## Code Working Group - Online Submission Form

# #46

## COMPLETE

Web Link 3 (Web Link)
Thursday, October 18, 2018 2:20:22 PM
Tuesday, November 06, 2018 12:43:28 PM
Over a week

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.

There may be an issue in terms of how precise statements such as "act in the client's interests" can be.

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.

Once again while we agree statements such as "do the right thing" are very imprecise.

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.

Agree but remove the first bullet point "where practicable avoid COIs". The statute needs to accept that COI will occur. There should be a duty to prioritise the interests of the client but it wont be pragmatic to avoid all COI all of the time. So the standard should not be "where practicable to avoid them". The standard should be all about how to manage them when they are present – i.e. they haven't been avoided and they need to be managed

#### 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 reference as to how an adviser needs 'to evidence' their advice. It is fundamentally important the client has a form of evidence to support the advice they have received i.e. report, email, video etc.

Page 7	
<b>Q9</b> Overall, do you agree or disagree with [standard 5] and proposed commentary?	Agree
<b>Q10</b> Please provide any comments on [standard 5] and the proposed commentary.	Respondent skipped this question
Page 8	
<b>Q11</b> Overall, do you agree or disagree with [standard 6] and proposed commentary?	Agree
<b>Q12</b> Please provide any comments on [standard 6] and the proposed commentary.	Respondent skipped this question
Page 9	Agree
<b>Q13</b> Overall, do you agree or disagree with [standard 7] and proposed commentary?	Agree
Q14 Please provide any comments on [standard 7] and t	he proposed commentary.
To ensure there is some substance in the complaints process, we and/or licencing requirements and will need to be more comprehe	
The client must be provided with information on how to complain in escalation to an external dispute resolution scheme.	ncluding the internal compliant management process and then an
Page 10	
<b>Q15</b> Overall, do you agree or disagree with [standard 8] and proposed commentary?	Agree
<b>Q16</b> Please provide any comments on [standard 8] and the proposed commentary.	Respondent skipped this question
Page 12	
<b>Q17</b> Overall, do you agree or disagree with [standard 9] and proposed commentary?	Respondent skipped this question

# Code Working Group - Online Submission Form

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

The standards needs to determine the quantity and quality of continuing professional development.

There should be a requirement for financial advisers and nominated representatives to create an annual CPD plan. To complete a minimum of 15 CPD hours p.a. and maintain a CPD log.

This standard allows someone to do very little on the basis that they are unlikely to be audited. And if they were to be audited, how could that audit be conducted with clarity and certainty.

While setting hours can become a tick- box exercise, it at least gives provides an indication of the minimum required to keep up to date.

CPD standards should (a) include an annual PDP (b) be delivered by an expert and (c) include external verification that the adviser actually did it (attended).

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 comentary.

Comments under standard 9 also apply here

Page 14

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

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

We believe there should be one minimum qualification for all persons providing a financial services investment plan. The minimum standards of particular competence, knowledge, and skill for designing an investment plan are the qualification 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).

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

There needs to be clarification of where KiwiSaver advice sits within the Investment Plan spectrum. Currently, a range of financial providers provide simple advice on KiwiSaver. A minimum for providing KiwiSaver advise 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).

The terms related to alternative qualifications also needs to be included in this section.

Critically Nominated reps should not be able to do investment plans. Further consideration also needs to go into how the role of nominated reps differs from financial advisers.

Page	1	5
------	---	---

rage 15	
<b>Q23</b> Overall, do you agree or disagree with [standard 12] and proposed commentary?	Agree
<b>Q24</b> Please provide any comments on [standard 12] and the proposed commentary.	Respondent skipped this question
Page 16	
Q25 Is there anything missing from the draft Code?	Yes
Q26 If you answered yes, what is missing?	
in the proposal to date. This gap was identified in the recent Rese can be addressed needs some thought but one area where seriou representatives. <b>Q27</b> Do you have any feedback on the examples, or	<b>^</b>
suggestions on other examples that should be included in the draft Code?	All ATTIC
Q28 Is there anything else you want to say?	Respondent skipped this question
Page 17 RELEVAL	
Q29 Name	
Wayne Smith	
Q30 Your role or professional title	
Chief Executive	
Q31 Individual or organisational submission	This is a submission on behalf of an organisation (eg employer)
Q32 If you give financial advice	l am not an AFA, RFA or QFE adviser
<b>Q33</b> My organisation or I give the following types of advice	Other (please specify): Adviser Professional Body

# Q34 Organisation Name

TripleA Advisers Association

Q35 Type of organisation	Industry body
Q36 Size of organisation	Large firm (50+ staff)
<b>Q37</b> 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
<b>Q38</b> 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
<b>Q39</b> Please provide your contact details (email and/or ph answer. This information would not be released publicly. understand particular points from your submission.	We may get in touch with you in order to help us
s 9(2)(a)	EMAS
s 9(2)(a)	Mir