

Appendix 2

Answers to questions on notice

ASIC Oversight hearing, 11 March, 2011

Australian Investment and Securities Commission

Question on notice 1, (Proof Hansard, pp 33 – 35)

Topic: Duplication of Complaints

Mr Day—As you know, ASIC receives around 14,000 reports of misconduct, or complaints, a year. Of those, I think it is important to note that about 21 per cent are not in the jurisdiction. They relate to other things and there is no actual information there that gives grounds for an offence. So 21 per cent are not something that ASIC would ever be able to action, for those reasons. We count the 14,000 as everything that comes through the door. We register and acknowledge everything that comes through the door and everything gets considered, initially, in that space. We aim to do 70 per cent of that initial assessment within 28 days. So 70 per cent of those who put in a complaint will get a response within 28 days.

In terms of the criteria and the matrix of issues that will apply to that, our formal assessment takes into account the information that the report contains. We will look at other antecedents. Have we been told about that individual party before? We match up previous information out of our database. We will take into account other sources of information that we might have received from other agencies or from other parts of ASIC. We match all those up, so it is not just taken in isolation without the context of other things. It is an important component of what we do.

Mr ANTHONY SMITH—You said 14,000.

Mr Day—Yes.

Mr ANTHONY SMITH—You might want to take this on notice, but what proportion of that would be repeat business, where you have multiple complaints in an area? Would it be 50 per cent?

Mr Day—We refer to them internally as duplicates. Those are ones that are about the same thing. Or are you talking about a person who has come back more than once?

Mr ANTHONY SMITH—No—the same issue.

Mr Day—We could probably tell you that.

Mr ANTHONY SMITH—Do you want to take it on notice?

Mr Day—I am happy to take it on notice. The thing you need to be careful about with that, as Mr Ripoll would know, is in relation to a matter like Storm it is in the

hundreds. The commission said some time ago that they put a threshold that anything that has a certain number, like a hundred complaints, needs to go to the commission. I can tell you that what we would call a high-volume matter is something that has something like eight complaints. That is not to say that we do not get matters that have 50 to 100 complaints. That happens occasionally, although in the last 12 months there has been less of that.

CHAIRMAN—But there is no minimum requirement?

Mr Day—No.

CHAIRMAN—If there was just one complaint, if it was significant—

Mr Day—I would not be able to mention the details of them but I could point to a number of things in the last three months that have been accepted for further investigation by our deterrence teams that have been on the basis of one complaint and no other information. In terms of the threshold, it does not need more than one. But if you like, Mr Smith, I can still take on notice the question about—

Mr ANTHONY SMITH—I do not want you to create a bureaucracy. I am not going to hold you to precise percentages.

Mr Day—We will see what we can provide.

Mr ANTHONY SMITH—What I was really getting at is that, at any given point in time, 10 or 20 per cent—you tell us—might be an ongoing matter. For instance, there was one that was public last year dealing with some telecommunications and small business matters. There was a crossover with the relevant ombudsman, for instance. At any given point in time, I imagine, you would have a certain percentage that are ongoing and then you would have new complaints coming in. What you are saying is that the substance of just a single complaint is sufficient. That is really what I was getting at.

Response

ASIC has reviewed the complaints data for the last three years and identified those matters which were merged together for ease of handling. The table below shows the proportion of complaints raising the same issue since July 2007.

Year	2007/2008	2008/2009	2009/2010	2010/2011 (Dec)
Number of Complaints	11,436	13,633	13,372	7,370
% raising same issues	20%	24%	16%	16%

However, it may be that some of the remaining complaints will have raised duplicate issues to other complaints but were not identified in the review.

Question on notice 2, (Proof Hansard, pp 36 – 37)**Topic: Following up on complaints**

CHAIRMAN—[...] Mr D'Aloisio, a complaint we often get into our offices or from people who write to us is that ASIC 'isn't doing anything about X, Y and Z', that there is no response or that you are not acting on what, on the surface, might appear to some people to be 'a case'—

Mr ANTHONY SMITH—It is still happening.

CHAIRMAN—Or it is still happening. A fund that has had some issues—perhaps fraud, and I could go through a number of specific ones. Generally speaking, we do get regular complaints. I want to give you the opportunity to satisfy us about this process of dealing with not just a complaint but with the matter, whether it is through litigation or through a particular action, that ASIC follows through on every single one as it were. That leads on from my question about the resourcing issue, but really I want to be confident—I am sure all the committee members want to be confident—that ASIC fulfils all of that to some satisfactory level, and hopefully that would then in turn satisfy people who complain about this view that either nothing or not enough is being done.

Mr D'Aloisio—It is a big question, Chairman. What I would like to do is not so much take it on notice but think about it a bit more and come back to you and give you an answer today as well. [...]

CHAIRMAN—Thanks for that. I appreciate that. So in terms of some follow-up that you said you would provide, maybe there are two particular areas of focus. One is that method of communication—while fully understanding what you have explained about what you can and cannot communicate, for all the right reasons—and maybe looking at how that is actually taken on board so that people, organisations or whoever it might be can feel satisfied that ASIC is undertaking its duties fully. So it is more of an opportunity for the commission to be able to give people some comfort that whatever it is that you are doing is satisfactory. The other one is around the idea or concept, certainly given what is portrayed to us as members of parliament, that a case might not be of interest to ASIC and there is a perception sometimes that, as has been explained to me, ASIC thinks it is too small, insignificant, not important enough, does not have enough public interest or whatever it might be. The complaint that is around is, 'Look, there is a case that exists but it's just not important to ASIC,' whereas it is important to the particular person that is raising the issue. So on those two themes there is maybe an opportunity to satisfy not only this committee but the public as well.

Mr D'Aloisio—Let me take both of those and we will give you a response. In giving you a response we will also do some internal spot reviews to illustrate our answer, to explain why our answer is what it is, so that it gives you a bit more meat—without naming individuals—about the issues that concern us when we balance individual rights against those of the public interest, the community interest, in trying to strike the right balance between keeping people informed and at the same time protecting those rights.

Response

Possible question: What does ASIC do when it receives a report of misconduct?

ASIC has a dedicated group, with staff in each of ASIC's offices, to receive, record, assess and refer reports of misconduct (complaints) that it receives, called Misconduct and Breach Reporting (MB&R). All such reports are received are registered in ASIC's internal and confidential national complaints management database within 1 business day of receipt. All reports of misconduct are acknowledged (insofar as the complainant provided contact details) by way of an acknowledgement letter and accompanying brochure explaining how ASIC deals with these reports. This acknowledgement letter is usually sent to the complainant on the day of registration of their complaint. For Market Integrity matters, the acknowledgement letter advises complainants that they will not hear further from ASIC unless we need further information due to the sensitivity of these matters. These reports of misconduct need to be treated with sensitivity, because if the complainant was aware if ASIC was taking further steps, or misrepresents this, it has the potential to move the share price of a stock, possibly for no good reason.

Once registered, reports of misconduct are preliminarily reviewed by a team leader who also classifies the matter in accordance with set keywords to enable ASIC to track and identify trends and enable accurate reporting. The team leader then allocates the matter to an appropriate M&BR analyst or lawyer for assessment.

ASIC is committed to finalising 70% of reports of misconduct received within 28 days of receipt. This commitment (as expressed in ASIC's Service Charter) reflects that ASIC may sometimes take longer to consider a complaint – for instance where the matter is complex or if ASIC determines that further evidence should be obtained prior to assessing the allegations of misconduct. Currently, for the year to date, ASIC is finalising around 80% within 28 days.

How does ASIC assess and prioritise reports of misconduct?

ASIC formally assesses every report of misconduct it receives to determine whether breaches of the legislation administered by ASIC may have occurred. As part of this process, we gather further information from internal and external sources to test the complaint (for example liquidator reports and AUSTRAC data), examine known history or intelligence about the subjects (including cross-referencing antecedent complaints, surveillances and investigations) and review the law to determine whether there has been a breach and if so, what action may be available to ASIC or the complainant to take.

Where a report of misconduct is assessed as being outside of ASIC's jurisdiction or where we believe there is no breach of the law, we will provide information to assist the complainant in resolving their issue. This may for example involve a referral to a more appropriate government agency or direct them to the Financial Ombudsman Service.

In cases where a suspected breach falling within ASIC's jurisdiction is identified, M&BR will consider whether to recommend further action on the basis of the following primary questions:

- What legal action can ASIC take?
- Is the evidence likely to be sufficient to support the allegations?
- How urgent and serious is the complaint, and would action support one of ASIC's stated priorities?
- If ASIC succeeds, will people behave better in future?

M&BR's recommendations are based on Commission priorities, Stakeholder and Deterrence Team priorities, as well as the above questions.

How does ASIC action reports of misconduct that are assessed as requiring action?

Matters considered to be serious enough are automatically escalated for SEL referral to an ASIC Deterrence team. Liaison is also undertaken with appropriate Stakeholder Teams within ASIC to ensure that the recommendation is appropriate.

Where a matter is considered to be of a systemic nature or where supporting evidence is lacking to warrant a formal Deterrence investigation, a referral to a Stakeholder Team for surveillance or compliance action may be considered.

Where a matter is referred to a Deterrence or Stakeholder Team, the file is transferred to that team for further consideration and potential action, and insofar as it would not jeopardise any potential investigation or action ASIC may be considering, the complainant is usually advised of this referral.

What does ASIC do when if it decides not to take action in respect of a report for misconduct?

Like other government agencies, ASIC is unable to pursue every potential actionable matter due to finite resources, competing priorities, lack of regulatory impact, lack of supporting evidence, lack of jurisdiction or alternative remedies available to the complainant to pursue.

In cases where ASIC decides not to take action in relation to a report of misconduct, the matter is recorded for intelligence purposes on an internal, confidential database to enable future cross-referencing, should further complaints or intelligence come to ASIC's attention. This approach ensures that ASIC is able to identify potential systemic issues and patterns of misconduct. Furthermore, assistance and information is provided to the complainant where possible, to assist in resolving the complaint or to help the complainant's understanding of other options that may be available to pursue privately.

In every case, the party reporting misconduct to ASIC is contacted to confirm whether or not ASIC will be considering the matter further and, where possible or required, why ASIC will not be actioning the matter further.

Further review and improvements

ASIC is reviewing the manner in which it communicates with those who report misconduct to it. In this, consideration needs to be given to legal or other reasons for not providing information about why ASIC is not taking action, or where it is, what the nature of that is and providing those who reported the misconduct with ongoing reports as to what ASIC is doing.

Further, the M&BR team is reviewing its handling of reports of misconduct to see what can be done to:

- speed the process up further;
- provide assistance sooner so the public can consider whether matters need to be raised with other agencies and not for ASIC unnecessarily; and
- provide clear and transparent information about what ASIC's attitude to certain complaints are (i.e. a large group of complaints relate to inter-director disputes in small proprietary limited companies, of which ASIC is generally of the view are private matters between the parties, which do not require ASIC to commit resources to as a matter of public policy).

This additional information, over time, will be available on ASIC's website to help the community make informed decisions and better understand how ASIC can assist them.

Question on notice 3, (*Proof Hansard*, p. 38)

Topic: Reporting on Cases which do not proceed to litigation

CHAIRMAN—[...] The Office of Legal Services Coordination relies on agencies like ASIC to provide them with details as to self-regulation in terms of any litigation that you are going to take on. Could you give us some idea of the level at which you do that?

Mr D'Aloisio—In addition to the certificate I give on compliance with Legal Services Directions, we report the cases we take on, the costs of counsel that we brief and the time. There is a range of reports that we provide back through—

CHAIRMAN—Does that include the cases that you do not take on? Does it go to the positive and the negative in terms of reporting?

Mr D'Aloisio—I will check that. I will take that one. I do not think it does go to the negative.

CHAIRMAN—I will explain why I am asking the question. I am assuming there is 100 per cent compliance and I am certainly satisfied that it is the case that ASIC does

report to the OLSC in terms of any potential breaches that ASIC might have and in terms of following the model litigant rules et cetera. But they are for all the cases that you do take on. What I am interested in is the decisions in the cases that you decide not to take on. So if there is a decision made, do you report that as well?

Mr D'Aloisio—If there is no case to answer or if a matter is a ‘no further action’—or an NFA—I do not think we report that to the Attorney-General’s Department. I will check. But in any event that material is available to us, to the commission and internally, and I can give those statistics to the commission. In other words, we can look at a 12-month period or whatever it is and outline the number of actions. We already report the investigations we take on—those where we are successful and those where we are not successful—and in that process we can also extract those where we decide that the evidence might be of a nature that requires no further action or where the public interest considerations are not met. We can give those numbers as well.

Response

ASIC is not required to report to OLSC on the matters which have not resulted in litigation. The Legal Services Directions 2005 (the Directions) have limited application to such matters. The decision whether or not progress a complaint or litigation is ultimately a regulatory decision informed by ASIC's statutory mandate rather than a legal decision to which the Directions apply.

ASIC provides a range of reports to OLSC. Some of these reports are required by the Directions, such as reports of any apparent or alleged breaches of the Directions (paragraphs 11.1(d) and 11.2 of the Directions) and reports on expenditure on legal services (paragraphs 11.1(ba) and (da) of the Directions). ASIC also has a number of reporting obligations arising from the two exemptions which have been granted to ASIC. These include a requirement for a quarterly report on all litigation being conducted by ASIC using its internal lawyers rather than external solicitors. They do not include any obligation to report on matters which have not proceeded to litigation.

The Directions apply to agencies' use of legal services and their handling of litigation and "claims". The Directions include a number of obligations which have to be fulfilled as part of a decision to commence litigation. They do not include any obligations that specifically address a decision not to commence litigation. At ASIC, such a decision may be made at a number of different stages along the process of progressing a complaint or investigation. Such decisions may involve obtaining internal or external legal advice and, when this occurs, the advice is obtained in accordance with those parts of the Directions which apply to the obtaining of legal advice. There is no general obligation to report decisions not to commence litigation to OLSC.

The term "claim" is not defined in the Directions but, based on the context in which it is used in the Directions, ASIC considers that it applies primarily to claims by or against the Commonwealth arising from matters such as claims for compensation against the Commonwealth or contractual matters involving the Commonwealth and another party. There are a number of obligations relating to the handling of claims, including the Appendix C to the Directions which requires monetary claims by or

against an agency to be settled in accordance with legal policy and practice. There is no general obligation to report claims, including claims that are resolved without litigation.

ASIC keeps statistics in relation to these matters for the purposes of internally managing the matters we decide to action or to take no further action on and to ensure effective planning in terms of staff and other resources needed to maximise our actions and support the community. We are continuing to look at ways in which we can make available these numbers for the information of the committee.

Question on notice 4 (*Proof Hansard*, pp 38 - 39)

Topic: ASIC, Model litigant rules and higher public interest

CHAIRMAN—Still on the theme of the model litigant rules, they are quite specific about how it all operates and the role that ASIC and other agencies need to play in adhering to those rules. Do you believe ASIC has a special case in the sense that there might be times when, rather than follow a settlement path, you have a higher public interest case because of giving examples to the market or setting a legal precedent or doing something which might have a further benefit?

Mr D'Aloisio—Do you mean outside the Legal Services Directions?

CHAIRMAN—Yes, where ASIC does make, or has the capacity to make, a decision not to follow model litigant rules on the basis that there is a higher public interest.

Mr D'Aloisio—I am not aware of any example where I have been involved or this commission has been involved in making that decision, that we would make a decision irrespective of the model litigant rules. Is there an example, Chairman?

CHAIRMAN—No.

Mr D'Aloisio—Our interests and the Attorney-General's interests are entirely consistent. At the end of the day we are a law enforcement agency and we work within law enforcement agency rules. There are some differences. For example, we can brief barristers probably more easily than some other agencies can in terms of some of the rules that are in place, but they are generally procedural rules. But on the substantive points of how we conduct litigation and judgments about what is in the public interest, I am not aware that we would say, 'Notwithstanding what the model litigant rules provide, we will go in this direction and then report it to the Attorney.' I have not had this question before—so it is not one that I have thought through—because the default always is that you are a Commonwealth agency and you comply with the agency rules. I do not see a circumstance right off. I am happy to think about it, Chairman.

CHAIRMAN—Okay. I will pursue it at some other point in time. I thought there might be a special case for ASIC where I think it would be a positive for ASIC to particularly go down a path which might not be entirely consistent with the model litigant rules because there is a higher public interest case.

Mr D’Aloisio—We will have a look at it. As for the most recent example, special leave to the High Court on James Hardie on an important point of law, when we looked at it we saw it affected ASIC and other agencies—probably ASIC more so—and the model litigant rules have provision for that. I will take it on notice.

Response

The *Legal Services Directions 2005 (the Directions)*, including the *Directions on the Commonwealth's Obligation to Act as a Model Litigant at Appendix B (the Model Litigant Obligations)*, are not inconsistent with ASIC's statutory mandate or regulatory objectives. Compliance with the Directions is not discretionary but, in any event, ASIC has not identified a need to act in a manner inconsistent with the Directions.

Paragraph 4.2 of the states that:

Claims are to be handled and litigation is to be conducted by the agency in accordance with the Directions on the Commonwealth's Obligation to Act as a Model Litigant at Appendix B, noting that the agency is not to start legal proceedings unless it is satisfied that litigation is the most suitable method of dispute resolution.

ASIC is required to comply with the Directions under s55ZG of the *Judiciary Act 1903*.

In addition to the wording of paragraph 4.2 of the Directions set out above, Appendix B to the Directions sets out a number of other obligations to consider alternative dispute resolution and to limit the areas in dispute in litigation. Paragraph 2 of the Model Litigant Obligations contains a number of sub-paragraphs which set out various aspects of the obligations and relevantly include:

- (d) *endeavouring to avoid, prevent and limit the scope of legal proceedings wherever possible, including by giving consideration in all cases to alternative dispute resolution before initiating legal proceedings and by participating in alternative dispute resolution processes where appropriate*
- (e) *where it is not possible to avoid litigation, keeping the costs of litigation to a minimum, including by:*
 - (iii) *monitoring the progress of the litigation and using methods that it considers appropriate to resolve the litigation, including settlement offers, payments into court or alternative dispute resolution*
- (h) *not undertaking and pursuing appeals unless the Commonwealth or the agency believes that it has reasonable prospects for success or the appeal is otherwise justified in the public interest,*

In each case, the requirement allows for each individual agency to determine what may constitute, for example, "the most suitable form of dispute resolution" (paragraph 4.2 of the Directions) or "methods that it considers appropriate to resolve the litigation" (paragraph 2(e)(iii) of the Model Litigant Obligations). Paragraph 2(h) of

the Model Litigant Obligations expressly refers to appeals being "justified in the public interest". For a regulatory and enforcement agency such as ASIC, consideration of what is "suitable" or "appropriate" will be made in the context of any regulatory outcome that ASIC seeks to achieve from litigation, consistent with its statutory mandate.

From time to time the most "suitable" or "appropriate" course for ASIC will include some form of dispute resolution or settlement. ASIC regularly participates in dispute resolution of its enforcement matters and sometimes settles such matters. Prior to the commencement of litigation, ASIC will consider the available evidence and the regulatory responses available under the relevant statutes. These may include non-litigious outcomes such as the acceptance of enforceable undertakings.

Question on notice 5 (*Proof Hansard*, p. 41)

Topic: Complaints and frozen funds

CHAIRMAN—To follow up on the complaints area: can you give us an idea of the level of complaints and what they revolve around at the moment.

Mr Day—In relation to frozen funds?

CHAIRMAN—Yes.

Mr Day—I do not have that information in front of me, but we can provide that on notice.

CHAIRMAN—I would be interested to see. I assume there would be fewer complaints today.

Mr Day—Yes, without a doubt. As Commissioner Medcraft said, when we get those we are speaking to the relevant stakeholder team investment managers so we can facilitate and foster a discussion with the fund.

CHAIRMAN—Perhaps you could take on notice to provide the committee with a short brief on where it is today in terms of complaints, what the complaints are and if they are being resolved satisfactorily.

Mr Day—Sure.

Mr Medcraft—We have an information sheet that we publish online for investors in frozen funds. It advises them of their rights.

Mr Day—A lot of those in those circumstances we push back to the service that assists with that and gives them the information that Commissioner Medcraft referred to.

Question on notice 6 (*Proof Hansard*, p. 43)**Topic: Statistics on prosecution of women**

Senator STEPHENS—We cannot go past the 100th anniversary this week of International Women’s Day and the discussion on women on boards and women as directors without talking about the gender breakdown of people who are being prosecuted, whether there is, as Pru Goward said this morning, an incredible risks to shareholders to try to increase the number of women on boards by taking some quite specific measures. How does the gender issue play out in terms of ASIC’s compliance regime?

Mr D’Aloisio—It is certainly not an issue that has been raised with me. Obviously, as an agency, issues of gender do not really come into consideration in prosecutions and so on. But I am happy to look back at the statistics over 12 months—

Senator STEPHENS—That would be helpful.

Mr D’Aloisio—and just extract it for you on a statistical basis and provide it to you. It is an interesting point that has been raised.

Response

ASIC does not record the gender of directors of companies, nor does it categorise prosecutions in terms of gender. However, an analysis of the available information indicates that of the 454 individuals prosecuted by ASIC in 2010, 15% were women.

Question on notice 7 (*Proof Hansard*, p. 47)**Topic: Complaints about not-for-profit companies**

Senator STEPHENS—The interesting issue for us is to what extent those organisations that are regulated by ASIC would have more or fewer complaints or compliance issues than any other organisations.

Mr Day—I can say off the top of my head that we occasionally get the odd complaint about a not-for-profit, but in terms of what level it is as a percentage of the population that we regulate, as John Price has pointed out, I would not be able to say now. I could take that away and come back to you about that.

Senator STEPHENS—It would be very helpful for us to understand the extent to which there are compliance issues within the ASIC regulatory framework.

Response

As at December 2010, ASIC 's records indicate that there were 1,796,738 companies registered in Australia of which 95 215 were not-for-profit (5.3%).

The table below shows the number of complaints received about not-for-profit companies as a proportion of all complaints.

Year	2007/2008	2008/2009	2009/2010	2010/2011 (Dec)
Number of Complaints	11,436	13,633	13,372	7,370
Number about not-for-profit companies	416	443	428	194
Proportion of Complaints	3.6%	3.2%	3.2%	2.6%

Question on notice 8 (*Proof Hansard*, p. 48)

Topic: Nature of issues raised in the not-for-profit sector

CHAIRMAN—In reference to the not-for-profit sector, are there any particular issues for ASIC in terms of its oversight of what is really just a small percentage of the whole sector in terms of their level of compliance as compared to the rest of the licensees that ASIC has?

Mr Price—It sort of goes back to Mr Day's comments a little earlier. I am certainly not aware of anything.

Mr Medcraft—I can probably comment, Mr Chairman, because I attended a session with you last year or the year before and I got some statistics on it, in terms of complaints, about two years ago. Most of the complaints were about governance coming from the not-for-profit sector, and we can come back with that. For the number of corporations that we have in this sector, the number of complaints was actually relatively high, but, as I said, the nature of them related to governance. That is my recollection, but we can come back with more detail.

Senator STEPHENS—It would be helpful if you could look at it again.

Mr Day—We can refresh the information about that.

Response

In the main, the issues raised in the not-for-profit sector appear to be internal issues as to control and decision making within the company and access to financial reports of not-for-profit companies. By and large ASIC sees these as internal matters to be resolved by the organisation and rarely require ASIC's intervention.

Australian Securities Exchange

Question on notice 1, (Proof Hansard, pp 5–6)

Topic: ASIC Report: *ASIC supervision of markets and participants*

CHAIRMAN—ASIC did a report last year on market supervision called REP 227: *ASIC supervision of markets and participants*. In there they refer to trading alerts, referrals on investigations and similar activities, including a whole range of other issues.

Mr Lewis—As I said, I have not read the report in detail. I am aware of it. I recently saw the press reports and some of the press releases on that.

CHAIRMAN—Can you take that on notice. I would be interested to hear the ASX's view on that particular report, whether there are any issues that come out of that and whether it is something that the ASX wants to comment on. I am happy for you to take that on notice. Just write back to the committee with your assessment or your opinion of the particular report.

Mr ANTHONY SMITH—Just on the question that the chair raises, if there is some sort of comparative analysis that you are able to do on what that report showed compared to the period prior to the handover that would be good. On notice is fine.

Mr Lewis—Yes. I certainly do remember reading the summaries in the press of the market surveillance activities that have been undertaken and the number of alerts that they were generating and the fact that the volume of alerts in their market monitoring system, which is known as SMARTS, was generating was in fact consistent with the volume of alerts that we were generating.

Response



ASX Compliance Pty Limited
ABN 26 087 780 489

Exchange Centre
20 Bridge Street
Sydney NSW 2000
PO Box H224
Australia Square NSW 1215

Telephone +61 2 9227 0000
Direct +61 2 92270771
kevin.lewis@asx.com.au

www.asx.com.au

13 May 2011

Mr Tim Bryant
Secretary, Joint Committee on Corporations and Financial Services
PO Box 6100
Parliament House
CANBERRA ACT 2600

Dear Mr Bryant,

Question on Notice from ASIC Oversight Hearing 11 March 2011

At the above-mentioned hearing, the Chairman noted that ASIC had published a report last year on market supervision entitled *REPORT 227: ASIC supervision of markets and participants* ("Report") and asked ASX, on notice, to make any comments it may have on the Report. Mr Anthony Smith also asked, on notice, if ASX could provide a comparative analysis of supervisory outcomes by ASX in the period before the Report compared to ASIC's supervisory outcomes in the period covered by the Report.

ASX notes, by way of background, that there was a press article in October 2010 alleging that ASIC's SMARTS computerised market surveillance system was generating significantly fewer alerts, compared to the numbers generated by ASX's SMARTS system beforehand.

As I indicated at the hearing, the alerts generated by SMARTS arise mostly from changes in the price and/or traded volume of securities above certain pre-defined thresholds. A significant proportion of the alerts generated by SMARTS are "false alerts", in the sense that the price or volume movement detected by SMARTS is often readily explicable by known market, sector or company specific events. The number of alerts generated in any given period can also be materially affected by the relative level of market volatility over that period. Hence, raw data as to the number of alerts being generated is not necessarily all that meaningful by itself and comparisons of the numbers of alerts generated across different periods can potentially be misleading.

With that qualification, I note that section B of the Report states that over the 5 months from 1 August 2010 to 31 December 2010, ASIC's SMARTS system generated 28,512 trade surveillance alerts. Broadly speaking, prior to the 1 August 2010 supervisory handover, ASX's SMARTS system on average used to generate between 5,000 and 6,000 alerts per month. Accordingly, ASIC's reported number of SMARTS alerts in the first 5 months of its assumption of responsibility for real-time market surveillance and supervision was broadly in line with ASX's experience.

By way of specific comparison, ASX's SMARTS system generated 18,638 alerts in the 3 months ended 31 March 2010 and 22,248 alerts in the 3 months ended 30 June 2010 (the latter quarter being one affected by a comparatively high level of market volatility, particularly in the month of May 2010).

Section B of the Report also states that ASIC commenced 67 preliminary enquiries for insider trading and 11 preliminary enquiries for market manipulation over the 5 months from 1 August 2010 to 31 December 2010.

By way of comparison, ASX commenced 38 preliminary enquiries for insider trading and 7 preliminary enquiries for market manipulation in the 3 months ended 31 March 2010 and 37 preliminary enquiries for insider trading and 4 preliminary

enquiries for market manipulation in the 3 months ended 30 June 2010. Again you will see that ASX's and ASIC's numbers are broadly comparable.

The only other observation I would make is in relation to the comment in the Report (on page 9) regarding the improvement in the time taken to get matters referred for investigation compared to "the previous situation where ASX would do the early detection and preliminary work and then the matter would be referred to ASIC's Deterrence team".

That comment and the outcome it reflects do not surprise ASX and should come as no surprise to any other informed commentator. The process agreed between ASX and ASIC for the referral of potential contraventions of the Corporations Act and/or ASX operating rules under section 792B of the Corporations Act specifically required ASX to complete a preliminary investigation of the matter to establish, as best it could, the facts grounding the contravention before formally referring the matter to ASIC. The timeliness of that investigation was heavily reliant on the timeliness of participants in responding to ASX's requests for information about matters of concern. Unlike ASIC, ASX does not have any police powers of search and seizure and it has no powers of enforcement against persons who are not privy to its operating rules (ASX's supervisory powers are grounded in its operating rules and in the law of contract -see section 793B of the Corporations Act - and are only enforceable against the market participants contractually bound by those rules). Further, once a matter was referred to ASIC by ASX, ASIC would inevitably have to conduct its own investigation in any event, resulting in a significant degree of "double handling".

Against that backdrop, it is not surprising that by directly taking over responsibility for detecting and investigating potential instances of market abuse in breach of the Corporations Act, ASIC has been able to shorten the overall time taken to conclude such investigations compared to the previous regime.

Please feel free to contact me if you wish to ask any further questions or if you wish me to amplify any of my comments above.

Yours sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Kevin Lewis". The signature is written in a cursive, flowing style.

Kevin Lewis
Chief Compliance Officer