

# Attachment to CP 306: Draft regulatory guide



**ASIC**  
Australian Securities &  
Investments Commission

REGULATORY GUIDE 216

## Markets Disciplinary Panel

November 2018

### About this guide

This guide is for those who are subject to the market integrity rules—principally, market participants.

It explains the disciplinary framework for the market integrity rules, the function of the Markets Disciplinary Panel (MDP), and the policies that the MDP will take into account when making decisions about alleged contraventions of the market integrity rules.

### About ASIC regulatory documents

In administering legislation ASIC issues the following types of regulatory documents.

**Consultation papers:** seek feedback from stakeholders on matters ASIC is considering, such as proposed relief or proposed regulatory guidance.

**Regulatory guides:** give guidance to regulated entities by:

- explaining when and how ASIC will exercise specific powers under legislation (primarily the Corporations Act)
- explaining how ASIC interprets the law
- describing the principles underlying ASIC's approach
- giving practical guidance (e.g. describing the steps of a process such as applying for a licence or giving practical examples of how regulated entities may decide to meet their obligations).

**Information sheets:** provide concise guidance on a specific process or compliance issue or an overview of detailed guidance.

**Reports:** describe ASIC compliance or relief activity or the results of a research project.

### Document history

This draft guide was issued in November 2018 and is based on legislation and regulations as at the date of issue.

This guide replaces:

- Superseded Regulatory Guide 216, issued July 2010, updated August 2017
- Superseded Regulatory Guide 225, issued May 2011

### Disclaimer

This guide does not constitute legal advice. We encourage you to seek your own professional advice to find out how the Corporations Act and other applicable laws apply to you, as it is your responsibility to determine your obligations.

Examples in this guide are purely for illustration; they are not exhaustive and are not intended to impose or imply particular rules or requirements.

## Contents

|          |  |           |
|----------|--|-----------|
| <b>A</b> | <b>The Markets Disciplinary Panel</b> .....          | <b>4</b>  |
|          | Peer review .....                                    | 4         |
|          | Legal structure of the MDP .....                     | 4         |
|          | Independence .....                                   | 5         |
|          | Types of matters referred to the MDP .....           | 5         |
| <b>B</b> | <b>Regulatory outcomes</b> .....                     | <b>7</b>  |
|          | Enforcement options .....                            | 7         |
|          | Infringement notices .....                           | 8         |
|          | Court enforceable undertakings .....                 | 8         |
| <b>C</b> | <b>MDP process</b> .....                             | <b>9</b>  |
|          | Referral to the MDP .....                            | 9         |
|          | Sitting panel .....                                  | 10        |
|          | Notice of hearing.....                               | 10        |
|          | Hearing .....  | 11        |
|          | MDP decision.....                                    | 12        |
|          | Publication .....                                    | 14        |
|          | Methods of correspondence .....                      | 14        |
| <b>D</b> | <b>Decision-making policies and principles</b> ..... | <b>15</b> |
|          | Reasonable grounds to believe .....                  | 15        |
|          | Determining the penalty.....                         | 15        |
|          | Indicative penalty ranges .....                      | 18        |
|          | Multiple factually related contraventions.....       | 18        |
|          | <b>Key terms</b> .....                               | <b>20</b> |
|          | <b>Related information</b> .....                     | <b>21</b> |

## A The Markets Disciplinary Panel

### Key points

The Markets Disciplinary Panel (MDP) is a peer review panel that makes decisions on behalf of ASIC.

Sitting panels of the MDP make decisions about whether infringement notices should be issued for alleged contraventions of the market integrity rules.

As far as practicable, sitting panels of the MDP make decisions independently of ASIC.

### Peer review

- RG 216.1 The Markets Disciplinary Panel (MDP) is a peer review panel which consists of a pool of industry experts from which sitting panels are drawn. The sitting panels make decisions about whether infringement notices should be issued for alleged contraventions of the market integrity rules.
- RG 216.2 The members of the MDP, including the MDP Chair and Deputy Chair, are appointed by the Chair of ASIC. All members have significant market or professional experience, and most of those appointed have current senior roles with market participants. A [list of current MDP members](#) is published on the ASIC website. Internal ASIC staff members are not appointed to the MDP.
- RG 216.3 The MDP is supported by a Panel Secretariat. The Panel Secretariat forms part of the Chief Legal Office and is comprised of internal ASIC staff, including a Special Counsel to the MDP. These internal ASIC staff are not involved in the investigation of matters referred to the MDP.

### Legal structure of the MDP

- RG 216.4 A Division of ASIC has been established to make decisions about alleged contraventions of the market integrity rules. The Division is comprised of three ASIC Commissioners (see Div 2 of Pt 4 of the ASIC Act).
- RG 216.5 Each of the three Division members delegate their powers to each MDP member. Each delegation directs the MDP member to have regard to our published policies in making a decision but does not direct the MDP member on how to decide a particular matter.

- RG 216.6 A sitting panel is convened to deal with each matter referred to the MDP. The MDP Chair determines the composition of a sitting panel. In doing so, they take into account the nature of the matter and the expertise and experience of the available MDP members. The MDP Chair, in consultation with the Panel Secretariat, also assesses any potential conflicts of interest of MDP members when deciding who is available to form a sitting panel. If the potential conflict relates to the MDP Chair, the MDP Deputy Chair, in consultation with the Panel Secretariat, will determine if the MDP Chair should participate in the matter. If the MDP Chair is absent or is conflicted out of a matter, the MDP Deputy Chair determines the composition of the sitting panel.
- RG 216.7 Each sitting panel is comprised of three members of the MDP. Sitting panels make decisions by majority vote. Each member of the sitting panel, including its Chair, has one vote. The members of a sitting panel constitute the Division of ASIC in dealing with the particular matter.

## Independence

- RG 216.8 The members of a sitting panel independently make decisions on the merits of each matter.
- RG 216.9 This independence is achieved through the following measures:
- (a) MDP members are not involved in investigations by the ASIC teams that refer matters to the MDP;
  - (b) the members of the Division of ASIC do not play any role in the consideration of a particular matter before a sitting panel; and
  - (c) material communications between a sitting panel and the ASIC team that investigated the matter occur through the Panel Secretariat, copied to the market participant that is the subject of the referral.
- RG 216.10 The Panel Secretariat may, from time to time, directly communicate with an ASIC team without copying the market participant. The Panel Secretariat may also, from time to time, directly communicate with the market participant without copying the relevant ASIC team. Such communications are limited to non-contentious issues.
- RG 216.11 The MDP encourages market participants and the ASIC teams to liaise with the Panel Secretariat on an informal basis where appropriate.

## Types of matters referred to the MDP

- RG 216.12 Our general policy is that most types of matters involving alleged contraventions of the market integrity rules may be referred to the MDP. However, some types of matters will generally not be referred to the MDP—for example, minor matters for which warning letters are

considered appropriate or matters involving alleged contraventions of the market integrity rules by market operators.

RG 216.13 Matters that only involve Tier 1 rules may be referred to a single internal ASIC delegate: see Table 2.

DRAFT

## B Regulatory outcomes

### Key points

When a matter is referred to the MDP for consideration, it will generally result in either:

- a finding that the MDP does not have reasonable grounds to believe that a contravention has occurred; or
- an infringement notice being given if the MDP has reasonable grounds to believe a contravention has occurred.

If a market participant offers ASIC a court enforceable undertaking to address alleged contraventions of the market integrity rules, ASIC may consult a member of the MDP about the terms of the proposed court enforceable undertaking.

### Enforcement options

- RG 216.14 A contravention of the market integrity rules will result in a contravention of a civil penalty provision of the Corporations Act. The Corporations Act also provides for a range of civil orders—including the payment of compensation and publication orders—to be made for a contravention of the market integrity rules.
- RG 216.15 ASIC will determine whether a contravention of the market integrity rules warrants a civil penalty or other civil proceedings, or whether an infringement notice or (if offered) a court enforceable undertaking is an appropriate regulatory outcome. Generally, a civil penalty or other civil actions will be appropriate for more serious contraventions of the market integrity rules.
- RG 216.16 If ASIC brings civil penalty proceedings, those proceedings may result in a court order for the market participant to pay the Commonwealth a pecuniary penalty if a declaration of contravention is made. The maximum penalty payable for a contravention of a rule is the penalty amount set by ASIC. That amount cannot exceed \$1 million.
- RG 216.17 If ASIC determines that an appropriate regulatory outcome for a contravention of the market integrity rules would be an infringement notice or a court enforceable undertaking it will refer the matter to the MDP.
- RG 216.18 The MDP does not have the power to bring civil proceedings. The MDP has the power to give infringement notices, as an alternative to civil proceedings, under Pt 7.2A of the Corporations Act and Corporations Regulations.

## Infringement notices

- RG 216.19 The MDP may give an infringement notice to a market participant if the MDP has reasonable grounds to believe that the market participant has contravened the market integrity rules.
- RG 216.20 An infringement notice may specify, as an alternative to civil proceedings, that a market participant that has allegedly contravened the market integrity rules does one or more of the following:
- (a) pay a penalty to the Commonwealth;
  - (b) undertake or institute remedial measures;
  - (c) accept sanctions;
  - (d) enter into a court enforceable undertaking to do an action mentioned in paragraph (a)–(c) above.
- Note: See reg 7.2A.02.
- RG 216.21 A rule in the market integrity rules specifies a maximum penalty of \$1 million, \$100,000 or \$20,000. Any penalty specified in an infringement notice for a contravention of the rule must not exceed 60% of the maximum penalty for that rule: see s798K(2). An infringement notice may be in relation to more than one contravention.
- RG 216.22 A market participant that is given an infringement notice is not obliged to comply with it. If the participant complies with the notice, no further regulatory action may be taken by ASIC against the participant for the alleged contravention. If the market participant chooses not to comply with it, ASIC may bring civil proceedings against the participant in relation to the contravention: see reg 7.2A.10.

## Court enforceable undertakings

- RG 216.23 As an alternative to civil proceedings, ASIC may accept a written court enforceable undertaking from a person who is alleged to have contravened the market integrity rules: see s798K.
- RG 216.24 ASIC may accept a court enforceable undertaking to:
- (a) take specified action within a specified period;
  - (b) refrain from taking specified action; or
  - (c) pay a specified amount within a specified period to the Commonwealth or to some other specified person.
- RG 216.25 If ASIC is considering accepting a court enforceable undertaking to resolve a matter, ASIC may seek advice from a member of the MDP about the terms of the proposed court enforceable undertaking. The selected member of the MDP may give advice in their capacity as a consultant.



## C MDP process

### Key points

The MDP process for dealing with alleged contraventions of the market integrity rules is to:

- convene a sitting panel when a matter has been referred to it by the ASIC market integrity group. The sitting panel consists of three MDP members who are selected by the MDP Chair;
- send a notice of hearing to the market participant after a sitting panel has been convened;
- under the processes for issuing infringement notices, give participants the opportunity to assess the material being relied on by ASIC and to give evidence and make submissions to the MDP if they wish to do so;
- give an infringement notice if it has reasonable grounds to believe that the market participant has contravened the market integrity rules; and
- publish the infringement notice in the ASIC Gazette after the end of the compliance period.

### Referral to the MDP

RG 216.26 The ASIC market integrity group determines which matters are referred to the MDP and which alleged contraventions of the rules are put to the MDP for consideration. The MDP is not involved in this referral process.

RG 216.27 A matter is referred to the MDP when the ASIC market integrity group gives the Panel Secretariat and the market participant its reasons for believing a market participant has contravened the market integrity rules. These reasons are known as ASIC's Statement of Reasons.

### Uncontested matters

RG 216.28 If the ASIC market integrity group and the participant wish to settle a matter following the provision of a Statement of Reasons, the terms of the proposed settlement are given to the Panel Secretariat by the ASIC team on behalf of both parties. The Panel Secretariat will convene a sitting panel to consider the proposed settlement.

RG 216.29 If the terms of the proposed settlement involve giving an infringement notice, it is still necessary to give the participant an opportunity to appear at a hearing. However, the participant may choose to waive that right.

RG 216.30 The MDP is not obliged to approve a negotiated infringement notice. If it does not, it may advise the parties of its reasons. The MDP may give an indication of its thinking at the time to facilitate the possibility of continued

settlement negotiations. It is then open to the parties to consider if they wish to enter into further negotiations to see if the matter can be settled subject to MDP approval. If not, then the matter will proceed to a hearing before the MDP.

### **Contested matters without a hearing**

RG 216.31 A market participant may choose to contest a matter only by making written submissions. They may take this approach regardless of whether they contest both the contravention and the penalty, or just the penalty: see RG 216.42–RG 216.43.

RG 216.32 In either case, a sitting panel will be convened. It is still necessary to give the participant an opportunity to appear at a hearing. However, the participant may choose to waive that right. The sitting panel will set out the timetable for making written submissions by both parties. The sitting panel will proceed to make a decision on the basis of the submissions and documents before it.

### **Sitting panel**

RG 216.33 The MDP Chair will allocate a matter to three members of the MDP, having regard to the nature of the matter, the skills and experience of the MDP member, the absence of conflicts of interest, and their availability.

RG 216.34 The three members chosen will be the ‘sitting panel’ for the matter. The MDP Chair may allocate himself or herself to the matter.

### **Notice of hearing**

RG 216.35 A notice of hearing will be sent to the market participant and to the referring team from the ASIC market integrity group. The notice will set out:

- (a) the nominated time, date and place of the hearing;
- (b) details of the sitting panel members who will consider the matter; and
- (c) a timetable for directions.

RG 216.36 The hearing is held in private.

RG 216.37 If a market participant objects to the membership of the sitting panel due to a conflict of interest or apprehended bias they should inform the Panel Secretariat as soon as possible of the reasons for the objection. Objections based on other grounds will rarely if ever warrant the reconstitution of a sitting panel. The common law test for the existence of an apprehension of bias is whether a fair-minded observer might reasonably perceive that the decision-maker might not bring a fair and unprejudiced mind to the determination of the matter.

- RG 216.38 The MDP Chair will determine if the objection warrants removal of the MDP member from the sitting panel. If the objection relates to the MDP Chair as a sitting member, the objection will be considered by the MDP Deputy Chair in consultation with the Special Counsel to the MDP.
- RG 216.39 The timetable for directions will specify, among other things, the day by which the market participant is to give its written submissions in reply to ASIC's Statement of Reasons. This is known as the Reply. The Reply should also include submissions on the appropriate penalty (if any).
- RG 216.40 Generally, the MDP will not seek further submissions from either party but it will consider requests to make further submissions. The MDP may seek further information from the parties.
- RG 216.41 The MDP expects that a matter will be dealt with in a single hearing. Generally, a participant will not be offered a hearing in relation to contravention and a separate hearing in relation to penalty.

### **Waiver of hearing**

- RG 216.42 A market participant may waive their right to a hearing. The waiver may be a full waiver or a partial waiver. A full waiver is where a participant does not wish to be heard at a hearing in relation to any aspect of the matter. For a partial waiver, if a participant waives their right to a hearing in relation to the alleged contravention but wishes to be heard in relation to the penalty, the single hearing will be the penalty hearing.
- RG 216.43 Participants are encouraged to inform the Panel Secretariat as early as possible if they wish to waive their right to a hearing. Where the matter (or part of it) is to be determined without a hearing, the Secretariat will arrange for the matter (or part of it) to be determined by the sitting panel based on the respective written submissions.

## **Hearing**

- RG 216.44 If a hearing is required, it will be conducted by the MDP as closely as possible in accordance with [Regulatory Guide 8 \*Hearings practice manual\*](#) (RG 8). Key aspects of the hearing process are set out below.

### **The hearing is fact-finding, not adversarial**

- RG 216.45 The hearing is a fact-finding one. It is not an adversarial exercise, such as in a court. Hearings are conducted informally and as expeditiously as possible.

### **Rules of evidence do not apply**

- RG 216.46 The rules of evidence and the usual court rules of procedure and practice do not apply to the hearing. The MDP will nonetheless base its decision on material that is relevant and credible.

### **Procedural fairness**

- RG 216.47 The MDP will apply the rules of procedural fairness to ensure that a market participant has an opportunity to make submissions at a hearing. The parties should proceed on the basis that a sitting panel has read all written submissions by both parties.

### **Expert witnesses**

- RG 216.48 The MDP may, in addition to relying on its own expertise, consider the written reports of independent experts submitted by ASIC or the participant to establish elements of an alleged contravention of a market integrity rule. The MDP may ask an expert, whose report has been provided to it, to be present to assist at a hearing.

### **Confidentiality**

- RG 216.49 The MDP is required by law to take all reasonable measures to prevent the unauthorised use or disclosure of confidential information. This does not prevent the publication of infringement notices and ASIC media releases about outcomes of MDP decisions.

### **Transcript**

- RG 216.50 The MDP may record or make a transcript of the hearing. If a record or transcript is made, a copy of it may be provided, on request, to the parties. The provision of the transcript to the market participant will be conditional on the market participant using the transcript only for the purposes of the MDP matter, such as taking legal advice about any decision by the MDP following the hearing.

## **MDP decision**

- RG 216.51 A decision of the MDP is made by a simple majority of the votes of the three members of the sitting panel. Each member, including the Chair of the sitting panel, has one vote. The Chair does not have a casting vote.

- RG 216.52 The Panel Secretariat will inform the market participant and ASIC of the MDP's decision as soon as practicable after the MDP has made it. The infringement notice (if any) will follow.

### **Infringement notice**

- RG 216.53 The MDP may give an infringement notice if it has reasonable grounds to believe that the market participant has contravened the market integrity rules.
- RG 216.54 The giving of an infringement notice, and any subsequent compliance with it, is not an admission of liability, nor does it represent a finding that the

market integrity rules have been contravened. It states the opinion of the MDP about the alleged conduct and provides the manner in which the issue may be dealt with, without engaging in court proceedings.

- RG 216.55 A decision to give an infringement notice is excluded from merits review by the Administrative Appeals Tribunal (AAT): see s1317C(gcc).
- RG 216.56 The infringement notice is the main means by which the MDP's decision and its rationale is made known to the market participant concerned and to all other market participants.
- RG 216.57 Where ASIC has alleged a contravention of more than one rule, and the MDP has reached an adverse finding for some but not all of the rules alleged by ASIC to have been contravened, the infringement notice will generally refer to the rules for which the MDP has made an adverse finding as well as the rules for which it has not made an adverse finding. The MDP generally considers it is beneficial to the market to include this information.

### **Reasons for decision**

- RG 216.58 The MDP will not give reasons for the decision to the recipient as a matter of course unless it is requested by the market participant.
- RG 216.59 The request should be made within seven days of the market participant receiving:
- (a) the infringement notice; or
  - (b) written notification of the MDP's decision, where the MDP makes no adverse findings.
- RG 216.60 The MDP may not act on a request made after the seven-day period.
- RG 216.61 However, there may be occasions where the MDP wishes to make further comments on a particular matter to a recipient but does not wish those comments to be included in the infringement notice. The MDP does not expect such occasions to arise often.

### **Compliance with an infringement notice**

- RG 216.62 A market participant is not obliged to comply with an infringement notice. But if the participant wishes to comply with it, it must do so within 27 days after the day on which the notice is given.
- RG 216.63 Compliance with an infringement notice will conclude the action ASIC can take against the market participant in relation to the conduct. If the participant does not comply with the notice, then ASIC may take civil proceedings against the participant in relation to the conduct. After the infringement notice is given, the MDP's involvement ceases.

- RG 216.64 Compliance with an infringement notice by a market participant does not preclude ASIC from taking regulatory action against other persons who were involved in the misconduct (e.g. individual employees). Compliance with an infringement notice does not affect the rights of third parties who have been adversely affected by the market participant's conduct.

## Publication

- RG 216.65 An infringement notice that is complied with will be published. This will normally occur soon after the end of the compliance period. The infringement notice will be published in full in the [ASIC Gazette](#). A summary of the notice will be published in an ASIC media release.
- RG 216.66 An infringement notice that is not complied with will also be published. This will normally occur at the time ASIC publishes a media release in relation to the commencement of civil proceedings. The infringement notice will be published in full in the ASIC Gazette.
- RG 216.67 In circumstances where the MDP makes no adverse finding and therefore no infringement notice is issued, ASIC may publish a summary of that outcome for the benefit of all market participants. The summary will not disclose the identity of the market participant to which the matter relates.
- RG 216.68 ASIC maintains a [register of MDP outcomes](#) on its website. This register contains links to the infringement notices, media releases and summaries.

## Methods of correspondence

- RG 216.69 The Panel Secretariat encourages all written material to be provided to the Panel Secretariat electronically; however, the Panel Secretariat may request that hard copies of submissions be provided.

## D Decision-making policies and principles

### Key points

The MDP can only give an infringement notice to a market participant if it has 'reasonable grounds to believe' that the participant has contravened the market integrity rules.

The MDP endeavours to achieve an outcome that is proportionate to the conduct of the market participant and promotes market integrity when it determines the penalty for an infringement notice.

While the MDP is not bound by precedent, it is guided by three tiers of penalty ranges that help it to achieve consistent penalties. The MDP may also take into consideration factual overlaps in circumstances where there are multiple related contraventions.

- RG 216.70 Each matter before the MDP must be decided according to the relevant circumstances of the particular matter. The MDP is not bound by precedent. However, it aims to be consistent in its decision-making.

### Reasonable grounds to believe

- RG 216.71 The MDP can only give an infringement notice to a market participant if it has 'reasonable grounds to believe' that the participant has contravened the market integrity rules.
- RG 216.72 The MDP follows the meaning of that phrase as determined by the High Court of Australia in *George v Rockett* (1990) 170 CLR 104. Belief is an inclination of the mind towards assenting to, rather than rejecting, a proposition. 'Reasonable grounds to believe' requires the existence of facts which are sufficient to induce that state of mind in a reasonable person.
- RG 216.73 The objective circumstances sufficient to show a reason to believe something need to point more clearly to the subject matter of the belief than is required for suspicion but need not establish on the balance of probabilities that a fact occurred or existed.

### Determining the penalty

- RG 216.74 The MDP is guided by the following principles in determining the appropriate regulatory outcome. The outcome should:
- (a) be proportionate to the conduct of the market participant; and

- (b) promote market integrity by acting as a deterrent to any future misconduct by the participant and as a general deterrent to other participants.

RG 216.75 Table 1 sets out the four key factors that the MDP will take into account when determining the penalty in an infringement notice.

**Table 1: Key factors to determine penalty**

| Factors                        | Relevant considerations   |
|--------------------------------|---|
| 1. Character of the conduct    | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>nature of the conduct</li> <li>whether the conduct was intentional, reckless or careless</li> <li>duration of the conduct</li> </ul>   |
| 2. Consequences of the conduct | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>whether the participant benefited</li> <li>whether clients or others suffered loss</li> <li>whether public confidence in the market may have been damaged</li> </ul>   |
| 3. Compliance culture          | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>adequacy of internal controls</li> <li>whether the conduct was promptly reported to ASIC</li> <li>the extent of cooperation with ASIC during its investigation</li> <li>past disciplinary or compliance history</li> </ul> |
| 4. Remediation                 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>steps taken to ensure that the conduct does not re-occur</li> <li>steps taken to compensate clients or others who suffered loss</li> </ul>   |

RG 216.76 In determining a penalty, the MDP generally classifies each of the four key factors as aggravating, mitigating or neither.

RG 216.77 A factor that is not aggravating does not mean that it is a mitigating factor. Market participants should not expect penalty discounts where their conduct did not have adverse consequences.

RG 216.78 For example, if the factor being considered is whether the conduct caused material loss to clients, the mere fact that clients did not suffer material loss does not necessarily make the factor a mitigating one. The MDP might consider it to be a mitigating factor if it is satisfied that the reason clients did not suffer any material loss was because of the internal controls the participant had in place to avoid or minimise the loss.

### **Key factor 1: Character of the conduct**

RG 216.79 Intentional, reckless or careless conduct is conduct ranging from the more serious to the less serious respectively. These expressions are not intended to be interpreted in their strict legal sense.

RG 216.80 Conduct is intentional if the market participant knew the conduct was a contravention of the rules. Intentional conduct is an aggravating factor.



RG 216.81 Conduct is reckless if the participant foresaw the real possibility that the conduct would be a contravention of the rules but nevertheless decided to engage in the conduct, indifferent to the consequences. Reckless conduct is likely to be an aggravating factor.

RG 216.82 Conduct is careless if the participant failed to take reasonable care. Negligence is a higher form of carelessness. Careless conduct will not usually be an aggravating factor but could be in some circumstances (e.g. where the conduct continued for a prolonged period).

### **Key factor 2: Consequences of the conduct**

RG 216.83 Conduct from which the participant benefited is an aggravating factor if the benefit could not have been gained from conduct that complied with the rules.

RG 216.84 Conduct which results in loss or damage to clients or others is not limited to financial loss. It extends to other forms of loss or damage that might not have a financial consequence (such as loss of confidential information).

RG 216.85 Conduct that damages public confidence in the market must be more than notional or hypothetical damage. The MDP does not consider that every finding of a contravention of a market integrity rule will necessarily damage public confidence in the market. The MDP does not expect any asserted damage to public confidence in the market to be quantified.

### **Key factor 3: Compliance culture**

RG 216.86 A market participant's poor compliance or disciplinary history is an aggravating factor, particularly if the conduct being considered by the MDP is the same as or similar to conduct sanctioned in the past.

RG 216.87 The MDP does not consider a participant to have a poor compliance or disciplinary history merely because of an adverse finding in the past. Adverse findings in relation to conduct that occurred more than six years before the conduct being considered by the MDP may be given little weight.

RG 216.88 A market participant's report to ASIC about conduct is a mitigating factor if the report is a comprehensive self-report and is coupled with full cooperation with ASIC. Compliance with compulsory notices to produce documents or provide information to ASIC is not considered to be a mitigating factor.

RG 216.89 The MDP will take into account the adequacy of the market participant's internal controls and procedures and the extent to which the participant has complied with those controls and procedures. The MDP considers that poorly designed internal controls and procedures are an aggravating factor, even if such controls and procedures are complied with. The MDP does not

consider a participant to have poorly designed controls and procedures merely because they fail to work on a particular occasion.

#### Key factor 4: Remediation

RG 216.90 Subsequent steps taken by a participant to address and remedy conduct and its consequences once they become aware of it will only be a mitigating factor if such steps are taken promptly.

### Indicative penalty ranges

RG 216.91 The market integrity rules classify each rule into one of three tiers for the purposes of the applicable maximum penalty. In determining the appropriate penalty to be specified in an infringement notice for an alleged contravention of a rule, the MDP will be guided by penalty ranges within each tier.

RG 216.92 The purpose of the ranges is to provide an indicative framework to ensure a consistent approach in determining the appropriate penalty.

**Table 2: Penalty ranges**

| Tier   | Maximum penalty (infringement notice) | Range        | Penalty             |
|--------|---------------------------------------|--------------|---------------------|
| Tier 1 | \$12,000                              | Low range    | < \$4,000           |
|        |                                       | Medium range | \$4,000–\$8,000     |
|        |                                       | High range   | \$8,000–\$12,000    |
| Tier 2 | \$60,000                              | Low range    | < \$20,000          |
|        |                                       | Medium range | \$20,000–\$40,000   |
|        |                                       | High range   | \$40,000–\$60,000   |
| Tier 3 | \$600,000                             | Low range    | < \$200,000         |
|        |                                       | Medium range | \$200,000–\$400,000 |
|        |                                       | High range   | \$400,000–\$600,000 |

### Multiple factually related contraventions

RG 216.93 The infringement notice regime does not allow for global penalties to be determined for multiple contraventions because separate penalties must be specified for separate contraventions.

RG 216.94 The regime does not otherwise restrict the approach the MDP can take in relation to multiple contraventions where there is a factual overlap in the circumstances of the matter. For example, the MDP may:

- (a) break down multiple contraventions into groups of factually related contraventions as a starting point and then assess which of those contraventions should be the subject of an infringement notice; and

Note: The MDP is not obliged to give an infringement notice for each adverse finding.

- (b) give an infringement notice for multiple factually related contraventions but only specify penalties for some of those contraventions so that the total of the penalties reflects the conduct as a whole.

Note: The MDP might specify a single penalty for one of the contraventions and specify no penalty for the other factually related contraventions.

RG 216.95 The MDP will be guided by the principle that the penalty to be specified in an infringement notice should be just and appropriate, and not excessive, having regard to the totality of the conduct. Where there are factually related contraventions, the total penalty should not be solely a function of how many rules have been contravened or how many times a rule has been contravened.

## Key terms

| Term                          | Meaning in this document  |
|-------------------------------|---|
| ASIC                          | Australian Securities and Investments Commission  |
| ASIC Act                      | <i>Australian Securities and Investments Commission Act 2001</i>  |
| Corporations Act              | <i>Corporations Act 2001</i> , including regulations made for the purposes of that Act  |
| Corporations Regulations      | Corporations Regulations 2001   |
| court enforceable undertaking | A court enforceable undertaking that may be accepted by ASIC under reg 7.2A.01 of the Corporations Regulations  |
| hearing                       | The meaning given by s5 of the ASIC Act   |
| infringement notice           | An infringement notice issued under reg 7.2A.04 of the Corporations Regulations   |
| market integrity group        | The ASIC teams responsible for market supervision and enforcement   |
| market integrity rules        | Rules made by ASIC, under s798G of the Corporations Act, for trading on domestic licensed markets   |
| MDP                           | ASIC's Markets Disciplinary Panel, through which ASIC exercises its power to issue infringement notices in relation to alleged contraventions of the market integrity rules |
| Pt 9.4B (for example)         | A part of the Corporations Act (in this example numbered 9.4B), unless otherwise specified  |
| reg 7.2A.01 (for example)     | A regulation under the Corporations Regulations (in this example numbered 7.2A.01), unless otherwise specified  |
| RG 8 (for example)            | An ASIC regulatory guide (in this example numbered 8)   |
| s798G (for example)           | A section of the Corporations Act (in this example numbered 798G), unless otherwise specified   |

## Related information

### Headnotes

court enforceable undertakings, hearings, infringement notices, market integrity rules, market participants, Markets Disciplinary Panel, MDP, penalties, remedial action, sitting panels, supervision

### Regulatory guides

[RG 8](#) *Hearings practice manual*

[RG 98](#) *ASIC's powers to suspend, cancel and vary AFS licences and make banning orders*

[RG 100](#) *Enforceable undertakings*

### Legislation

ASIC Act, Div 2 of Pt 4 (Divisions of ASIC); s5

Corporations Act, Pt 7.2A; s798G, 798K(2), 1317C(gcc)

Corporations Regulations, Pt 7.2A; regs 7.2A.01–7.2A.02, 7.2A.04, 7.2A.10

### Cases

*George v Rockett* (1990) 170 CLR 104