

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 S 9 (2) (a)
ii.	Please provide your contact details S 9 (2) (a)
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) We are a Life, Health Insurance Advisors
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) Please do not use our personal and company details

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>A good outcome for a client is a good idea.</i>
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

Share your views

C. Do you agree with a requirement to act with honesty, fairness and integrity? If not, please set out your reasoning.

Yes

Keep the commitments you make to your client

D. 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.

Ethical behaviour Yes and focus on processes please

E. 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?

Best Practice Training, case studies and Product Training

Manage and fully disclose conflicts of interest

F. Should the Code include a minimum standard on conflicts of interest in addition to the legislation?

Yes as long as you clearly state what a conflict of interest would be.

Do no harm to the client or the profession

G. 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.

I agree no further regulation required.

H.	Is an additional minimum standard on doing no harm to the client necessary? If so, what standard do you No
----	---

Keep your client's data confidential

I.	In which situations, if any, should the retention, use or sharing of anonymised bulk customer data be subject to Code standards?
J.	Do you agree that the Code should cover the various aspects of maintaining client confidentiality discussed in this paper? Yes
K.	Are there other aspects of maintaining client confidentiality to consider? Yes, Robo Advice, companies being hacked.

Ethical processes in Financial Advice Provider entities

L.	Do you agree that the Code should require the Financial Advice Provider to document and maintain its "ethical processes"? Yes - Larger organisations.
M.	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? That depends on the size of the organisation – Company with 10 or more advisers yes. One adviser – No.
N.	Should Financial Advice Providers also be subject to additional standards in respect of leadership and culture? If so, how should these be framed? Yes, these should be part of your adviser group and insurance providers
O.	Do you propose other additional standards of ethical behaviour that should apply to Financial Advice Providers? No, just training, case studies, best practice.

Ethics training

P.	Do you agree that Financial Advice Providers should be required to meet standards relating to ethics training? If not, please state your reasoning. Yes
----	--

Q.	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. At this stage something to be reviewed later, but yes.
R.	Should there be a requirement for ongoing refresher training on ethics? Yes

Resolving ethical dilemmas

S.	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. Yes -
----	--

Compliance functions

T.	Should there be a requirement for explicit sign-off on the soundness of financial advice provided directly by a Financial Advice Provider? Yes for robo advice
U.	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. Bigger companies yes.
V.	Should this extend further into an internal audit obligation, having in place processes to systematically test for and detect violations of ethical behaviour?
W.	Are there any potential compliance costs for small and/or large Financial Advice Providers that need to be considered? Yes

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.
----	--

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? Look at company process and training/ education and Adviser group
----	---

Conduct and client care

Advice situations

Share your views	
Z.	Are there other delivery methods that should be considered when testing our thinking? No

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.	Are there any potential compliance costs for small and/or large Financial Advice Providers that need to be considered? Yes

EE.	Are there any additional matters that should be addressed in the advice-giving standards? Those listed above? Others?

Advice process

FF.	Do you think there are any other components that should be included in the design considerations of an advice process? Disclosure obligations of clients and easy access to records. Insurance companies to take more responsibilities.
GG.	Should the Code include guidance material to help determine what needs to be considered when designing an advice process. Yes 100%
HH.	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? Yes divide into separate parts and qualification. Insurance, financial planning, mortgage broker and banking.
II.	Should any of the key aspects that we have listed above be removed? If so, why?
JJ.	Are there any situations in which an advice process need not be followed? Yes

Personalised suitability

KK.	What comments do you have about a proposed minimum standard on personalised suitability analysis? What are your views on the example above? Great
------------	--

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>Too much for a small business , more an adviser group or larger company.</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>Yes extremely time consuming and no added value to clients and their needs</p>

General competence, knowledge and skills

<i>Share your views</i>	
NN.	<p>Do you agree with our interpretation of the meaning of “competence, knowledge, and skills”? If not, why not?</p> <p>Yes</p>
OO.	<p>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.</p> <p>Digital at this stage cannot address some of the issues around insurance and consumers can unknowingly purchase incorrectly.</p>
PP.	<p>What do you think are the advantages of this approach to general competence, knowledge and skills?</p> <p>Break into sectors - Finance, mortgage broker, insurance etc.</p>
QQ.	<p>What do you think are the disadvantages of this approach to general competence, knowledge and skills?</p> <p>As above.</p>
RR.	<p>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)?</p>
SS.	<p>What factors should we consider in determining whether to make the proposed unit standard a renewing obligation?</p> <p>CPD credits</p>

Particular competence, knowledge and skills

<i>Share your views</i>	
TT.	<p>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?</p> <p>Level 5 is too high when giving Insurance advice only</p>
UU.	<p>How should RFA's experience be recognised?</p> <p>Through competence and process training.</p>
VV.	<p>What do you think are the advantages of this approach to particular competence, knowledge, and skill?</p> <p>Could be measurable and would be upskilling for all.</p>
WW.	<p>What do you think are the disadvantages of this approach to particular competence, knowledge, and skill?</p> <p>Nil</p>
XX.	<p>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)?</p> <p>People don't understand ACC and how it works and are totally unaware of things such as accidental death benefits. There is absolutely no understanding of insurance by consumers. Therefore the process needs to be basic.</p>
YY.	<p>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?</p> <p>I think you need relevant training in each section. An insurance adviser should not require the same compliance as a Financial Adviser (AFA).</p>

Other comments

Share your views

ZZ. Are there any other comments you would like to make to assist us in developing the Code?

Yes

Ethical behaviour is a great standard and I believe that it can be delivered by adviser groups and insurance companies along with case studies training.

Law – We should know relevant laws in the areas that we are trading in. This may include tax, estate planning, buy/sell agreements etc.

Product Provider -Training would help to develop core knowledge and skill and also throughout the code you have never mentioned claims. This is a shame as a claim outcome has a huge effect on the clients buying decision

Advisers Process - Allowing the client to make a decision through process should put some ownership back on the client for the decision that they make at the time of purchase. Would you like option “A” or option “B”.

Best Practice – What procedures do you have to followup clients, is 3 times sufficient leaving phone/ email messages? At what point does it become the client’s responsibility? This needs to be clearly defined.

Ongoing Training – CPD credits is a good way of continued education as we have found product providers and adviser group to be a great source of on-going information whether it is product based or business training. I don’t believe a person who has been in the industry for 30+ years can get away without on-going development.

Claims - The concerns I do have is when you do insurance planning we cannot predict the outcome of a claim and looking back on our work it is very easy to judge as incorrect advice in hindsight. This I believe puts us at an unfair advantage and I don’t think we should be held as accountable for client’s decisions as we are unable to predict an outcome. This also affects areas such as Advice on replacement where there can be some clear advantages to change product.

Payment – We take care in what we do but a lumbered with the Investment Advisers. We don’t believe we should have to disclose our commissions.