omission that would or would be likely to bring the financial advice profession into disrepute? If not, please set out your reasoning.</p> <p>Of course, totally agree.</p>
----	---

H.	<p>Is an additional minimum standard on doing no harm to the client necessary? If so, what standard do you propose?</p> <p>The legislation should clearly state what is acceptable and what is not. Keeping things as simple and as clear as possible is paramount. So to me, what will an additional standard achieve when one is already in place with clearly stated guidelines and levels accepted.</p>
----	---

Keep your client's data confidential

I.	<p>In which situations, if any, should the retention, use or sharing of anonymised bulk customer data be subject to Code standards?</p> <p>None</p>
J.	<p>Do you agree that the Code should cover the various aspects of maintaining client confidentiality discussed in this paper?</p> <p>Yes</p>
K.	<p>Are there other aspects of maintaining client confidentiality to consider?</p>

Ethical processes in Financial Advice Provider entities

L.	<p>Do you agree that the Code should require the Financial Advice Provider to document and maintain its "ethical processes"?</p> <p>There should be standards of course. I don't know whether adding another level of compliance is necessary. A provider can essentially write what they want to.</p>
M.	<p>Should the Financial Advice Provider be required to have a publicly available corporate code of ethics? Are there particular situations where a corporate code of ethics should be or should not be required?</p> <p>We should have an industry code of ethics that is easily made available to the market place – they should always be required.</p>
N.	<p>Should Financial Advice Providers also be subject to additional standards in respect of leadership and culture? If so, how should these be framed?</p> <p>No – how they run their own business in terms of leadership / culture is their own business – As long as industry standards and legislative requirements are met, I see no reason for this to occur. It doesn't happen in other industries that I am aware of.</p>
O.	<p>Do you propose other additional standards of ethical behaviour that should apply to Financial Advice Providers?</p> <p>No – as stated above – there will be a minimum level required for ALL providers. I don't know that adding a further layer will add any value</p>

Ethics training

P.	<p>Do you agree that Financial Advice Providers should be required to meet standards relating to ethics training? If not, please state your reasoning.</p> <p>Of course</p>
Q.	<p>Should ethics training requirements apply to all officers and employees of a Financial Advice Provider, as appropriate to their role and contribution to the process of financial advice provision? If not, please state your reasoning.</p> <p>Yes – this should be a part of the formal training required</p>
R.	<p>Should there be a requirement for ongoing refresher training on ethics?</p> <p>I don't know whether formal training is required, more about the industry as a whole continuing to push the ethics point across to all</p>

Resolving ethical dilemmas

S.	<p>Do you agree that Financial Advice Providers should be required to have in place, and use, a framework for resolving ethical dilemmas that may arise in giving financial advice? If not, please set out your reasoning.</p> <p>Yes</p>
----	---

Compliance functions

T.	<p>Should there be a requirement for explicit sign-off on the soundness of financial advice provided directly by a Financial Advice Provider?</p> <p>Yes, may</p>
U.	<p>Do you agree that Financial Advice Providers should be required to have in place a compliance function aimed at following up on concerns raised by employees and other stakeholders? If not, please set out your reasoning.</p> <p>Yes</p>
V.	<p>Should this extend further into an internal audit obligation, having in place processes to systematically test for and detect violations of ethical behaviour?</p> <p>I think we must be careful not get too tied up in compliance administration and ensure we are focussing on what this whole process is about – adding value to the market place, acting in the best interests of the clients.</p>
W.	<p>Are there any potential compliance costs for small and/or large Financial Advice Providers that need to be considered?</p> <p>Ensuring compliance costs are not too heavy – there are a lot of one man bands out there like myself.</p>

Responsibility for the whole advice process

X.	Do you agree that Financial Advice Providers should be required to be able to demonstrate that they meet the standards of ethical behaviour as if the Financial Advice Provider carried out the whole advice process directly itself? If not, please set out your reasoning. Yes
----	---

Reinforcing good ethical behaviour

Y.	What principle or mechanism do you propose the Code could include to reinforce good ethical behaviour on a day-to-day basis? Client files are reviewed on a day to day basis – for a one man band it is obviously different but will be liable regardless.
----	---

Conduct and client care

Advice situations

<i>Share your views</i>	
Z.	Are there other delivery methods that should be considered when testing our thinking?

Advice-giving standards

AA.	How do the current client care standards work in practice, especially in advice-giving situations not previously covered by the AFA Code? In answering this question, please ignore “scope of advice” (CS-8) and “suitability” (CS-9 and part of CS-10).
BB.	Could any aspect of the current client care standards be worded better? (For example, we are aware that the definition of “complaint” could be improved.)
CC.	Are there any aspects of the current client care standards that could be expanded or clarified (for example, in light of the published findings of the Disciplinary Committee)?

DD.	<p>Are there any potential compliance costs for small and/or large Financial Advice Providers that need to be considered?</p> <p>Costs must not be too high to push the one man / small providers out of the market.</p>
EE.	<p>Are there any additional matters that should be addressed in the advice-giving standards? Those listed above? Others?</p> <p>Yes, some of the listed subjects are relevant but I'm not too sure where you are wanting to take things eg: change of servicing adviser</p>

Advice process

FF.	<p>Do you think there are any other components that should be included in the design considerations of an advice process?</p> <p>The current process is suitable – ensuring the process is adhered to is the key.</p> <p>The listed material in the paper is relevant</p>
GG.	<p>Should the Code include guidance material to help determine what needs to be considered when designing an advice process?</p> <p>Yes, should be clearly explain eg: independent research provided in terms of benefit quality</p>
HH.	<p>Are there any other important aspects you think should be included in the advice process for all types of financial advice activities under the new regime?</p> <p>Banks should detail that their advice is not independent and they have one product to offer</p>
II.	<p>Should any of the key aspects that we have listed above be removed? If so, why?</p> <p>No – looks good</p>
JJ.	<p>Are there any situations in which an advice process need not be followed?</p> <p>The clients best interests always needs to be looked after – rarely, I can complete a limited advice for a client but this is always documented and signed by the client. In effect, a process is still maintained.</p>

Personalised suitability

KK.	<p>What comments do you have about a proposed minimum standard on personalised suitability analysis? What are your views on the example above?</p> <p>I think the examples are positive with some common sense coming into play as well.</p>
-----	--

Organisational standards

LL.	<p>What are the practical advantages and disadvantages of including organisational standards as described? What explanatory material or examples could we provide in the Code that might help to make these standards easier to comply with in practice?</p> <p>The concept is potentially good but having someone write down their processes will not potentially mean that they are adhered to. The true reality between company culture, etc and advice can be very different. Having controls where the advice / process is checked is more relevant I believe.</p>
MM.	<p>Would implementing these organisational conduct and client care standards create a particular compliance burden for your firm? If yes, please explain why.</p> <p>Again, I think the real measure is the outcome. Although I understand the intention, the reality is very different.</p>

General competence, knowledge and skills

<i>Share your views</i>	
NN.	Do you agree with our interpretation of the meaning of “competence, knowledge, and skills”? If not, why not? yes
OO.	Are there other factors, which contribute to combined expertise , that we have not listed? We are particularly interested in factors that are relevant to financial advice that is given by a Financial Advice Provider directly, including by digital means.
PP.	What do you think are the advantages of this approach to general competence, knowledge and skills?
QQ.	What do you think are the disadvantages of this approach to general competence, knowledge and skills?
RR.	In what ways do you think this proposed standard contributes to, or detracts from, the legislative purposes (for example ensuring the quality and availability of advice, avoiding unnecessary compliance costs, and promoting innovation and flexibility)?
SS.	What factors should we consider in determining whether to make the proposed unit standard a renewing obligation? I believe there needs to be a minimum requirement to enter the industry – level 5 is a good level and is specific to the products they are offering to the market

Particular competence, knowledge and skills

<i>Share your views</i>	
TT.	What are the advantages and disadvantages of our approach of identifying two types of financial advice? What impact would it have on the type of advice you give and on your compliance costs? Positive to have different types of advice.
UU.	How should RFA’s experience be recognised? A time factor is probably the easiest. Still, ultimately how the RFA conducted themselves is the key.

VV.	What do you think are the advantages of this approach to particular competence, knowledge, and skill?
WW.	What do you think are the disadvantages of this approach to particular competence, knowledge, and skill?
XX.	In what ways do you think this proposed standard contributes to, or detracts from, the legislative purposes (for example ensuring the quality and availability of advice, avoiding unnecessary compliance costs, and promoting innovation and flexibility)?
YY.	What alterations, if any, would you suggest to the baselines we have nominated: specialist strand for product capability, Level 5 for discipline capability, and relevant degree (or other degree plus Level 6) for planning capability?

Other comments

<i>Share your views</i>	
ZZ.	Are there any other comments you would like to make to assist us in developing the Code?