# #16

### COMPLETE

Collector: Web L nk 3 (Web L nk)

Started:Saturday, October 13, 2018 2:10:37 PMLast Modified:Saturday, October 13, 2018 3:10:50 PM

**Time Spent:** 01:00:13

#### Page 3

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

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

Second bu et pont: I fee spec f c ment on shou d be made about the adv ser's role in making recommendations which may fa outs de the cient's views and preferences, where the adv ser fees to since the cient's best interests to do so. This deals implied in the 5th builties to should be more visible.

### 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.

This standard is central to the code as a whole. I'm pleased to see its inclusion as it will help FAPs keep their advisers focussed on clean endors rather than the FAP's needs (where the FAP's needs may conflict).

#### Page 5

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

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

D sc osure of such conf cts s most mportant.

### 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.

No competent adv ser shou d object to this standard. It isn't good enough to say to the cilent that the new product is 'better' and not say why.

### Page 7

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

Neither agree nor disagree

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

This standard is quite lengthy and over apsito an extent with Code Standard 1: treating cients fairly and acting in their interests. In my view, the longer the Code, the less likely to sit that advisers will also own a parts of t. You might consider pruning this CS, or expanding CS1 and deleting this one.

### Page 8

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

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

Very good.

### Page 9

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

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

Adv sers are bound by the Privacy Act in any case, but lagree it's a good dea to include this standard here.

### Page 10

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

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

Very good.

#### Page 12

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

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

In my v ew Leve 5 s atta nab e by any worthy adv ser.

#### Page 13

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

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

Keep ng up to date with knowledge of financial services will a ways be in the best interests of cients. A structured CPD process s m ar to the AFA process s des rab e n my v ew, to ensure adv sers actua y adhere to th s CS.

### Page 14

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

Agree

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

Yes, very good.

#### 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.

In my view nominated representatives of an FAP should be held to the same standard as individuals. Recent history shows that prob ems are most ke y to emanate from arge FAPs

### Page 16

Q25 Is there anything missing from the draft Code?

Yes

Q26 If you answered yes, what is missing?

Robo-Adv ce does not appear to me (I cou d be wrong) to be nc uded.

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

Noth ng other than my comments above. I'd g ve the draft an 8.5 out of 10.

Q28 Is there anything else you want to say?

Good on you for creat ng a readab e and eas y understandab e code.

#### Q29 Name

Dav d P ne BBS CLU

Q30 Your role or professional title

Coach, mentor, tra ner, was adv ser for 37 years and may start aga n soon!

Q31 Individual or organisational submission

This is an individual submission and not on behalf of

an organisation

Q32 If you give financial advice...

I am a

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

Fire and general insurance

Business insurance,

Life and/or health

insurance

Other (p ease

spec fy):

Not current y pract s ng but these are the f e ds I was, and

n the near future w be, practs ng n.

Q34 Organisation Name

P ne F nanc a (2010) Ltd

Q35 Type of organisation

Financial advice

firm

Insurance broker

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.

Former NZ President of two national adviser organisations of 800 and 1200 members respectively, and also a felemember of MDRT

**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.

No prob em, p ease fee free to pub sh. Thank you for the opportun ty to contr bute.

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)

