8 March 2019

Mr Mark Fitt
Committee Secretary
Senate Economics Legislation Committee
PO Box 6100
Parliament House
CANBERRA ACT 2600

By email: Economics.Sen@aph.gov.au

Dear Mr Fitt

Senate Economics Legislation Committee
Inquiry into Treasury Laws Amendment (Combating Illegal Phoenixing) Bill 2019 [Provisions]

Thank you for the opportunity to lodge a submission in the above inquiry.

ARITA - Australian Restructuring Insolvency & Turnaround Association has been highly involved in providing feedback, consultation and input into the Government's proposed reforms to combat illegal phoenix activity, including this bill and a number of other related measures.

We continue to highlight that registered liquidators are at the frontline in discovering and pursuing illegal phoenix activity. The success or otherwise of these, or any reforms with a similar goal, turns on how effectively they can be deployed by liquidators and then how regulators engage positively with those liquidators to pursue the directors and unregulated advisers who are the drivers of this illicit behaviour. This submission on the Treasury Laws Amendment (Combating Illegal Phoenixing) Bill 2019 (Bill) is made from this perspective.

ARITA has long taken the position that illegal phoenix activity, facilitated by dodgy pre-insolvency advisers, is undermining the effective operation of the market and strips assets from other rightful creditors in external administrations.

Stopping this behaviour is ARITA's most significant law reform priority and we have provided the following submissions on issues related to combating illegal phoenix activity:

(a) Submission to The Treasury on combating illegal phoenix activity dated 27 September 2018;
(b) Submission to the Department of Jobs and Small Business on proposed Reforms to the Corporations Act 2001 (Cth) to Address Corporate Misuse of the Fair Entitlements Guarantee Scheme dated 9 July 2018;
(c) Submission to The Treasury on combatting illegal phoenix activity 30 October 2017;
(d) Submission to The Treasury on proposed Reforms to the Corporations Act 2001 (Cth) to Address Corporate Misuse of the Fair Entitlements Guarantee Scheme dated 18 October 2018.
(previous submissions)

These previous submissions are in addition to our extensive work regarding the Director Identity Number (DIN) reforms which are being separately considered by the Senate Economics Legislation Committee and are addressed in our submission dated 5 March 2019.

We have included as an annexure to this submission, our previous submission of 27 September 2018. Copies of the other previous submissions are available on request.

Key points

Existing legislation contains a number of tools which already address illegal activity (e.g. s 182, s 184, s 588FB and s 588G, each of which include liability options for criminal contravention). These mechanisms (and others) are being used by ASIC to address illegal phoenix behaviour,[1] however, there is not sufficient focus on enforcement actions to have a deterrent effect on those who engage in this activity.

In ARITA's recent member survey, almost half the responses indicated that the influence of pre-insolvency advisers (who are often linked to illegal phoenix activity) was increasing. Alongside this, almost 40% of responses agreed that stronger enforcement of existing laws was the single best way of reducing this influence.

While we maintain our strong belief that a more appropriate response would be to strengthen existing anti-phoenixing tools within the *Corporations Act 2001* (Act) rather than creating quasi-duplicate mechanisms, we believe that many of the amendments incorporated into the Bill following our previous submissions and consultations with The Treasury contribute to allaying some of ARITA's concerns regarding the Government's package.

While we are pleased to see a number of matters raised by ARITA have been addressed in the Bill, including the inherent lack of documentary evidence alleviated by the presumption inserted at proposed s 588E(4A), we maintain our significant concerns that a lack of adequate funding to liquidators will continue to hamper the effectiveness of the reforms.

---

[1] See: ASIC media release 19-047MR on a former director and two pre-insolvency advisers being charged with breaches of directors' duties and money laundering; ASIC media release 18-351 concerning a company director sentenced for breaching director's duties for illegal phoenix activity.

General comments on draft legislation

Creditor-defeating disposition

- We support the narrowing of the definition of creditor-defeating disposition (CDD) to exclude dispositions for market value or the best price reasonably obtainable. This is consistent with ARITA's previous recommendation that dispositions in the ordinary course of business should be specifically excluded from the definition.

  Of particular note is the 'best price reasonably obtainable' test which recognises the concerns noted in our previous submission[2] that:

  > *[m]ost businesses in financial distress would normally undertake some attempts to discount their products or services during that period of financial distress in order to generate cashflow and/or reduce stock levels. This is normal and generally appropriate behaviour in an attempted turnaround phase. These provisions presume this behaviour to be creditor defeating and appear to place the onus on directors to prove otherwise. We do not feel that this is a reasonable approach or consistent with natural justice.*

- We welcome the addition of the presumption that a disposition was for less than market value or the price reasonably obtainable for the property if it is proved that the company failed to keep or retain financial records relating to the disposition. An inherent lack of documentary evidence has been a significant barrier to liquidators being able to take action in relation to illegal phoenix activity.

  ARITA also supports the reversal of the onus of proof requiring the defendant to disprove the matter the subject of the presumption.

Voiding the transaction

- In its previous submission, ARITA sought to have the exclusion for voidability of a CDD made under a deed of company arrangement, scheme of arrangement or by the company's liquidator widened to apply to any external administrator or controller. We are pleased to see the addition of voluntary administrators to the provision (s 588FE(6A)(c)), which effectively gives coverage to all external administrators.

  While the provision has not been widened to include controllers, we note that the amendment to the definition of a CDD to exclude market value or best price reasonably available should ensure that proper dispositions by controllers do not constitute a CDD. A disposition by a controller which is not at market value or the best price reasonably available is likely to breach a controller's statutory duty of care in exercising their power of sale under s 420A of the Act.

---

[2] Submission to The Treasury on combating illegal phoenix activity dated 27 September 2018

Duties to prevent creditor defeating dispositions

- ARITA is pleased to see the creation of an actual "phoenixing" offence by the incorporation of the term "phoenixing" in the objects of the new 'Subdivision B – Duties to prevent creditor-defeating dispositions'. We had previously raised concerns that the absence of this would hinder any effective communication strategy that may actually drive cultural change to call out and mitigate this behaviour.

- Having previously raised the concerns that the limitation to transactions which occur within 12 months of the external administration may be subject to avoidance, we are pleased to see the extension of the officer's duty to prevent creditor-defeating dispositions to circumstances where less than 12 months after the disposition, the company ceases to carry on business altogether as a direct or indirect result of the disposition.

- We note that the Bill proposes to make voluntary administrators liable for any contravention of the prohibition on CDDs but provides an exclusion for other types of external administrators.

  While ARITA has previously raised concerns regarding pre-pack arrangements, whereby a troubled company concludes an agreement for the sale of assets or disposal of the whole business in advance of statutory administration procedures without making adequate provision for the payment of obligations to creditors (often facilitated via a voluntary administration), the distinction in s 588GAB of the Bill is incongruous, as the form of external administration should not impact possible liability.

  Any external administrator who engages in conduct that results in a company making a CDD should be subject to the offence provisions.

  The explanatory memorandum suggests that liquidators and provisional liquidators should not be subject to criminal liability or the civil penalty provisions as liquidations are a final form of administration.

  However, it is important to note that illegal phoenix activity, including pre-pack arrangements for sale of assets at less than market value, may just as easily be conducted via a liquidation, particularly given the intention is to "kill off" the old entity and move the business to a new entity.

  Therefore, we suggest that the whole of the proposed s 588GAB(3) exception be removed.

Other comments

- ARITA supported the amendments to the Insolvency Practice Rules (Corporations), that commenced on 7 December 2018, which prevent related parties facilitating illegal phoenix activity by unduly influencing vote at creditor's meetings in an external administration.

  We do however highlight an issue with the amendment, whereby the new restriction does not apply to voting on proposals without meetings. The ability for creditors to vote on matters via proposal in lieu of a creditors meeting was a new measure introduced as part of the *Insolvency Law Reform Act 2016* (ILRA).

  The ILRA was an extensive reform and there are a number of drafting oversights that ARITA has identified and raised with The Treasury on numerous occasions. This includes concerns regarding proposals without meetings which is again highlighted by the new amendment. An article setting out our concerns in this matter is attached for your reference.

  The impact of this error on the related party voting issue was recently the subject on extensive consultation with the Australian Securities and Investments Commission, which agrees that the new amendments do not extend to proposals without meetings, thereby presenting a "loophole" which can easily avoid the restraints of the new restrictions.

If you have any queries concerning this submission please contact [redacted] [redacted].

Yours sincerely

[redacted]

Chief Executive Officer

About ARITA

ARITA - Australian Restructuring Insolvency & Turnaround Association represents practitioners and other associated professionals who specialise in the fields of insolvency, restructuring and turnaround.

We have more than 2,400 members and subscribers including accountants, lawyers and other professionals with an interest in insolvency and restructuring.

Around 84 percent of registered liquidators and 87 percent of registered trustees are ARITA members. We represent firms of all sizes, from small practice through to multi-national firms, with the majority of our membership being drawn from those in small-medium practice.

ARITA's ambition is to lead and support appropriate and efficient means to expertly manage financial recovery.

We deliver this through the provision of innovative training and education, upholding world class ethical and professional standards, partnering with government and promoting the ideals of the profession to the public at large. In 2017, ARITA delivered close to 300 professional development sessions to around 5,000 attendees.

The Association promotes best practice and provides a forum for debate on key issues facing the profession. We also engage in thought leadership and public policy advocacy underpinned by our members' needs, knowledge and experience. We represented the profession at 23 inquiries, hearings and public policy consultations during 2017.

Annexure A - Submission to The Treasury on combating illegal phoenix activity dated 27 September 2018

27 September 2018

[redacted]
Senior Adviser
Corporations Policy Unit
Consumer and Corporations Division
The Treasury
Level 5
100 Market Street
SYDNEY NSW 2000

By email: Phoenixing@treasury.gov.au

Dear Ms [redacted]

Combating Illegal Phoenix Activity

Thank you for the opportunity to lodge a submission on the draft reforms to combat illegal phoenix activity.

As an overarching comment, it is important to note that registered liquidators are at the frontline in discovering and pursuing illegal phoenix activity. The success or otherwise of these, or any reforms with a similar goal, turns on how effectively they can be deployed by liquidators and then how regulators engage positively with those liquidators to pursue the directors and unregulated advisers who are the drivers of this illicit behaviour.

Key points

The key points of our submission are as follows:

- We strongly believe that a more appropriate response would be to strengthen existing anti-phoenixing tools within the Corporations Act rather than creating quasi-duplicate mechanisms.
- We are disappointed that an actual "phoenixing" offence has not been created. The absence of this will hinder any effective communication strategy that may actually drive cultural change to call out and mitigate this behaviour.

- A lack of adequate funding and documentary evidence available to liquidators will continue to hamper the effectiveness of the reforms.
- ARITA has concerns regarding the breadth of transactions captured as a 'creditor-defeating disposition' and believes that dispositions in the ordinary course of business should be specifically excluded from the definition.
- While ARITA supports an administrative recovery regime, an inherent lack of supporting documentation in relation to illegal phoenix transactions will limit any recovery by ASIC.
- ARITA generally supports the reforms to prevent officers from backdating resignations or abandoning companies, subject to the addition of anti-avoidance mechanisms, but notes that its effectiveness is closely tied to the implementation of the proposed Director Identity Number.
- ARITA supports the changes in respect of GST estimates and director penalties.
- While supportive of the move for the ATO to retain tax refunds, ARITA believes measures are required to restrict the ability of the ATO to obtain a higher priority for its debt following the appointment of an external administrator.
- ARITA supports the reforms to restrict related creditors' voting rights to the value of the consideration paid for an assigned debt when conducting a poll for a resolution concerning the appointment or removal of an external administrator.

Further details in relation to these matters are reported in the body of our submission.

Should you have any queries arising from this submission please contact .

Yours sincerely

John Winter
Chief Executive Officer

About ARITA

The Australian Restructuring Insolvency and Turnaround Association (ARITA) represents professionals who specialise in the fields of restructuring, insolvency and turnaround.

We have more than 2,400 members and subscribers including accountants, lawyers and other professionals with an interest in insolvency and restructuring.

Around 84 percent of registered liquidators and 87 percent of registered trustees are ARITA members. We represent firms of all sizes, from small practice through to multi-national firms, with the majority of our membership being drawn from those in small-medium practice.

ARITA's ambition is to lead and support appropriate and efficient means to expertly manage financial recovery.

We deliver this through the provision of innovative training and education, upholding world class ethical and professional standards, partnering with government and promoting the ideals of the profession to the public at large. In 2017, ARITA delivered close to 300 professional development sessions to around 5,000 attendees.

The Association promotes best practice and provides a forum for debate on key issues facing the profession. We also engage in thought leadership and public policy advocacy underpinned by our members' needs, knowledge and experience. We represented the profession at 23 inquiries, hearings and public policy consultations during 2017.

Table of contents

1 Combating Illegal Phoenix Activity 5

1.1 Combating illegal phoenix activity 5

1.2 Phoenixing offences and property transfers to defeat creditors 6

1.2.1 Creditor-defeating dispositions 6

1.2.2 Voiding the transaction 7

1.2.3 Recovery by ASIC 10

1.2.4 Offences and civil penalty provisions 10

1.3 Improving the accountability of resigning directors 11

1.4 GST estimates and director penalties 12

1.5 Retention of tax refunds 13

2 Restricting Related Creditor Voting Rights 14

3 Outstanding amendments to the Insolvency Law Reform Act 2016 15

Appendix A – ARITA response to The Treasury's Combatting Illegal Phoenixing Consultation Paper - October 2017 16

Appendix B - Consolidated list of outstanding ILRA 'fixes', errors and anomalies 17

1 Combating Illegal Phoenix Activity

1.1 Combating illegal phoenix activity

Recommendation 1.1: A lack of adequate funding and documentary evidence available to liquidators will continue to hamper the effectiveness of the reforms.

ARITA supports the Government's commitment to ongoing reform of Australia's corporate insolvency regime, including the countering of illegal phoenix activity, however we do not believe that the reforms in the Exposure Draft meets this objective at a practical level.

Notably for reforms aimed at addressing illegal phoenix activity, we highlight that there is no definition of 'illegal phoenix activity' in the Exposure Draft.

We maintain the position noted in our submission in response to The Treasury's Combatting Illegal Phoenixing Consultation Paper in October 2017 (included at Appendix A), that there already exists a variety of laws and penalties for transactions, acts and omissions which either constitute or facilitate illegal phoenix activity. Rather than creating new laws, the present laws need enforcement or stiffer penalties.

As noted by Professor Helen Anderson, Melbourne Law School, The University of Melbourne, "the 2015 Senate Economics References Committee inquiry into insolvency in the Australian construction industry, for example, recommended that the Australian Securities and Investments Commission ('ASIC') should focus enforcement action on pre-insolvency advisors, and should 'publish a regulatory guide in relation to the nature and scope of pre-appointment advice given or taken by companies."[1]

Professor Anderson and her colleagues have undertaken extensive Government funded[2] research in relation illegal phoenix activity and make a number of informed recommendations[3] which have been overlooked in the Exposure Draft.

We are aware that the proposed reforms are part of a tranche of reforms aimed at combating illegal phoenix activity, and while we support these additional reforms which remain pending, we are concerned that the Exposure Draft relies on them for effectiveness. This includes the implementation of a Director Identity Number (DIN), transparency of tax debt procedures and measures to protect the payment of employee entitlements, including payment of superannuation guarantee amounts and reliance on the Fair Entitlements Guarantee.

On this basis we believe that all of the pending reforms to combat illegal phoenix activity should be combined and considered as part of a wholistic review.

---

[1] Catching Pre-insolvency Advisors: The Hidden Culprits of Illegal Phoenix Activity. *Company and Securities Law Journal.* 35. 2017

[2] Phoenix Activity: Regulating Fraudulent Use of the Corporate Form (Discovery Projects) awarded by Aust Research Council 2014 - 2018

[3] Anderson, H, Ramsay, I, Welsh, M, and Hedges, J, Phoenix Activity: Recommendations on Detection, Disruption and Enforcement (February 2017)

The Exposure Draft and explanatory memorandum continues to intimate that registered liquidators as a profession are facilitating illegal phoenix activity. We maintain that the focus on registered liquidators as a whole is inappropriate. Registered liquidators are part of the solution in combating illegal phoenix activity, indeed even with the noted concerns the Exposure Draft is still reliant on registered liquidators for implementation.

Apart from the many statutory reports they provide to ASIC identifying misconduct (including illegal phoenix activity), which generally are not acted upon, registered liquidators are hampered by inadequate funding and a lack of documentary evidence which means that illegal phoenix activity often passes unchallenged. To this end, cumbersome and costly access to funding and support from the Assetless Administration Fund is a major inhibitor to liquidators undertaking this work.

This lack of adequate funding and documentary evidence available to registered liquidators will continue to hamper the effectiveness of the reforms in the Exposure Draft.

1.2 Phoenixing offences and property transfers to defeat creditors

1.2.1 Creditor-defeating dispositions

Recommendation 1.2.1: ARITA has concerns regarding the breadth of transactions captured as a 'creditor-defeating disposition' and believes that dispositions in the ordinary course of business should be specifically excluded from the definition.

The proposed reforms define a creditor-defeating disposition as:

"**588FDB Creditor-defeating disposition**

(1) A disposition of property of a company is a creditor-defeating disposition if the disposition has the effect of:
   (a) Preventing the property from becoming available for the benefit of the company's creditors in the winding-up of the company, or
   (b) Hindering or significantly delaying, the process of making the property available for the benefit of the company's creditors in the winding-up of the company."

This definition appears to capture every sale or disposition of property made in the 12-month period before an external administration and we have concerns that this could result in negative connotations.

Most businesses in financial distress would normally undertake some attempts to discount their products or services during that period of financial distress in order to generate cashflow and/or reduce stock levels. This is normal and generally appropriate behaviour in an attempted turnaround phase. These provisions presume this behaviour to be creditor defeating and appear to place the onus on directors to prove otherwise. We do not feel that this is a reasonable approach or consistent with natural justice.

We believe it would be appropriate to narrow the scope of a creditor-defeating disposition to exclude dispositions in the 'ordinary course of business'. This would ensure that behaviour such as selling stock at a reduced price to improve cash flow would not be inadvertently captured.

The concept of 'ordinary course of business' is one which is generally understood in business contexts and has been used in other parts of the *Corporations Act 2001* (Corporations Act) as a mechanism for excluding certain transactions from the operation of a particular provision. For example sections 259C and 259D (contained in Part 2J.2 relating to the 'Self acquisition and control of shares') use the concept of "…a transaction entered into in the ordinary course of business…" as a means of excluding transactions which would otherwise be void under those provisions.

In the alternative, should the definition remain so wide, it may be better described as a "relevant disposition" or "relevant transaction" which would be subject to the proposed defences before being automatically considered as a transaction to defeat creditors.

1.2.2 Voiding the transaction

The current form of the broad definition of creditor-defeating disposition is limited by the requirements for a transaction to be voidable if:

- The transaction or act was effected within 12 months of the start of an external administration; and
- The external administration occurs as a direct or indirect result of the transaction or act.

This proposed causal nexus is too narrow and could easily be avoided. We believe that the removal of the nexus, particularly the second limb (requiring that an external administration occur as a direct or indirect result of the transaction or act), and inclusion of an ordinary course of business exception in the definition would more appropriately achieve the desired objective.

The Exposure Draft states that "[e]stablishing that a company was insolvent (or became insolvent as a result of a disposition) is a critical step in voiding a creditor-defeating disposition" (at 2.18).

While a presumption of insolvency will apply where a company has failed to maintain financial records in accordance with section 286 of the Corporations Act, it does not overcome the inherent practical problems faced by liquidators when investigating and assessing whether to pursue recoveries under the proposed provisions. These problems include:

- Illegal phoenix activity that involves the transfer of corporate assets from Oldco to Newco for token or no consideration. This deprives a liquidator of possible remuneration from the liquidation of Oldco. Liquidators are not required to perform

work for which they are not paid[4], beyond their bare reporting requirements, and a lack of adequate funding will hamper the effectiveness of the reforms.

- An inability to make even a high-level assessment of whether a creditor-defeating disposition was for market value consideration to determine whether recovery action is commercial to pursue, particularly where there are often few if any funds available in the external administration to cover the cost of such work.

- Frustrating the liquidator's ability to obtain Assetless Administration Fund (AAF) funding from ASIC as decisions on whether to provide funding are "heavily influenced" by the availability of sufficient evidence[5].

- Similar to the AAF, creditor funding, most commonly available from the Australian Taxation Office or the Department of Jobs and Small Business under the Fair Entitlements Guarantee, is also dependent on the availability of sufficient evidence and the commerciality of the action.

The limitation to transactions which occur within 12 months of the external administration is also subject to avoidance by:

- the back-dating of transactions, particularly transfers of assets to related parties, and/or
- the transfer of assets and no subsequent appointment of an external administrator by the directors. Any subsequent appointment of an external administrator would be dependent on a creditor seeking an appointment via the Court, which could easily fall outside of the 12-month window.

We note that the Exposure Draft (s 588FE(6B)(c)) provides that a creditor-defeating disposition is not voidable if it is made under a deed of company arrangement, scheme of arrangement or by the company's liquidator. This provision does not provide for dispositions by receivers, receiver and managers or voluntary administrators and the provision should be widened to apply to any dispositions by any external administrator or controller.

We support the market value defence detailed in the Exposure Draft and note that it is consistent with ARITA's published policy position on pre-positioned sales[6] and the recommendation of the Productivity Commission[7], which supports an orderly wind down of the company's operations – that is a well-managed process where assets may be realised for market value in a non-distressed sale – prior to making a formal insolvency appointment.

ARITA's proposed framework dictates that although directors may obtain the assistance of advisors, including insolvency practitioners, during this process, any advisor retained by the directors in the pre-positioning phase could not subsequently be appointed in any formal

---

[4] *Corporations Act 2001* – Section 545
[5] ASIC Regulatory Guide 109 Assetless Administration Fund: Funding criteria and guidelines
[6] Policy Positions of the Australian Restructuring Insolvency and Turnaround Association as at February 2015
[7] Productivity Commission Inquiry Report Business Set-up, Transfer and Closure, No 75, 30 September 2015

insolvency administration. This is consistent with the current and appropriate independence requirements for insolvency practitioners in Australia.

We do not support a pre-pack arrangement such as that available in the United Kingdom, whereby a troubled company and its creditors conclude an agreement in advance of statutory administration procedures. Such a pre-pack arrangement enables an insolvency practitioner who has substantively advised or assisted on the detail of the pre-packaged transaction (i.e. advice going beyond the general availability of a pre-pack as an option) to subsequently take an appointment as external administrator.

As noted by O'Callaghan J[8] "[t]he United Kingdom experience with pre-packs does, however, place in sharp relief a number of the ethical issues that may, or in some cases invariably will, arise where a potential administrator assumes the role of administrator or liquidator".

Although the independence requirements of external administrators in Australia are well established, we strongly recommend that clarity be provided in the explanatory materials that the assessment of whether a creditor-defeating disposition was made for market value consideration must be undertaken by an independent external administrator who was in no way involved in the transaction.

While we support a market value defence, it would be remiss of us not to highlight that, contrary to the indication in the Explanatory Memorandum, the determination of market value is not a simple matter. The Explanatory Memorandum defines market value to be "the price that would be paid in a hypothetical transaction between a knowledgeable and willing, but not anxious, seller to a knowledgeable and willing, but not anxious, buyer, who transact at arm's length" (at 2.28) this definition does not take into account other matters, such as the benefits and detriments of a transaction as is the case in an uncommercial transaction[9].

Consideration should be given to creditor-defeating dispositions where the purchase price includes some, but not all, of the company's liabilities. The value of the assumed liabilities may constitute market value for the purposes of the defence, however the transaction would still be to the detriment of any remaining creditors which are most likely to include the ATO.

We note that Chartered Accountants Australia and New Zealand (CA ANZ) supports us in this concern regarding the difficulty in determining market value.

---

[8] *Korda, in the matter of Ten Network Holdings Ltd (Administrators Appointed) (Receivers and Managers Appointed)* [2017] FCA 914
[9] *Corporations Act 2001* – section 588FB

1.2.3 Recovery by ASIC

Recommendation 1.2.3: While ARITA supports an administrative recovery regime, an inherent lack of supporting documentation in relation to illegal phoenix transactions will limit any recovery by ASIC.

ARITA supports the introduction of an administrative recovery notice regime to provide a more expedient and cost-effective manner of pursuing breaches, although we note the reforms limit this regime to creditor-defeating dispositions.

The proposed administrative power for ASIC is very narrow, particularly in contrast to the *Bankruptcy Act 1966* provisions[10] which empower the Official Receiver to issue a notice to a person who has received money or property as a result of a transaction that is void against the trustee, with the notice requiring that person to pay to the trustee an amount equal to the money or the value of the property received. Generally, this type of notice applies to transactions that are void against the trustee under the following provisions of the *Bankruptcy Act 1966*:

- section 120 – undervalued transfers
- section 121 – transfers made with the intention to defeat creditors
- section 121A – a transfer for less than market value or a transfer made with the intention to defeat creditors where consideration was given to a third party
- section 122 – voidable preferences
- section 128B – superannuation contributions made to defeat creditors where the contributor is a person who later becomes a bankrupt
- section 128C – superannuation contributions made to defeat creditors where the contributor is a third party.[11]

The Exposure Draft provides for ASIC to form an opinion on the orders to be given (section 588FGAA(3)(b) & (c)). Again, noting our concerns regarding an inherent lack of adequate funding and documentary evidence, we are concerned it will not be possible for ASIC to obtain a reasonable level of certainty in order to be satisfied that an administrative order should be made.

1.2.4 Offences and civil penalty provisions

ARITA fully supports measures which hold responsible persons that procure, incite, induce or encourage a company to enter into a disposition where a reasonable person would have known the disposition was a prohibited creditor-defeating disposition.

To limit the ability of such advisors to avoid these provisions, we suggest that the wording in s 588GAB be extended to capture those that 'assist' in such dispositions.

---

[10] *Bankruptcy Act 1966* – Section 139ZQ
[11] Extracted from Official Receiver Practice Notice 7 – Official Receiver notices

1.3 Improving the accountability of resigning directors

Recommendation 1.3: ARITA generally supports the reforms to prevent officers from backdating resignations or abandoning companies, subject to the addition of anti-avoidance mechanisms, but notes that its effectiveness is closely tied to the implementation of the proposed Director Identity Number.

A hallmark of illegal phoenix activity has often been the ability to appoint unknowing 'dummy' or fictitious individuals as directors, leaving no-one ultimately accountable to the external administrator or creditors.

ARITA has long been an advocate of the implementation of a Director Identity Number (DIN) to enable consistent identification of directors across various companies. The implementation of a DIN will protect against fictitious directors and protect legitimate directors from having their identities misappropriated. We are aware that other reforms are underway to implement a DIN.

While we support the reforms to prevent officers from backdating resignations or abandoning companies, we believe its effectiveness is closely-tied to the implementation of the DIN.

In addition to the above, we believe that the measures as drafted could be subject to avoidance (i.e. manipulation of a company's constitution to the same effect) and anti-avoidance measures should be considered.

The abandonment provisions also do not account for unexpected situations which may result in the company being left without a director (i.e. death or bankruptcy of a sole director) and also fail to ensure that minimum director requirements are maintained in accordance with a company's constitution.

1.4 GST estimates and director penalties

Recommendation 1.4: ARITA supports the changes in respect of GST estimates and director penalties.

We support steps taken to ensure that tax payers remit their taxes and that the ATO has appropriate powers to enforce payment and not allow directors to abuse the corporate form. However, we are conscious that there is a risk that such increased powers may not encourage the ATO to take proactive early debt management measures.

Failure to intervene early allows debts to increase to levels which cannot be managed through a turnaround process. Early intervention by the ATO can encourage directors to obtain appropriate advice in a timely manner, including the recently enacted safe harbour measures.

Allowing the position to reach unmanageable levels can facilitate directors seeking advice from unregulated pre-insolvency advisors who offer questionable solutions to severe financial distress, including relief from tax debts.

1.5 Retention of tax refunds

Recommendation 1.5: While supportive of the move for the ATO to retain tax refunds, ARITA believes measures are required to restrict the ability of the ATO to obtain a higher priority for its debt following the appointment of an external administrator.

ARITA supports retention of tax refund measures that help avoid the redirection of tax refunds away from meeting a company's outstanding liabilities, including its tax related debts, outside of an external administration.

It would however, be of concern to ARITA if tax refunds which would ordinarily be available in an external administration were able to be retained by the ATO. This would include circumstances where relevant pre-appointment lodgements remained outstanding on appointment. It would be unreasonable to expect external administrators to sign-off on pre-appointment lodgements (noting that the ATO itself issues guidance which limits the circumstances in which external administrators are required to make outstanding pre-appointment returns) and directors would no longer have the power to do so following the appointment.

ARITA has previously raised concerns[12] that any 'super priority' obtained by the ATO is unacceptable and can result in the ATO substantially improving its position versus other unsecured creditors, and more specifically employee creditors who should enjoy priority of payment in a liquidation. This is contrary to the intent of the liquidation process and the preference recovery provisions.

As noted in Professor Anderson and her colleague's report into illegal phoenixing, a super-priority for the ATO over secured creditors "simply has the effect of disadvantaging other creditors, especially the main group of priority unsecured creditors - employees - who are more likely to need recourse to the Fair Entitlements Guarantee. Redressing the loss of one victim of harmful phoenix activity should not come at the expense of other victims."[13]

For completeness, we also note that outside the ATO's specific right to offset under the *Tax Administration Act 1953*[14], the mutual credit and set-off provisions of the Corporations Act[15] would arguably not be available to the ATO in a liquidation as it is not available where there is prior knowledge of insolvency.

---

[12] ARITA submission on review into the Australian Taxation Office's use of Garnishee Notices – 18 June 2018
[13] Anderson, H, Ramsay, I, Welsh, M, and Hedges, J, Phoenix Activity: Recommendations on Detection, Disruption and Enforcement (February 2017), page 125
[14] *Taxation Administration Act 1953* - Section 8AAZL
[15] *Corporations Act 2001* - Section 553C

2 Restricting Related Creditor Voting Rights

Recommendation 2: ARITA supports the reforms to restrict related creditors' voting rights to the value of the consideration paid for an assigned debt when conducting a poll for a resolution concerning the appointment or removal of an external administrator.

We are supportive of the reforms to restrict related creditors' voting rights to the value of the consideration paid for an assigned debt when conducting a poll for a resolution concerning the appointment or removal of an external administrator.

While the measures may restrict overt measures to manipulate voting on the appointment or removal of an external administrator, we believe there is still scope to impact the voting via other means and anti-avoidance measures also need to be considered.

In particular, we note that it does not restrict the ability for a facilitator of illegal phoenix activity to purchase assigned debt and vote for the full value.

As an alternative to the assignment of debts, voting during an external administration could be manipulated by including related creditors representing a majority value in the company's outstanding debts prior to the appointment of an external administrator. Again, a lack of books and records could aid this behaviour.

3 Outstanding amendments to the Insolvency Law Reform Act 2016

While not considered as part of the current exposure draft, we note that ARITA has identified a number of errors and anomalies in the Insolvency *Law Reform Act 2016* (ILRA), including the Insolvency Practice Rules (Corporations) 2016.

A complete list of the areas of concern is provided at Appendix B, which includes critical issues in relation to the funds handling and proposals without meeting provisions.

We have previously raised these concerns with The Treasury and we ask that you consider addressing at least the critical issues with the current reforms.

ARITA continues to receive a significant number of technical queries from its members identifying practical problems with the ILRA and seeking guidance to enable them to effectively comply with their statutory obligations.

Appendix A – ARITA response to The Treasury's Combatting Illegal Phoenixing Consultation Paper - October 2017

30 October 2017

Mr James Mason
Financial System Division
The Treasury
Langton Crescent
PARKES ACT 2600

By email: phoenixing@treasury.gov.au

Dear Mr Mason

Combatting Illegal Phoenixing

Thank you for the opportunity to lodge a submission on the range of law reform proposals (set out in the Consultation Paper) which have the aim of deterring and disrupting illegal phoenix activity.

The key points of our submission are as follows:

- There already exist a variety of laws and penalties for transactions, acts and omissions which either constitute or facilitate illegal phoenix activity. Rather than creating new laws, the present laws need enforcement and stiffer penalties.
- There is already a system for designating 'high risk' operators of companies: the disqualification regime in Part 2D.6 of the *Corporations Act 2001* (Cth) ('the Act'). That regime should be enforced more rigorously to disqualify high risk individuals from managing corporations.
- Registered liquidators are part of the solution to addressing illegal phoenix activity. Apart from the many statutory reports they provide to ASIC which identify misconduct, which generally are not acted upon, liquidators are often hampered by inadequate funding and a lack of documentary evidence (by reason of breaches of laws relating to books and records) which means that phoenix activity often passes unchallenged.
- We support the introduction of an administrative recovery notice regime in corporate liquidations similar to the present s 139ZQ of the *Bankruptcy Act 1966* (Cth) ('*Bankruptcy Act*'), which will provide a more expedient and cost-effective manner of pursuing voidable transactions, including those transactions which reflect illegal phoenix activity (eg, uncommercial transactions).
- We support measures to prevent miscreant directors abandoning companies or 'gaming the system' by backdating resignation notices. We support attaching the

responsibility for notification of resignation of directorships to the directors themselves rather than merely the company concerned.

- A cab rank or 'roster' system for the appointment of external administrators was rejected by the *Harmer Report* and is fraught with issues of practicality, timeliness and cost. A cab rank appointment system is an anti-competitive measure which sits in tension with recent law reforms introduced by the *Insolvency Law Reform Act 2016* (Cth) ('ILRA') enhancing the rights of creditors to replace external administrators appointed under a voluntary system.
- We support the limited exclusion of related creditor voting rights on resolutions for the removal and replacement of an external administrator, which will ensure the new and improved ILRA rights of creditors to replace external administrators work better and as intended.
- ARITA does not support of the notion of a Government liquidator to conduct external administrations. The existing profession of private, registered liquidators are better placed – in terms of efficiency, competence, expertise and costs – to conduct external administrations. A Government liquidator would also confront complications borne from the fact that the Commonwealth Government is often a major creditor in external administrations.
- Rather than creating new administrative (recurring) expenditure through a cab rank system or Government liquidator, Government funding and resources should be devoted to enforcement of present laws and providing liquidators of assetless companies with the funding required to pursue illegal phoenix activity.
- We are concerned by proposals which seek to elevate the pre-liquidation rights and status of Government creditors (principally the Australian Taxation Office) above those enjoyed by other general unsecured creditors.

Yours sincerely

John Winter
Chief Executive Officer

About ARITA

The Australian Restructuring Insolvency and Turnaround Association (ARITA) represents practitioners and other associated professionals in Australia who specialise in the fields of restructuring, insolvency and turnaround.

We have more than 2,200 members including accountants, lawyers, bankers, academics and other related professionals.

ARITA's mission is to support restructuring, insolvency and turnaround professionals in their quest to restore the economic value of underperforming businesses and to assist financially challenged individuals.

We deliver this through the provision of innovative training and education, upholding world class ethical and professional standards, partnering with government, and promoting the work of the profession to the public at large.

Some 84 percent of registered liquidators and 89 percent of registered trustees choose to be ARITA Professional Members.

ARITA promotes best practice and provides a forum for debate on key issues facing the profession. We engage in thought leadership and advocacy underpinned by our members' knowledge and experience.

1 Broad Reforms

1.1 A Phoenix Hotline

1. *On a scale of one to ten, where one is 'ineffective' and ten is 'highly effective', please rate how well you think this measure will operate to deter and disrupt illegal phoenix activity.*

   3.

2. *Are there any other reporting mechanisms which you think would assist people to report suspected illegal phoenix activity?*

   Clear pathways for online reporting at each relevant government department. At the moment, there is no online mechanism for reporting phoenix activity to ASIC yet, as the regulator for companies, ASIC is the logical place for a person to report suspected phoenix activity.

   We support additional resourcing to enable more action taken in response to reports of director misconduct lodged by registered liquidators. Significant information about phoenix activity, transfers of assets and breaches of director's duties is reported to ASIC by registered liquidators under ss 533, 422 or 438D of the Act.

   ASIC's Annual Report 2015/16 reported that liquidators lodged 9,951 reports with 8,258 alleging misconduct. Of those, following supplementary reports, only 129 reports (1.5% of the reports alleging misconduct) were referred for compliance, investigation or surveillance.

   In ASIC's most recent report on external administrators' reports (July 2015 to June 2016: Report 507), ASIC reported that registered liquidators lodged 9,465 reports under ss 533, 422 or 438D of the Act.[1]

   In those reports, the following levels of misconduct were reported against directors:

   - Possible misconduct in 7,797 (82.4%) reports
   - Insolvent trading (5,736 or 61% of reports) and of these 1,118 (19.5%) were claims for over $1 million. Six reports alleged a criminal breach involving more than 200 creditors with three of these estimated an insolvent trading claim of $1 million to $5 million and two alleged a claim exceeding $5 million
   - Failure to keep financial records (3,357 or 42% of reports)
   - Failure to assist the liquidator (2,684 or 13% of reports)
   - Breach of s 180 (care and diligence) – Directors' and officers' duties (3,636 or 38% of reports).

[1] It is noted that the numbers reported in these reports do not align. No reconciliation of this difference is provided by ASIC.

These allegations of misconduct against company directors are substantive and extensive, with few ending up referred for further consideration.

We have attempted to determine the number of prosecutions of directors that result from liquidator's report of misconduct. However, ASIC does not provide sufficient detail in its enforcement reports to be able to identify the actual director misconduct prosecuted.[2]

3. *What are the benefits and risks of a 'phoenix hotline'?*

   Limited – but it is another way to gather information and to promote that the government is focused on this area. It is important that, whichever government agency operates the hotline, procedures are put in place to share the information gathered across all relevant government agencies.

4. *Which agency do you believe would be best placed to operate such a hotline?*

   It appears that the ATO has greater resources, however, as the regulator of companies, ASIC is the logical agency. Any hotline needs to be backed by a willingness to aggressively pursue and prosecute phoenix behaviour.

5. *What public reporting would be appropriate to ensure transparency? What other mechanism could be considered?*

   The statistics reported need to show reports received and action commenced as a result of those reports. In due course, a reporting of outcomes arising from those actions should be reported, including what the offence was, who the offender was and the penalty awarded.

[2] For example, refer ASIC Report 536 where enforcement outcomes on corporate governance is reported as follows:

Table 6: Corporate governance—Results by misconduct type

Type of misconduct	Criminal	Civil	Admin	Enforceable undertaking	Negotiated outcome
Action against directors	2	1	1	0	0
Insolvency	0	1	0	0	0
Action against auditors	0	0	1	0	0
Action against liquidators	1	0	0	1	1
Other corporate governance misconduct	0	0	1	0	0
Total	**3**	**2**	**3**	**1**	**1**

1.2 A Phoenixing Offence

6. *On a scale of one to ten, where one is 'ineffective' and ten is 'highly effective', please rate how well you think this measure will operate to deter and disrupt illegal phoenix activity.*

7. (See explanation below.)

ARITA sees little utility or merit in the creation of a new 'phoenixing offence' provision which would appear to do little more than replicate laws or provisions which already exist. However, ARITA strongly supports the notion of introducing an administrative recovery notice mechanism for liquidations similar to that which presently exists in bankruptcy under s 139ZQ of the *Bankruptcy Act*. We consider that this will provide a more cost-effective and expedient process for liquidators to pursue obvious and actionable phoenix transactions under the existing law.

New 'phoenixing offence'

The proposed new 'phoenixing offence', which focusses on transfers of property with the main purpose to prevent, hinder or delay the process of that property becoming available for creditors, appears to largely already exist in the form of s 588FE(5) of the Act. While s 588FE(5) is not cast in terms of a *prohibition* of such a transfer, it does render voidable a transaction which is 'an insolvent transaction' (within 10 years prior to the relation-back day) and where the company became a party to the transaction 'for the purpose, or for purposes including the purpose, of defeating, delaying, or interfering with, the rights of any or all of its creditors on a winding up of the company.' Defences also apply under s 588FG of the Act.

Therefore, the sort of 'phoenixing offence' provision proposed in the Consultation Paper would appear to already exist, though some consideration could be given to whether:

- Creditors be provided with the right to sue directly, similar to that which presently exists in the context of actions for compensation for insolvent trading (ie, with liquidator consent or court leave); and
- Whether s 588FE(5) might be improved to incorporate an 'inferred purpose' currently provided for in s 121(2) of the *Bankruptcy Act* (namely, that the main purpose will be taken to be the purpose prescribed by the provision if it can reasonably be inferred that, at the time of the transaction, the company was insolvent). However, serious consideration would need to be given to whether the statutory defences are sufficient to ensure that there is no adverse effect upon legitimate asset dispositions (eg, in good faith and for good value) which might be part of a genuine restructure of an insolvent company.

Power of liquidator to issue, or apply for the issue of, an administrative recovery notice

We agree that replicating the s 139ZQ notice regime which presently exists under the *Bankruptcy Act* will provide significant assistance to liquidators in pursuing illegal phoenix activity. We agree the same safeguards should be provided for, principally the ability of the recipient of a notice to apply to Court to have it set aside.

That said, some changes to the law would assist and support the ability of liquidators to not only take action under existing provisions, but to also make maximum use of any new power to issue administrative recovery notices. Specifically, we note that liquidators of companies are only automatically entitled under statute to obtain books and records of the company to which they have been appointed. A liquidator could apply to Court to obtain orders against third parties for production of documents (incidental to an examination) but this is a costly process.

In contrast, s 77A of the *Bankruptcy Act* empowers a trustee in bankruptcy to require production of books of an 'associated entity' of the bankrupt which may be in the possession of a third party. Therefore, a welcome amendment to the Act would be the introduction of a similar statutory power or right of liquidators to make written requests of third parties for books and records of, say, an 'associate' of a company to which the liquidator has been appointed.

The matter of books and records is significant, not only in terms of a director's obligation to deliver them to a liquidator (ss 530A and 530B) but also the base requirement of a company to keep written financial records under s 286 of the Act. Non-compliance with these provisions makes it difficult for a liquidator to investigate and pursue actions to remedy illegal phoenix activity. Accordingly, we think directors should face stiffer penalties for non-compliance with all these provisions, including personal penalties or consequences for directors in the event of a breach of s 286 of the Act which will impose a stricter standard upon directors than their current obligation to merely 'take all reasonable steps' to secure the company's compliance with s 286 (see s 344 of the Act).

Inadequate books and records, or the failure to deliver them to a liquidator, is an abuse of the use of the corporate form and should be sanctioned, particularly where asset transfers have occurred but the terms and conditions of the transactions cannot be evidenced. The absence of significant consequences for not providing books and records to a liquidator encourages continued non-compliance by phoenix operators because the benefits of non-compliance plainly outweigh the risks.

7. *What are the benefits and risks of this approach?*

   Again, we see little benefit in the new 'phoenix offence' but agree there are significant advantages in providing for an administrative recovery notice regime.

8. *Should ASIC retain control of the issuing of such notices to ensure that they are not issued inappropriately?*

   We do not see why ASIC need retain control of the issuing of administrative recovery notices. Registered liquidators, as regulated professionals, are well placed to appropriately utilise any new power to issue administrative notices to recover compensation or property resulting from illegal phoenix transactions (such as uncommercial transactions). The ability of liquidators to issue notices independently would be a potential 'game changer' by reason of the expediency with which remedies could be sought against perpetrators or beneficiaries of illegal phoenix activity.

9. *Are there other regulators who should also be able to issue such notices (for example the Fair Entitlement Guarantee Recovery Program)?*

   ARITA considers that the right to conduct such recovery action should not be vested in individual creditors but should remain a matter of power and judgment of the liquidator (the liquidator being the officer and fiduciary charged with the conduct of the winding up in the interests of creditors as a whole). Active and engaged creditors can, as always, opt to support or fund a liquidator to take whatever action may be open to pursue voidable transactions.

10. *Should liquidators have the ability to independently issue such notices in cases where they suspect that illegal phoenixing has taken place?*

    See our submission above in respect of Question No. 8.

11. *How long should the law allow for the recipient to respond?*

    The equivalent *Bankruptcy Act* regime allows 60 days to set aside a notice. In the context of pursuing illegal phoenix activity, we think this time frame is too lengthy and something in the order of 21 days (or 15 business days) is sufficient.

12. *What course of action should be pursued where the recipient fails to comply with a notice?*

    The obvious feature of such a regime would be that which exists under the *Bankruptcy Act* – ie, the amount payable under the notice would be recoverable by the liquidator as a debt. See the recent decision in *Downey (in his capacity as Trustee of Kotsopoulos) v Deakin* [2017] FCCA 2076.

13. *What are the some of the challenges ASIC is likely to face in seeking compliance with the notice?*

    We envisage that the challenge will be one faced by a liquidator, not by ASIC. The likely challenges are those which present in respect of any potential defendant to litigation: the transfer of assets to reduce the capacity to meet a judgment, or spurious applications to set aside notices once they are issued.

14. *Do you think that such an arrangement will reduce the cost of taking recovery action or seeking compensation for the loss suffered?*

    Reinforcing our submissions made above in respect of Questions 6 and 8, ARITA agrees that an administrative recovery notice regime would reduce the time and costs of taking action to avoid illegal phoenix transactions and obtain compensation for creditors. Administrative notices would effectively reverse the onus which usually rests on the liquidator to issue formal court process to claim such compensation. If payment is not made under the notice, then court proceedings will still need to be issued to recover that amount as a debt. However, this type of legal proceeding is a more straightforward proposition, as was reflected in the recent case of *Downey (in his capacity as Trustee of Kotsopoulos) v Deakin* [2017] FCCA 2076.

    AFSA Annual Reports indicate that around 25 to 40 such notices are issued by the Official Receiver each year. This may appear to be a modest number, but when one considers that each notice represents the alternative of formal court process which would otherwise

be necessary, the use of such notices is a significant feature of the personal insolvency regime and would be a positive improvement to our corporate insolvency laws.

15. *Are there safeguards which should be implemented in respect of the proposal?*

    The ability of a recipient to apply to Court to set aside a notice is, in our view, a sufficient safeguard.

16. *If such a provision were to be introduced, should any of the existing voidable transaction provisions be amended or repealed?*

    We refer back to our submission above in respect of the existing s 588FE(5) of the Act. Indeed, the notion of an administrative recovery notice regime would appear to complement all existing voidable transactions provisions. Therefore, we do not see any argument or reason for any such amendments or repeals.

17. *Are these remedies appropriate? Are there further remedies or penalties we should consider?*

18. *If the above amendments are made, should the law also be amended to include a specific provision to the effect that knowing involvement in a contravention of the provision will itself constitute a contravention of the provision (as per sections 181 — 183 of the Act)?*

19. *What tests can be applied to determine if a person has been involved in the facilitation of illegal phoenix activity?*

    Addressing these three questions together, we repeat our above submissions to Questions No. 6 to 16. Apart from the changes we advocate above, our view is that presently there are ample laws and remedies which address illegal phoenix activity. Rather than creating new provisions and remedies which largely repeat or mirror existing ones, it is breaches of the existing laws which need to be sanctioned. Any new 'phoenix offence', like existing laws, will only be effective if there is enforcement and action, whether by regulators or by liquidators funded and supported by Government.

20. *On a scale of one to ten, where one is 'ineffective' and ten is 'highly effective', please rate how well you think this measure will operate to deter and disrupt illegal phoenix activity.*

    1.

21. *Which existing breaches of the law, if any, should be designated as phoenix offences?*

    We repeat our submissions above for Questions No. 17 to 19. Breaches of existing obligations need to be subject to stiffer penalties but also enforced. Being designated a 'Higher Risk Entity' as a result of a flagrant breach of the law would appear to be of little utility. A more appropriate manner of recognising a miscreant as a high-risk proposition would be to prosecute that person's breaches of the law and seek imposition of the appropriate penalty.

1.3 Addressing issues with directorships

22. *On a scale of one to ten, where one is 'ineffective' and ten is 'highly effective', please rate how well you think this measure will operate to deter and disrupt illegal phoenix activity.*

    9.

23. *Do you agree that there should be a rebuttable presumption that a director should still be held responsible for misconduct if the required notice is not lodged with ASIC in a timely way?*

    Yes, subject to the director having some control over – or responsibility for – reporting the resignation. We commend the notion of attaching responsibility for the notice to a director so that a director cannot abrogate the reporting obligation to the company, which may be a mere, assetless shell. We support a similar approach to the existing s 286 of the Act which currently only imposes an obligation on the company to keep financial records (see our submission above at [1.2]).

    We also submit that directors should be able to avail themselves of a portal or e-register which an individual can search and consult to verify if he/she is a director of any company (including directorships of which the individual may not be aware).

24. *What are the benefits and risks of this approach?*

    We see no obvious risks or downside to such an initiative. We agree with the stated potential benefit of preventing the existing exploitation of the law by directors who backdate resignations to avoid responsibility and accountability (to the extent that this is a prevalent practice).

25. *What is a reasonable period to allow for the requisite notice to be lodged with ASIC?*

    We submit that, given the significance of directorships and the duties and accountability of those who are responsible for managing the use of the corporate form, 28 days to notify one's resignation as a director is too accommodative. We submit that 14 days (or 10 business days) is reasonable and preferable, particularly if the responsibility for notification attaches to the director individually.

26. *Should the onus for reporting to ASIC be placed on the individual director, rather than the company? If so, would this constitute a significant compliance burden?*

    As stated above, we support this change and consider it appropriate that this responsibility attach to the individual who has resigned. Indeed, we consider that this would provide a direct benefit to directors in that they can obtain certainty that their resignation has been acknowledged and recorded. We are aware of instances where directors have discovered that they have remained noted as a director after their resignation, presumably due to inadvertence or oversight on the part of the company.

    Attaching the responsibility for notice of resignation to directors will empower directors to take proper steps to protect themselves while at the same time reducing the risk of phoenix activity. We believe there should be a system of mutual reporting or accessible system of record which aligns with the advent of the 'Director Identification Number' (DIN). Directors to whom the new responsibility would attach also require adequate information regarding the current record and status of their directorships.

27. *How should the above measure be enforced? For example, by application to court or ASIC taking other administrative action?*

    We submit that the presumption (ie, that a director whose resignation is lodged late may be held liable for misconduct that occurred up to the date of lodgement) should only be capable of being overturned or rebutted upon application to Court. We presume that the director who is the subject of the late lodgement of notice of resignation would remain (post-resignation) subject to the usual statutory and general law directors' duties unless the director obtained a court order overturning this position

28. *On a scale of one to ten, where one is 'ineffective' and ten is 'highly effective', please rate how well you think this measure will operate to deter and disrupt illegal phoenix activity.*

    10.

29. *Should sole directors be able to resign without appointing a liquidator or deregistering the company?*

    We submit that this should not be permissible. The importance of a director's obligations and responsibilities would support the view that it is a significant shortcoming in our corporate law that such a practice is still possible.

30. *What are the benefits and risks of this approach?*

    We submit that there is no identifiable risk but a clear benefit – namely, limiting the proliferation of 'zombie' companies and their potential use in perpetrating phoenix activity.

    We do note the potential situation which may arise if there are only two remaining directors of a company. If one of those directors resigned, this would leave the remaining sole director unable to resign unilaterally. Therefore, consideration might be given to whether a director, whose resignation would leave a company with a sole director, must first give a period of notice to the other director who stands to be the sole remaining director after that resignation takes effect. This would at least give the prospective sole remaining director some advance notice of the situation in which they will soon find themselves by reason of their fellow director's resignation.

31. *Should abandoning a company instead be an offence?*

    No. We submit that the law should prevent the resignation of a sole director taking effect unless the director has first either arranged for the appointment of a replacement director, appointment of a liquidator, or deregistration (deregistration would of course require the usual declaration from the director as to the company's assets and liabilities).

32. *Should a company with no director for a prescribed period be automatically deregistered? If so, what would be an appropriate period before deregistration should commence?*

    We note that this scenario should become rare if the proposed measure was implemented. However, there would be cases where a company may, for instance, be unintentionally abandoned due to the death of a sole director. In such instances we submit that ASIC should have the power to administratively wind up the company or deregister it.

    We note that ASIC presently has the power to administratively wind up 'dormant' or 'zombie' companies which may assist employees who have the ability to make claims

under the Fair Entitlements Guarantee ('FEG') Scheme if their employer enters liquidation: s 489EA of the Act.

33. *What other options are available for consideration?*

    We have no other submission to make on this point.

1.4 Restrictions on voting rights

34. *On a scale of one to ten, where one is 'ineffective' and ten is 'highly effective', please rate how well you think this measure will operate to deter and disrupt illegal phoenix activity.*

    8 (eight), insofar as the proposed restriction on voting rights of related party creditors is limited to resolutions for the proposed removal and replacement of an external administrator (and to the extent that a liquidator is aware of – or able to verify – a creditor's 'related' status).

35. *What are the benefits and risks of this approach?*

    Recent reforms introduced by the ILRA enhance the rights of creditors to replace external administrators. We submit that these rights would be supported and complemented by a further measure which restricts the ability of related creditors to 'block' or obstruct the attempts of arms-length creditors to replace an external administrator if there is a perception that the practitioner chosen by the directors will not act in their interests. Indeed, as we submit below at [2.2], these new rights of replacement are one reason we submit that a cab rank system of appointment is unnecessary.

    That said, we observe that any exclusion of related creditor votes will only be effective to the extent that a liquidator is aware of – or able to verify – a creditor's 'related' status.

36. *Is the current definition of "related creditor" too broad for this purpose? If so, how should "related creditor' be defined?*

    The definition of 'related creditor', presumably that which is set out in s 75-41(4) of Schedule 2 to the Act, incorporates the definition of 'related entity' in s 5 of the *Bankruptcy Act*. That definition does not appear to be unduly broad and captures the range of related parties whose votes, we submit, should be excluded from any resolution dealing with the removal and replacement of an external administrator appointed by directors of a company.

37. *Should related creditors that were company employees be subjected to a different treatment than, say, if they were directors? Why or why not?*

    No. We do not see why there should be any distinction within classes or categories of related creditors for the purposes of excluding voting rights on resolutions for the replacement of an external administrator.

38. *What level of evidence should be imposed on related creditors to substantiate their respective debts?*

    We support a limited exclusion of related creditors' voting rights relating to resolutions for the removal and replacement of an external administrator. In all other contexts and for all other resolutions (or indeed for the purposes of distribution and dividends), related

creditors need to substantiate their proofs and claims (whether formal proofs or for voting purposes) to the same extent as any other creditor. This should not and need not change.

The administrator is entitled to reject a related creditor's proof of debt for voting purposes if it cannot be substantiated because of a director's non-production of the company's books and records (which would otherwise enable such substantiation): *Re Waleri Nominees* [2003] VSC 42. An administrator is entitled to consider circumstances and matters beyond that which appear in the proof of debt itself.

Presently, s 75-100(2) of the *Insolvency Practice Rules (Corporations) 2016* ('IPRs') provides that the person presiding at a creditors' meeting, in deciding the entitlement of a person to vote 'must have regard to the merits of a person's claim'. Unnecessary complexity will be introduced to creditors' meetings if different evidentiary standards, burdens or tests are legislated and applied to creditors' proofs of debt for voting purposes, depending on whether a proof is lodged by a related or arms-length creditor. This complexity will just add time and cost to the process of creditors' meetings in external administrations.

39. *Should restrictions on related creditor voting be extended to all resolutions proposed in an external administration? Why or why not?*

    We do not support a broad restriction on related creditor voting rights for all resolutions in external administrations. Subject to substantiation of their claims, related creditors are still creditors and legitimate stakeholders in an insolvency procedure. To the extent that the primary concern surrounds the ability of related creditors to block the attempts of arms-length creditors to override the directors' choice of external administrator, any restriction of related creditor voting rights should be targeted to this scenario and this issue.

    Where related creditors in an external administration constitute a majority in number or value, broadly excluding their voting rights would hinder the efficient and cost-effective conduct of external administrations. For example, approval of remuneration could be more likely to necessitate an application to court if there are insufficient arms-length creditors to approve remuneration (whether due to a lack of quorum or because no arms-length creditor responds to a proposal without meeting).

40. *Will limiting related creditor voting participation in a creditors' meeting add additional complexities to proceedings? For example quorum requirements in order to validly hold a creditors' meeting.*

    We repeat our above submission to Question No. 39. If the restrictions on voting rights of related creditors are limited to removal/replacement resolutions, we do not envisage any additional complexities for the conduct of external administrations.

41. *Should the above rule apply to a particular size or type of external administrations or liquidations?*

    We submit that the policy justification for the *limited* exclusion of related creditor voting rights applies regardless of the size or type of external administration.

42. *Should the court have the power to overturn this restriction?*

In respect of resolutions for the removal and replacement of an external administrator, there is presently an ability of the 'outgoing administrator' to apply to Court for reappointment where he/she has been replaced by an 'improper use' of this power vested in creditors: s 90-35(4)-(6) of Sch 2 to the Act. This could possibly be extended by providing for an excluded related creditor to also have standing to make such an application for relief against a resolution for the removal and replacement of an external administrator by arms-length creditors (if ss 90-10 and 90-15 of Sch 2 do not already provide such capacity for relief).

43. *Should this restriction only be applied to certain types of companies, for example small proprietary companies?*

    No. We repeat our submission above in relation to Question No. 41.

44. *Are there circumstances where this restriction should not apply?*

    No. We repeat our submission above in relation to Questions No. 41 and 42.

45. *What are some of the ways a related creditor might attempt to circumvent the above measure?*

    It is conceivable that some related creditors may seek to circumvent any limits on their voting rights by debt trading.

46. *What other measures could be considered to avoid collusion between liquidators and related creditors?*

    We reject the premise that this an issue or problem of a general or widespread nature. The Consultation Paper itself acknowledges that 'the overwhelming majority of registered liquidators … have done the right thing.' The few registered liquidators who allegedly are not 'doing the right thing' should be the focus of regulatory attention and action.

1.5 Promoter penalties

47. *On a scale of one to ten, where one is 'ineffective' and ten is 'highly effective', please rate how well you think this measure will operate to deter and disrupt illegal phoenix activity.*

    1.

48. *Should the promoter penalty laws be expanded to apply to promoters or facilitators of illegal phoenix activity?*

    As a professional, there are already consequences of facilitating illegal phoenix activity.

    There are presently laws in place to deal with facilitators of illegal phoenix activity such as s 79 of the Act which was used by ASIC to prosecute a solicitor that advised directors on phoenix activity (*ASIC v Somerville & Ors* [2009] NSWSC 934).

    There is also the *Crimes (Taxation Offences) Act 1980* which can be used to impose criminal sanctions where a person enters into an arrangement with the intention of securing that a company will be unable to pay a range of taxes, including SGC. Liability can also be imposed on advisors.

Rather than create new laws, existing laws should be better enforced. If necessary, penalties under existing laws could be increased to act as a greater deterrent.

49. *What are the benefits and risks of this approach?*

    See above.

50. *If the promoter penalty laws are expanded to illegal phoenix activity, how would they best be structured? For example by adding a new limb to the existing provisions or creating a separate new provision?*

    Existing law already addresses the issue. New law is not necessary.

51. *Are there additional safeguards that would be needed to ensure innocent advisers are not caught by the provisions? Should the adviser have to corroborate that they acted as mere adviser and not as a promoter?*

    New law is not necessary.

52. *If promoter penalties are expanded to apply to promoters of illegal phoenix activity, do the existing sanctions provide sufficient deterrent?*

    New law is not necessary.

53. *Are the offences of civil penalty and criminal prosecution available under section 202 the Superannuation Industry (Supervision) ACT 1993 preferred to the promoter penalty options above?*

    New law is not necessary.

54. *An alternative approach to stop the promotion or facilitation of illegal phoenix activity may be a Court order to require specific performance of some action, for example, submitting a company liquidation proposal for consideration by ASIC. Is there merit in this or alternate approaches to effectively deter those who promote or facilitate illegal phoenix activity?*

    New law is not necessary.

    We would however, recommend that registration of advisors be required in the same way that to:

    - provide legal advice you must be a lawyer
    - undertake an insolvency administration you must be a registered liquidator
    - provide financial advice you must hold an Australian Financial Services Licence
    - provide tax advice you must be registered with the Tax Practitioners Board.

If registration of the advisor is required, then facilitating phoenix behaviour could result in the registration being removed.

1.6 Extending the Director Penalty Notice regime to GST

55. *On a scale of one to ten, where one is 'ineffective' and ten is 'highly effective', please rate how well you think this measure will operate to deter and disrupt illegal phoenix activity.*

    10.

56. *What are the benefits and risks of this approach?*

    We agree that the DPN regime should be extended to cover all Commonwealth tax debts. In our view this at least encourages reporting to avoid the lockdown provisions. As a result, the ATO is informed as to outstanding tax debts and can implement processes to recover debts in a timely fashion. Failure to report means the ATO may lack transparency of the outstanding tax position.

    However, the effectiveness of the DPN regime is limited to the assets held by the directors subject to the notices. It is likely that sophisticated directors will not hold any substantial assets in their own names and will have taken steps to minimise their personal risks prior to taking directorships. In this case, bankruptcy and the subsequent inability to act as a director may be the consequence of the DPN process.

    We do hold concerns about the ATO's increasing priority position and the impact that has on ordinary unsecured creditors, particularly small business creditors.

57. *Should the DPN regime be expanded to cover GST for all directors, or be restricted to those identified as High Risk Phoenix Operators (see Part Two)?*

    The DPN regime for GST should operate in the same way as the current process.

58. *Are there alternative approaches to securing outstanding payment of GST from companies and their directors?*

    Yes, proactive monitoring and requirement for timely payment of GST liabilities – this should be the same approach for all taxes.

    Consideration of the implementation of a single touch approach for GST – possibly implemented as single touch reporting for transactions over a certain size or in particular industries.

1.7 Security Deposits

59. *On a scale of one to ten, where one is 'ineffective' and ten is 'highly effective', please rate how well you think this measure will operate to deter and disrupt illegal phoenix activity.*

    4.

60. *What are the benefits and risks of this approach?*

    The benefits are greater protection for the ATO, but this is at the potential detriment of other unsecured creditors.

61. *Would improvements to the garnishee provisions adequately address the proposal to strengthen the effectiveness of the security deposit power?*

    We disagree with the use of garnishees as they unfairly advantage the ATO. If the ATO is going to have the power to garnishee, the garnishee proceeds should be subject to potential recovery as preferential payments in the event of a subsequent liquidation. All other creditors that receive payments from a company that may be insolvent run the risk of the payment being subsequently recovered and it is unfair that the ATO can avoid this risk.

62. *Should the proposal be limited to businesses that have been identified as High Risk Phoenix Operators (see Part Two)?*

    Refer to our discussions below at [2.1]. We do not agree with the use of a HPRO designation.

63. *Are there concerns or practical issues that would need to be addressed with expanding the garnishee power generally for future tax liabilities?*

    We do not agree that future tax liabilities should be able to be addressed by expanding the garnishee power. We do not agree with the unfair advantage provided to the ATO by the current use of garnishees. Extending garnishee powers to possible future tax liabilities would only increase this advantage to the detriment of the company's other unsecured creditors.

64. *Are there any further concerns if this were achieved through amending the definition of 'tax-related liability' to include the amount of an anticipated future tax liability which is the subject of a security deposit demand?*

    We hold the same concerns as discussed at 63.

65. *Are there any issues with the existing garnishee processes that should be considered?*

    Yes, as mentioned at 61, garnishees provide an unfair advantage to the ATO as the ATO is able to obtain payment without risk of subsequent recovery as a preference. This ability to obtain protected payment is not available to any other unsecured creditor.

    Furthermore, they are able to enforce garnishees after the appointment of a voluntary administrator against both pre-appointment and post-appointment debtors to the detriment of other creditors and against the objectives of Part 5.3A of the Act.

66. *Should the Government consider additional measures to prevent circumvention of the provisions by transferring, disposing or encumbering assets where a request is issued?*

    The Act already provides a range of recovery provisions in the event of liquidation, including for recovery of uncommercial transactions, unreasonable director-related transactions and unfair preferences (which can include taking security for no value).

    The ATO needs to proactively pursue recovery of debts to liquidation if necessary.

    Reforms need to be made to encourage director compliance with their obligations to provide RATAs and books and records to liquidators, ASIC needs to be more proactive

in prosecuting directors for breaches of their duties and funding needs to be provided to liquidators so that they can undertake recovery actions for the benefit of creditors.

There is no point creating new laws – it is better to proactively pursue enforcement and recovery under the laws that are already available.

67. *Should the penalties for not complying with a security deposit request be increased to improve compliance?*

Note our concerns expressed above with regards to the ATO's increasing priority position and the impact that has on ordinary unsecured creditors, particularly small business creditors.

2 Dealing with Higher Risk Entities

2.1 Targeting higher risk entities

68. *On a scale of one to ten, where one is 'ineffective' and ten is 'highly effective', please rate how well you think this measure will operate to deter and disrupt illegal phoenix activity.*

3.

69. *What are the benefits and risks of this approach?*

It appears that many of the features of the proposed 'objective test' for designation as a 'Higher Risk Entity' ('HRE') already are either breaches of existing laws (eg, failure to provide books and records to a liquidator) or factors which are existing elements of the provisions in Part 2D.6 of the Act which provides for the disqualification of persons from managing corporations.

Indeed, it could be said that Part 2D.6 of the Act already serves as a regime for designating and dealing with 'high risk' persons. Instead of constructing another similar regime, these existing laws could and should be enforced with greater resolve.

Putting aside the provisions for automatic or court-ordered disqualification on the grounds of convictions, bankruptcy or the contravention of a civil penalty provision (ss 206B and 206C of the Act), a person may be disqualified by the Court or by ASIC for involvement in the failure of two or more corporations (ss 206D and 206F of the Act). ASIC's power of disqualification is based on the lodgement of a s 533 report by a liquidator for each of the corporations concerned. A s 533 report may be lodged due to either apprehended misconduct/breach of duty or the inability of the company to pay unsecured creditors more than 50 cents in the dollar.

ARITA receives regular feedback from its member registered liquidators that s 533 reports are rarely acted upon by ASIC. This appears to be borne out by ASIC's recent reports that include information on enforcement measures and outcomes.[3]

If the stated intention is indeed to 'target the most egregious illegal phoenix operators who have adopted phoenixing into their business model' then the existing disqualification

[3] ASIC's Annual Report 2015/16 and Report 536 'ASIC enforcement outcomes: January to June 2017'.

regime in Part 2D.6 of the Act is sufficient and appropriately calibrated to enable regulator action to prevent these individuals from continuing to enjoy the privilege of trading through a corporation. This is the very reason these provisions exist: to guard against abuse of the corporate form.

In terms of risks of the proposed approach, it appears reasonable to assume that notification of a decision to declare an individual a High Risk Phoenix Operator ('HRPO'), followed by a review process, would simply increase the operator's apprehension of forthcoming regulator action. This may simply serve as a 'tip-off', prompting earlier sharp practices before the regulator moves to apply any 'preventative measures'.

70. *Are the safeguards for designating HRPO sufficient? Can you suggest any alternative safeguards that would still allow for swift preventative action to be taken to prevent phoenix activity from occurring?*

71. *What safeguards would be required to ensure that the measure is appropriately targeted?*

72. *Should the Commissioner of Taxation have a discretion to declare a company of which a HRPO is, or has recently been, an officer to also be a HRPO? Should this be extended to other individuals or entities which are associates of the HRPO?*

73. *Should "associate" be defined or determined administratively?*

Addressing these four questions (70-73) together, we repeat our submission above in respect of Question No. 69

2.2 Appointing liquidators on a cab rank basis

ARITA acknowledges the need for a mechanism that enables early intervention to hinder or limit illegal phoenix activity. However, putting aside the recent ILRA reforms which deliver such a mechanism (discussed further below), ARITA also notes that the Consultation Paper refers to the 'incentive' or 'opportunities' for registered liquidators to facilitate illegal phoenix activity but cites no evidence or empirical research in support (or as evidence) of the prevalence of such activity.

We also observe that:

- Australian general law independence standards are rigorous and case law in recent years has demonstrated that the existing laws are able to address problematic referral relationships and their potentially adverse impact on investigations carried out by an external administrator;[4]
- Recent changes to the law implemented by the *Insolvency Law Reform Act 2016* (Cth) ('ILRA') have made it easier for creditors to replace an external administrator if they harbour discontent with the performance of an incumbent practitioner in the discharge of his/her role and responsibilities;

---

[4] *Australian Securities and Investments Commission v Franklin (liquidator), in the matter of Walton Construction Pty Ltd* [2014] FCAFC 85.

- ‘High risk phoenix operators’ could be identified and dealt with under existing laws (eg, director disqualification provisions) so that there are fewer ‘phoenix operators’ managing corporations in the first place. In this regard, see our submission above at [2.1];
- The Consultation Paper acknowledges the role played by ‘pre-insolvency advisers’ in facilitating phoenix activity. ARITA’s view is that there are grounds for characterising such pre-insolvency advisers as either:
    - unlawfully engaging in legal practice in breach of State and Territory legislation regulating the entitlement to provide legal advice (such entitlement being limited to admitted lawyers who hold a current practising certificate); or
    - unlawfully providing financial product advice without an Australian financial services licence (‘AFSL’).

  Unlike legal practitioners and registered liquidators who are entitled to give advice to directors of insolvent companies in the course of lawful and regulated professional practice, pre-insolvency advisers who facilitate phoenix activity would appear to be doing so in flagrant breach of existing State/Territory or Commonwealth legislation.

  ARITA submits there is a pressing need for regulatory action – either by the Legal Services Commissions in various States and Territories or by ASIC at the Federal level – to restrain pre-insolvency advisers from plying their trade and facilitating phoenix strategies.

2.2.1 Option 1: High risk phoenix operators

74. *On a scale of one to ten, where one is ‘ineffective’ and ten is ‘highly effective’, please rate how well you think this measure will operate to deter and disrupt illegal phoenix activity.*

    1.

    The notion of a cab rank or ‘roster’ system for the appointment of external administrators to voluntary insolvency procedures has previously been considered – and rejected – in Australia.

    We note that registries of various State and Territory Supreme Courts may still administer, if required, a rotational system for court appointments whereby applicants for a winding up order may approach the registry which may select a liquidator from a list maintained by the Court (whereupon the applicant must then proceed to seek a signed consent from that selected liquidator). However, the designation of ‘Official Liquidator’ was abolished in March 2017 and, as a practical matter, it has been the case for some time that usually the applicant (petitioning creditor) obtains and furnishes the Court with a consent signed by a registered liquidator and the Court will proceed to appoint the applicant’s nominee.

    Turning to voluntary appointments, the 1988 *Harmer Report* addressed the notion of a ‘roster basis’ for the appointment of an administrator. After acknowledging the

importance of the independence of administrators and that 'the administrator not be the "puppet" of the directors', the Commission concluded that:[5]

> '*A roster system would detract from the voluntary nature of the procedure. The quality of administrators would inevitably vary from person to person. The directors may have proposals for dealing with the company's insolvency. In fact, the existence of those proposals may have encouraged the directors to have the company voluntarily submit its affairs to a particular insolvency administrator. Therefore, it is important that the company, at least in the initial stages, should have some freedom of choice in appointing the administrator.*'

The *Harmer Report* also acknowledged that there were other 'sufficient safeguards towards ensuring … independence': Registered liquidators have appropriate experience and qualifications and owe general law duties of independence which can, in some circumstances, justify a court order for their removal. Certain close connections between a practitioner and a company will also disqualify a practitioner from taking an appointment.

With the addition of the ARITA Code of Professional Practice, the safeguards identified in the Harmer Report are still part of the legal landscape affecting the appointment of liquidators and administrators today. Liquidators and administrators are disqualified (under the *Corporations Act*) from taking appointments in the event of certain pre-appointment connections with the company. Further, there are general law duties of actual and perceived independence which apply to external administrators of collective insolvency procedures (ie, liquidations and voluntary administrations).

We envisage practical difficulties in the efficient administration of a cab rank or 'roster' system which incorporates (as it must) a right to refuse consent to an appointment on various grounds (eg, conflict or time, experience or resource constraints). It is possible that days (or even a week) could pass before an appointee accepts an appointment. This delay may result in significant prejudice to stakeholders (creditors).

It stands to reason that the few 'dishonest liquidators' said to exist – and whose existence is the very rationale for the notion of a cab rank system – will also be panel liquidators, capable of taking appointments to companies whose officers are HRPOs. There is no suggestion in the Consultation Paper that any registered liquidator will be ineligible as a panel liquidator for the mooted cab rank.

This highlights the logical flaw in the proposed cab rank system: unscrupulous registered liquidators need to be sanctioned or deregistered rather than be incorporated into a modified appointment system which is designed to rein in their conduct. Alternatively, any notion of excluding certain registered liquidators from the cab rank panel would beg the question as to why the individual is still registered at all.

Further, the very existence of a cab rank is anti-competitive. As the *Harmer Report* alluded to, the quality of the performance of various practitioners should be expected to affect directors' choice of practitioners for prospective appointments. If the decision to engage professionals with a track record of high quality work is taken out of the hands of

[5] General Insolvency Inquiry (ALRC Report 45), pp 37, 38.

the market and put under Government control, this diminishes competition. Indeed, it could be said that it reduces incentives for practitioners to aspire to excellence and efficiency in service delivery. Why seek to achieve distinction in the market for one's work when the ability to attract new engagements is determined by a roster rather than market forces and perceptions?

For the same reasons, a cab rank system will mean that the costs of some external administrations will be higher than they otherwise would have been. Some directors, faced with the choice between two practitioners of commensurate standing and quality, will not be able to choose the one with lower charge-out rates. This is how competition can work for the benefit of stakeholders in an external administration.

Ultimately, a cab rank is a step towards the 'de-professionalisation' of the highly specialised and expert work performed by registered liquidators. Similar considerations apply to the notion of a Government liquidator, addressed in more detail below.

75. *Are there alternate measures that would be more effective? If so, please provide an outline of what you think would work.*

Rather than establishing and administering a cab rank, we contend that a more effective use of ASIC's current expenditure on the regulation of registered liquidators ($10.2 million in annual costs) could adequately address any liquidators who have been identified as facilitating their appointors' interests to the detriment of creditors.

The recent changes to the rules for the conduct of external administrators introduced by the ILRA enhance the ability of creditors to replace external administrators 'as of right', rather than having to apply to a court and 'show cause' for the replacement of the practitioner. These mechanisms, which have only been in force for less than two months, will provide creditors with the means to take appropriate action where there is an apprehension that a liquidator either lacks independence, is not carrying out due investigations or is failing to fulfil any other aspect of his/her role and duties.

We accept that excluding related party creditor votes for the purposes of voting on a resolution to replace an incumbent practitioner would strengthen these new rules and make them work even more effectively.

Against the background of these recent improvements to creditors' rights to replace external administrators, the notion of a cab rank appears premature.

76. *Currently, it is intended that the cab rank be restricted to circumstances where an HRPO is or has recently been an officer of the company.*

77. *Should a cab rank apply to all external administration appointments?*

Addressing these two questions (76-77) together, we do not think a cab rank system of appointments has merit for any type of appointment of an external administrator.

However, the potential problems and impracticalities of a cab rank rule would be even more acute for voluntary administrations, where there may be a very real need to make an urgent or timely appointment of a practitioner with appropriate industry experience and requisite resources. The administration of a roster system of appointment could mean several days to complete an appointment and obtain the Part 5.3A statutory moratorium.

Such a delay could prejudice the preservation of business value or compromise potential outcomes and returns to creditors.

78. *Should it be applied more widely, but be limited to specified types of external administration appointments where certain criteria are met? For example:*

    - *whether it was a director initiated creditors' voluntary liquidation and/or the appointment of a liquidator following a voluntary administration*
    - *industry sector*
    - *whether pre-insolvency advice was received*
    - *prescribed criteria on the company's financial affairs*
    - *when there has been a recent transfer identified for some or all the companies assets*
    - *where there has been a change of directors within a prescribed period.*

    If the cab rank applies only to those companies where specified criteria are met what should those criteria be? Please specify your reasons.

    As a general point, we are sceptical of the capacity for a cab rank system to be applied accurately and efficiently against the above criteria.

    To the extent that circumstances of pre-insolvency advice, financial affairs and asset transfers were relevant criteria, presumably this would necessitate a declaration or provision of information by directors, which would then be used for the purposes of administering the cab rank. Again, this administrative process would take a good deal of time and, in any event, the outcome would be only as reliable as the declarations or information provided by directors.

    Another important consideration in applying a cab rank to, say, creditors' voluntary liquidations ('CVLs') but not to voluntary administrations is that this may create the unintended consequence of directors favouring one type of procedure over another solely due to the ability to invoke a voluntary appointment procedure. Insolvent companies which are suited to a CVL may become the subject of voluntary administration appointments when in fact liquidation is the only feasible fate for those companies.

    We also note that under the current law creditors can influence the choice of insolvency practitioner who acts as either administrator of a deed of company arrangement or liquidator following a voluntary administration.[6]

79. *Who should administer the cab rank and how should it be administered? Please explain your reasoning.*

    The practical issues, cost and unintended consequences of a cab rank appointment system will exist regardless of what Government agency might be responsible for administering it.

[6] Sections 444A(2) and 499(2A) of the *Corporations Act 2001* (Cth).

80. *How do you think such a system should be funded?*

The notion of a cab rank appointment mechanism is an excessive measure, the cost of which will be disproportionate to the 'opportunities' stated to exist for a 'dishonest liquidator' to facilitate misconduct.

The Consultation Paper itself acknowledges the 'overwhelming majority of registered liquidators who have done the right thing'. Accordingly, any cab rank system should not constitute a cost of regulating registered liquidators and therefore should not be recovered from registered liquidators under the new ASIC Industry Funding Model.

On the matter of funding liquidators to conduct basic investigations and reporting, we acknowledge and agree with the statement in the Consultation Paper that the activities of liquidators need to be funded in instances of low or no-asset companies.

2.2.2 A Government liquidator

81. *On a scale of one to ten, where one is 'ineffective' and ten is 'highly effective', please rate how well you think this measure will operate to deter and disrupt illegal phoenix activity.*

1.

82. *Should consideration be given to establishing a government liquidator to conduct small-to-medium external administrations? Please provide your reasons.*

ARITA does not support of the notion of a government liquidator to conduct external administrations (regardless of their size, however that might be defined or determined). Broadly, we identify two drawbacks of a government liquidator:

- The existing profession of private, registered liquidators are better placed – in terms of efficiency, competence, expertise and costs – to conduct external administrations. What is needed is more funding of registered liquidators to enable them to carry out investigations and take the necessary action to pursue perpetrators or beneficiaries of illegal phoenix activity. Registered liquidators are part of the solution, not part of the problem.
- The Commonwealth Government is often a major creditor in external administrations, either through the ATO or the Department of Employment which administers the FEG Scheme. The ATO is not uncommonly met with claims to disgorge unfair preference payments. For this reason, we think issues and questions arise as to the independence or potential conflict of interest where a major creditor is responsible for conducting an external administration and deciding whether to appoint a private registered liquidator (and who to appoint).

We also reject the presumption that the occurrence of phoenix activity is limited to 'small-to-medium' external administrations.

83. *What are the benefits and risks of this approach?*

We repeat our submission above to Question No. 82.

84. *If a government liquidator is created, what external administrations should they conduct? Please provide your reasons.*

We repeat our submission above to Question No. 82.

85. *How do you believe a government liquidator should be funded?*

    We repeat our submission above to Question No. 82 and again submit that serious consideration should be given to increasing Government funding of registered liquidators to investigate and pursue remedies for illegal phoenix activity. This is far preferable to appropriating scarce Government resources and funding to the conduct of external administrations.

2.3 Removing the 21-day waiting period for a DPN

86. *On a scale of one to ten, where one is 'ineffective' and ten is 'highly effective', please rate how well you think this measure will operate to deter and disrupt illegal phoenix activity.*

    1.

87. *Should the 21 day notice period be removed where a director has been designated as a HRPO?*

    No, directors are entitled to a period in which to attempt to deal with the DPN (noting that we do not agree with the HRPO designation).

    The fact that DPNs are served at the time they are put in the post also means that if this change were made, enforcement could occur with no notice.

88. *What are the benefits and risks of this approach?*

    As noted earlier in this submission, it is likely that sophisticated directors will not hold any substantial assets in their own names and will have taken steps to minimise their personal risks prior to taking directorships (for example through the transfer of assets into trusts). This will have occurred well before the issuance of any DPN.

    If the director is unable to pay and ends up bankrupt, the bankruptcy trustee has powers to recover assets for the benefit of the estate where applicable. The laws already exist to overcome the behaviour set out in the consultation paper, trustees just need to be funded to take the needed action.

89. *Should further safeguards attach to DPNs issued to HRPOs in addition to the existing legal rights and safeguards that currently apply to DPNs?*

    See above.

90. *Are there alternative approaches to stop a designated HRPO from disposing of their personal assets once they are aware they are required to pay a director penalty?*

    Existing legislation already exists to recover any such transfers in the event of bankruptcy. It is important that a trustee in bankruptcy is funded to undertake such actions.

2.4 Providing the ATO with the power to retain refunds

91. *On a scale of one to ten, where one is 'ineffective' and ten is 'highly effective', please rate how well you think this measure will operate to deter and disrupt illegal phoenix activity.*

    3.

92. *Should the ATO's power to retain refunds be broadened in respect of HRPOs who have failed to provide other notifications/lodgements capable of affecting their tax liability?*

    Yes, but this should be extended to all taxpayers, not just HPROs (noting that we are not supportive of the HPRO designation). If a taxpayer has not complied with their reporting obligations, they should not be entitled to a refund until their tax affairs are bought up to date.

93. *What are the benefits and risks of this approach?*

    The benefits are to ensure that the taxpayer is up to date with their reporting obligations prior to making refund to reduce the risk of refunding when there is a pending obligation. The risk is that the unexpected loss of cashflow will detrimentally affect the business and other creditors.

94. *Should this proposed power be broadened further where notifications are not yet due but will become due in the next reporting cycle? For example where lodgement of an income tax return by the HRPO is not due for some months but is expected to result in a significant liability, should the ATO be able to retain a refund presently owed?*

    The ATO should have to follow a process to determine likely liability (such as an estimated assessment) in order to be able to retain the refund. The outcome of the process should be able to be administratively challenged. It should not be a unilateral power to retain.

    Unilateral power for early retention of a refund would likely force businesses suffering some level of financial difficulty to fail (possible prematurely) due to cash flow disruption and may cause other creditors to suffer a more significant loss.

Appendix B - Consolidated list of outstanding ILRA 'fixes', errors and anomalies

26 April 2018

Consolidated List of Outstanding Issues/Errors in ILRA-related Legislation

The following further errors, issues and anomalies in the legislation - ie, Schedule 2 to the *Corporations Act 2001* ('IPS') and the *Insolvency Practice Rules (Corporations) 2016* ('IPRs') - have been identified since 1 September 2017:

1. ***Proposals without meetings***: This issue has been resolved in Bankruptcy (via amendments to the Insolvency Practice Rules) but it remains an issue in Corporate – see the explanation below which was previously provided to Government in early 2017.

   "ARITA's review of the new Insolvency Practice Rules (made under the new Insolvency Practice Schedules introduced by the ILRA) has uncovered some issues regarding the ability of external administrators to put proposals to creditors without a meeting. These parts of the Insolvency Practice Schedules and Rules (for corporations and bankruptcy) are set to commence on 1 September 2017.

   As members will be aware, proposals without meeting have been a hallmark of Bankruptcy Act administrations for some time. ARITA's understanding is that the ILRA was intended to provide a similar streamlined mechanism for voting in corporate external administrations. However, the new provisions as drafted appear to restrict the use of proposals without meetings to a very narrow range of matters. Other than remuneration approvals in administrations commencing on and after 1 September 2017, it is difficult to see what practical use can be made of proposals without meeting in corporate external administrations.

   For corporate external administrations, the problem arises because a proposal without meeting under s 75-130 of the Insolvency Practice Rules (Corporations) can only be used to pass a mere 'resolution' for the purposes of the Insolvency Practice Schedule (Corporations). If a resolution is required under a provision of any part of the *Corporations Act* other than the Insolvency Practice Schedule, then the amended definition of 'resolution' in s 9 of the *Corporations Act* appears to require a meeting to take place.

   This problem extends to matters such as:

   - varying or terminating a DOCA (ss 445A and 444E);
   - approving certain acts of a liquidator under s 477; and
   - seeking approval of remuneration in ongoing administrations (the ILRA provides that the old Act provisions will continue to apply to the approval of remuneration in ongoing administrations).

   As stated above, these changes relating to proposals without meeting are part of the new, general rules for external and estate administrations commencing 1 September 2017."

2. ***Funds Handling provisions in Division 65 of the IPS***: Applications to Court have been necessitated by the strict application of the funds handling provisions in Division

65 of the Insolvency Practice Schedule (Corporations). It is less than ideal that the new legislation is necessitating such applications to the Court for relief.

It appears that an amendment needs to be targeted at (or focussed on) both group appointment scenarios and pre-appointment account arrangements which are either impractical or prejudicial to company/creditors to terminate.

3. ***Requirement of applicants for registration as a liquidator to have been engaged in relevant employment at senior level that provides 'exposure to processes (including bankruptcy) under the Bankruptcy Act 1966'***: This requirement under ss 20-1(2)(c) and 20-1(3)(c) of the IPRs has been construed and applied by ASIC to require that applicants demonstrate recent senior-level experience in bankruptcy. This presents an unreasonable 'barrier to entry' for applicants for registration as many firms, especially regional ones and even major boutiques, do not run bankruptcy practices. Such a requirement also appears anomalous when compared against the 'bankruptcy experience' of many current registered liquidators (some of many years standing). Throughout discussions around the drafting of the rules it was always understood that 'exposure' was taken to mean suitable education and understanding sufficient to allow a registered liquidator to know the interplay between regimes and the impacts of bankruptcy law on corporate insolvency that they may undertake. It is our view that the latter position needs to be expressly confirmed.

4. ***Right of person to inspect a s 40-100 IPS notice by an industry body***: It appears that s 1274 of the *Corporations Act* would allow a person to inspect a s 40-100 IPS notice by an industry body (eg, ARITA) stating that the industry body suspects there are grounds for disciplinary action regarding a registered liquidator.

   There are protections given to the industry body (against liability) in s 40-105 of IPS. However, the terms of both ss 40-100 (IPS) and 1274(2) of the Act seem clear: the notice (and relevant supporting documents which are taken to be 'included' in the notice) are 'lodged' under s 40-100 and therefore would be a 'lodged' document for the purposes of s 1274(2), meaning that a person may inspect it. It is not included in the list of documents excluded from public access (eg, a s 533 report).

   The approved form of the industry notice states this same position re s 1274(2) in the 'Guide' behind the approved form.

   A s 40-100 industry notice should be on the list of documents in s 1274(2) excluded from the right of inspection. In theory, currently it appears that anyone could write to ASIC and ask for a copy of any or all industry notices ever lodged.

   Absent this, it is our view that industry bodies may choose not to lodge under this provision.

5. ***Prohibition of Committee of Inspection ('COI') member benefit***: Section 80-55 of the IPS prohibits a member of a COI deriving any profit or advantage from the external administration of the company. Section 80-55(2)(b) provides that a COI member is taken to have derived such a benefit from the external administration if the

member derives a profit or advantage from a creditor of the company. Therefore, if in the ordinary course a COI member deals with a creditor the terms of s 80-55 are breached and the COI member commits a strict liability offence: s 80-55(7).

These sorts of breaches are not a matter of the EA's duties but are <u>a real risk for creditors who choose to participate as a COI member</u>. Indeed, <u>the strict terms of s 80-55 and the risk of breaches create a disincentive for creditors to participate in external administrations through COI membership</u>. This would appear to work against the spirit and intention of the ILRA changes.

Unless some sort of 'ordinary course' exception is introduced into IPS s 80-55, it may become more difficult to encourage creditors to nominate for COI membership and COIs themselves may become defunct.

6. ***CVL DIRRI provision***: Subsections 506A(3) and (6) erroneously refer to the 'administrator' instead of 'liquidator'.

7. ***Website link notification***: Section 600G(1) does not refer to ss 436DA and 506A which means that the 'electronic means' in s 600G(4) – eg, website link of which the recipient is notified - cannot be utilised for DIRRIs which must be given to creditors under those provisions. Therefore, it appears that DIRRIs must be sent by mail.

8. ***Reviewing Liquidator***: Section 90-26(4)(c) of Schedule 2 to the *Corporations Act* appears to erroneously refer to ss 90-28(2)(c) and (3)(b) which refers to the Court's power to replace a reviewing liquidator in circumstances where a reviewing liquidator has already been appointed and the review has not been completed. It appears that the correct reference should instead be to ss 90-23(6) and (9) of Schedule 2.

   The key issue is the intended scope of the Court's power to make an order for a reviewing liquidator to review remuneration/costs/expenses relating to (or incurred during) a period beyond the usual 'prescribed period'.

   It appears that the intention of s 90-26(4) of the IPS is to establish the default 'prescribed period' position, subject to the Court's ability to make an order for some other period. As the provision is currently drafted, that power of the Court to determine some other period (ie, to disturb the usual prescribed period) only seems to extend to the situation of an 'incoming' reviewing liquidator who is appointed to replace an 'outgoing' reviewing liquidator (either due to resignation or a court-ordered removal from office). This limitation appears difficult to understand or justify.

9. ***Initial notification to creditors***: IPR 70-30(3)(c) appears to require a replacement liquidator in a court liquidation to provide the information under IPR 70-30 to creditors within 20 business days of their appointment. This requirement does not extend to replacement voluntary administrators (under IPR 70-30(3)(b)) or liquidators in a creditors voluntary liquidation (under IPR 70-30(3)(d)) due to the different events that trigger the requirement. Is the fact that court liquidators are required to do this a drafting error?

26 April 2018

We think a preferable solution is to provide for a consistent requirement for insolvent liquidations (both CVL and Court-ordered), so that for an incoming liquidator who has been appointed under s 90-35 of the IPS, that 'new' liquidator be obliged only to send the information in IPR s 70-30(2)(a) within 10 business days of his/her appointment. The other information in subsection (2)(b) through to (f) does not need to be sent again. Such an obligation would also trigger the requirement to send an IRN under IPR s 70-35(5)(b) (it appears that this rule would need no amendment).

10. ***Statutory report by a liquidator***: IPR 70-40 will require a replacement liquidator in either a court liquidation or creditor's voluntary liquidation to provide a statutory report to creditors within 3 months of their appointment, notwithstanding when their appointment occurs and whether the incumbent liquidator has already provided one. If the liquidator was replaced multiple times by creditors, each and every replacement liquidator would have to provide this report. Is this the intention or an unintended consequence of the amendment to IPR 70-40?

    We tend to think that it makes sense that a three-month report be required again, given that it might be a perception of inadequate investigations or reporting which prompted creditors to make the replacement in the first place.

11. ***Requirement to send an IRN in a MVL***: IPR 70-35 requires a liquidator in an MVL to send an IRN to creditors (where there are any creditors) even though it is members that approve the liquidator's remuneration. This should be excluded for an MVL, or specified to be sent to members where it is intended that a remuneration determination will be sought? It may not be appropriate to be sent to members as generally remuneration is approved at the meeting appointing the liquidator, which is what is contemplated under IPR 60-10(2).

12. ***Anomalous rights of creditors in a MVL***: Following on from point 6 above, the following provisions provide for certain rights of creditors in MVLs which appear anomalous:

    a. IPR ss 70-30 and 70-40 require a liquidator in a MVL to give initial information (including about creditors' rights) and/or a 3-month report to any creditors which may exist in a MVL at the time when the information and/or report is due.

    b. IPS ss 75-15 and 90-35 appear to grant creditors in a MVL the right to request a meeting and to replace the liquidator.

    In a 'solvent winding up' (MVL), where creditors will ultimately be paid in full, these rights of creditors are difficult to understand and justify. If a company in MVL turns out to be insolvent, then the MVL is converted to a CVL under s 496 of the *Corporations Act*.

    Accordingly, we contend that MVLs should be 'carved-out' or excluded from the reach and application of these four provisions. An example of where this has been done is IPS s 85-5: MVLs are excluded from this provision which provides creditors the right to give directions to an external administrator.

26 April 2018

13 ***Remuneration reporting requirement in an MVL***: Based on the wording in IPS 60-10, it appears that a proposed liquidator in an MVL can seek a resolution to approve a remuneration determination at the general meeting of the company at which he or she is appointed liquidator. The remuneration reporting requirements in IPR 70-45(4) only apply to an external administrator, not a 'proposed' external administrator. Prior to that meeting in an MVL, the proposed liquidator is not yet the liquidator so technically is not required to comply with IPR 70-45(4). The former section that dealt with this situation for MVLs prior to 1 September specifically provided for the 'proposed liquidator' to report to members prior to the approval of remuneration: repealed s 495(5).

So, we suggest that both IPS s 60-10(2) and also IPR s 70-45(4) be extended to also cover 'proposed' external administrators in a members' voluntary winding up.

We also query whether provision might be made for remuneration approval in an MVL to be obtained via a proposal without meeting (such proposals presently being limited to creditors and contributories: IPS s75-40).

14 ***Replacement of external administrators (process)***: There are a number of apparent anomalies in the procedural requirements for the replacement of external administrators under IPS s 90-35 and IPR s 75-265.

a. The inconsistent notice periods for the meeting in IPS 90-35(2) and IPR s 75-20. We think the preferred solution is simply to repeal s 90-35(2) and then the various meeting notice provisions for those meetings covered (or not covered) by s 75-20 should operate effectively. It would also be helpful if the Rules made it clear that a resolution for removal and replacement of an external administrator will not be valid or effective if notice of that resolution is not included in the notice of meeting sent to creditors (as a safeguard against 'ambush' resolutions at meetings convened for another purpose).

b. It is unclear whether it was intended that IPS s 90-35 and IPR 75-265 (or parts thereof) apply to replacements of voluntary administrators at a first meeting in a VA (s 436E of the Act). IPR s 75-265 provides that it applies to removal and replacement of an external administrator under IPS s 90-35 which would appear to mean that this rule does not apply to replacements pursuant to s 436E of the Act (first meeting in a VA). However, we also note that IPR s 75-265(3) places specific obligations on replacement voluntary administrators and it would appear this could only apply to a first meeting in a VA, as creditors do not have the power to request a meeting in a voluntary administration.

c. If IPR s 75-265 is intended to apply to replacements of VAs at the s 436E meeting, then subsection (4) of the rule needs to be amended to exclude s 436E meetings (because it is not practically possible for a DIRRI of an incoming administrator to be sent with the first meeting notice).

26 April 2018

d. The lodgements required under IPR s 75-265(6) are required regardless of whether the removal and replacements resolutions were successful. We do not think that the DIRRI and consent of the proposed incoming external administrator should need to be lodged if that external administrator did not end up being appointed.

e. The note at the foot of IPR ss 75-265(2) (3) creates confusion and, in our view, should be deleted. Two of the provisions cited in the note – ss 436DA and 506A of the Act – do not related to 'incoming' administrators but refer to appointments made when the external administration is commenced in the usual way.

f. There is no clear mechanism by which, upon receiving notice of a meeting to replace an external administrator, creditors can propose an *alternative* incoming administrator to the one whose DIRRI is sent out with the notice under IPR s 75-265(4). Is it possible for an amendment which would allow for this, on the condition that the DIRRI of the alternative incoming administrator is tabled at the meeting?

15 ***The heading to IPR s 75-145***. While it is strictly not part of the Act, we suggest that the heading to this rule be amended to accurately reflect the fact that the rule applies to all types of meetings concerning companies under external administration (not just meetings of creditors). See IPRS 75-1 and IPR s 75-145(3).

16 ***Section 422C is defectively drafted***. While the intention and purpose of s 422C seems clear, it currently suffers from defects in its drafting. According to the literal terms of the provision, it only applies where a controller retires and, at that same point in time, a liquidator is appointed 'instead' of the former controller. A more likely or common scenario is that a receivership co-exists with a liquidation for some time and that an issue emerges with respect to the transfer of books and records to the liquidator when the receivers eventually retire.

Mark Wellard, Legal Director
ARITA
26 April 2018

Annexure B – ILRA: ARITA's concerns regarding proposals without meeting

ARITA

AUSTRALIAN RESTRUCTURING INSOLVENCY & TURNAROUND ASSOCIATION

Cart

On Behalf Of: (select)

ILRA: ARITA's concerns regarding proposals without meeting

Posted on 31/01/2017

ARITA's review of the new Insolvency Practice Rules (made under the new Insolvency Practice Schedules introduced by the ILRA) has uncovered some issues regarding the ability of external administrators and bankruptcy trustees to put proposals to creditors without a meeting. These parts of the Insolvency Practice Schedules and Rules (for corporations and bankruptcy) are set to commence on 1 September 2017.

As members will be aware, proposals without meeting have been a hallmark of Bankruptcy Act administrations for some time. ARITA's understanding is that the ILRA was intended to provide a similar streamlined mechanism for voting in corporate external administrations. However, the new provisions as drafted appear to restrict the use of proposals without meetings to a very narrow range of matters. This problem extends to both bankruptcy and external administrations. Other than remuneration approvals in administrations commencing on and after 1 September 2017, it is difficult to see what practical use can be made of proposals without meeting in either personal insolvency or corporate external administrations.

In bankruptcy, existing s 64ZBA of the Bankruptcy Act provides that a successful proposal without meeting 'is taken to have been passed by a resolution of creditors **at a meeting**.' However, the new, equivalent provision – s 75-130 of the Insolvency Practice Rules (Bankruptcy) - merely provides for a deemed 'resolution'. Therefore, whenever a provision of the Bankruptcy Act requires a 'resolution **at a meeting**', the new IPR provision would appear inadequate.

Examples of this are the variation/termination of a composition/scheme (s 74A), annulment of bankruptcy (s 74(5)) and the variation/termination of a personal insolvency agreement (ss 221A, 222B). All these provisions require not just a mere 'resolution', but a resolution 'at a meeting'.

For corporate external administrations, the same problem arises because a proposal without meeting under s 75-130 of the Insolvency Practice Rules (Corporations) can only be used to pass

a mere 'resolution' for the purposes of the Insolvency Practice Schedule (Corporations). If a resolution is required under a provision of any part of the Corporations Act other than the Insolvency Practice Schedule, then the amended definition of 'resolution' in s 9 of the Corporations Act appears to require a meeting to take place.

Like bankruptcy, this problem extends to matters such as varying or terminating a DOCA (ss 445A and 444E), approving certain acts of a liquidator under s 477 and seeking approval of remuneration in ongoing administrations (the ILRA provides that the old Act provisions will continue to apply to the approval of remuneration in ongoing administrations).

As stated above, these changes relating to proposals without meeting are part of the new, general rules for external and estate administrations commencing 1 September 2017. ARITA has passed on these concerns to Government for consideration, along with other apparent technical errors identified by ARITA during its review of the new rules and transitional provisions.

Members can access the complete list of other ILRA-related technical drafting issues identified by ARITA and raised with Government.

ILRA-related technical drafting issues identified by ARITA
(Adobe PDF File)