

**Haydar Tuncer**

**From:** Chris Savundra <s 22>  
**Sent:** Thursday, 2 September 2021 8:30 PM  
**To:** Kevin Truong; Rashpal Hartmann  
**Subject:** Re: Responses required by COB Friday, 10 September | Questions on Notice | 011, 012, 013 | Prime Trust/CDDA Scheme | PJC on Corporations and Financial Services [SEC=OFFICIAL:Sensitive, ACCESS=Legal-Privilege]

Thanks Kevin.

---

**From:** Kevin Truong <s 22>  
**Sent:** Thursday, September 2, 2021 3:33:41 PM  
**To:** Chris Savundra <s 22>; Rashpal Hartmann <s 22>  
**Subject:** RE: Responses required by COB Friday, 10 September | Questions on Notice | 011, 012, 013 | Prime Trust/CDDA Scheme | PJC on Corporations and Financial Services [SEC=OFFICIAL:Sensitive, ACCESS=Legal-Privilege]

Thanks Chris. I've made an amendment in response to one of your comments and also responded to your comments. Otherwise, I think its good to go to Treasury for comment.

**Kevin Truong**  
 Senior Lawyer, Chief Legal Office  
**Australian Securities and Investments Commission**

Level 5, 100 Market Street, Sydney, 2001

Tel: s 22 | Mob: s 22  
 s 22



**ASIC**

---

**From:** Chris Savundra <s 22>  
**Sent:** Thursday, 2 September 2021 3:10 PM  
**To:** Kevin Truong <s 22>; Rashpal Hartmann <s 22>  
**Subject:** RE: Responses required by COB Friday, 10 September | Questions on Notice | 011, 012, 013 | Prime Trust/CDDA Scheme | PJC on Corporations and Financial Services [SEC=OFFICIAL:Sensitive, ACCESS=Legal-Privilege]

Thanks Kevin. This looks good. I've marked up my comments in the link. I'd be grateful if you could please review and let me know if there are any changes. If not, I'll clean it up and send to Treasury for their review and comment before we send it off for internal approval.

Happy to discuss.

Kind regards,

**Chris Savundra**  
 General Counsel

**Australian Securities and Investments Commission**

Level 5, 100 Market Street, Sydney NSW 2000

Tel: s 22 | Mob: s 22  
 s 22



**ASIC**

**EA:** Jenna Halim | Tel: s 22 | s 22

From: Kevin Truong s 22  
 Sent: Thursday, 2 September 2021 11:32 AM  
 To: Chris Savundra s 22 Rashpal Hartmann s 22 >  
 Subject: FW: Responses required by COB Friday, 10 September | Questions on Notice | 011, 012, 013 | Prime Trust/CDDA Scheme | PJC on Corporations and Financial Services [SEC=OFFICIAL:Sensitive, ACCESS=Legal-Privilege]

Hi Chris and Rashpal

Please see linked below draft responses to the questions taken on notice.

[Question on Notice 11 12 and 13 - Spoken PJC 27 August 2021 - CDDA Scheme.docx](#)

Happy to discuss.

Thanks

**Kevin Truong**  
 Senior Lawyer, Chief Legal Office  
 Australian Securities and Investments Commission

Level 5, 100 Market Street, Sydney, 2001  
 Tel: s 22 | Mob: s 22  
 s 22



From: Zoe Kakarides s 22 >  
 Sent: Thursday, 2 September 2021 10:42 AM  
 To: Chris Savundra s 22 >; Rashpal Hartmann s 22 >; Kevin Truong s 22 >  
 Cc: Bruce Meagher s 22 >; Louise Macaulay s 22 >; Jenna Halim s 22 >; David Ryan s 22 >  
 Subject: Responses required by COB Friday, 10 September | Questions on Notice | 011, 012, 013 | Prime Trust/CDDA Scheme | PJC on Corporations and Financial Services [SEC=OFFICIAL]

Dear Chris, Rashpal and Kevin

The below highlighted questions were taken on notice at the PJC hearing last Friday.

Can you please arrange for responses to be drafted in the attached template (one question/answer per template), approved by you and returned to me by **COB Friday, 10 September**.

For your reference, attached is the Hansard from this hearing. This line of questioning starts on Hansard page 26.

Please let me know if you require anything further.

## QoN 011

### Extract – Hansard page 26

**Mr HILL:** In handing over to Chris, can I just seek clarification on the term that you used? The media article in the digging that I've done suggests that Treasury or others are trying to steer people towards the so-called act-of-grace payments, which are the ones that, ultimately, are at the discretion of the government. Usually the finance minister has to sign them off. The investors don't want an act-of-grace payment. They want a determination under this specific scheme. I was under the understanding that this scheme still exists. So I just pulled that up because

you've used the words 'act of grace', but that's not what they're pursuing. The media reports were that, for whatever reason, at some point in 2015 ASIC lost the delegation, which they had from the then Assistant Treasurer Josh Frydenberg when he was in his previous role. They had a delegation to make a determination under the CDDA Scheme and for some reason that delegation was lost. Why was the delegation lost? I understood that delegations from ministers to agencies were standing delegations. They can be refreshed or revoked when there's a change of minister but they don't lapse. Why was the delegation lost? Does the scheme still exist? Who can determine things under that scheme? I'd like to understand that before we talk about act of grace payments, if that's okay, Chair.

**CHAIR:** Of course.

**Mr Savundra:** You're correct in that the defective administration, or the CDDA, scheme, remains in place. As I understand, in September 2015 the authorisation for the minister lapsed. I'd like to take on notice just to double check what I'm about to tell you is correct, but as I understood it, it was a personal authorisation. It was when the then acting minister ceased to be the acting minister that the authorisation lapsed. In terms of the chronology of events, if it might assist you, it lapsed in 2015. In February 2019 ASIC received a CDDA application on behalf of 40 investors relating to the client trust. In March 2019 we advised those applicants that we no longer had an authorisation and, therefore, we were unable to consider the application under the CDDA Scheme. I think, as Mr Longo has said, the authorisation was a matter for the minister. So really that's as far as ASIC can take it.

---

## QoN 012

### Extract – Hansard page 27

**Mr HILL:** I have two supplementary questions, Chair. If you could give us quite a specific answer. Perhaps I'm just arcane and curious, but I would like to understand the delegation issue precisely. I have an email that ASIC sent to a complainant in March 2019 saying very clearly that the authorisation lapsed when there was a change of office holders. I'd like to unpick that a little more. Have there been any discussions or dialogue between ASIC and the Treasury or the Treasurer since receiving the request in 2019? What advice or request for advice has come from the Treasury and the Treasurer's office? What advice has been provided by ASIC in relation to this matter? Have there been discussions with any other ministers or the Department of Finance? I see in the email in 2019 that ASIC referred the complainants to the Department of Finance, not the Treasury. I'm sorry. I'm not trying to be tricky. It says, 'You may wish to contact the Discretionary Payments Section of the Department of Finance,' with an email address.

**Mr Savundra:** I'd need to take that on notice in terms of the interactions that we've had with Treasury in relation to this specific application—that's the Prime Trust investors' application. More generally from time to time over that period since September 2005 there have been a number of interactions with Treasury in relation to the CDDA Scheme and the fact that there is no authorisation for ASIC.

---

## QoN 013

### Extract – Hansard page 27

**Mr HILL:** Thank you; that's very helpful. My final question on that topic is: have you been asked for any input on an act of grace or a CDDA claim assessment in relation to the Prime property trust collapse?

**Mr Savundra:** I'd like to take that on notice, Mr Hill. I'm not aware of any. If the report in the paper is correct around Treasury's position, I wouldn't have thought that they would, given that they don't feel that they're in a position to make a determination.

**Mr HILL:** The stated reason was that they didn't want to interfere with ASIC's independence, which I think, left the readers, or me at least, to throw my hands up in the air and going, 'Really? Someone's got to be responsible!' If you don't have the delegation, it makes no logical sense to say that the Treasury wouldn't assess it because it would interfere with your independence. But, anyway, we will take that up with Treasury.

---

Regards  
Zoe

Zoe Kakarides

Senior Specialist, Office of the Chair

Australian Securities and Investments Commission

Level 7, 120 Collins Street, Melbourne, 3000

Mob: s 22

s 22



**ASIC**