

From: [REDACTED]
To: [AFCA Review](#)
Subject: Submission for Treasury re AFCA
Date: Tuesday, 9 March 2021 6:26:23 PM

In addressing the AFCA submission terms of reference criteria i submit as follows.

1 Is AFCA meeting its statutory objective of resolving complaints in a way that is fair, efficient, timely and independent?

Definitely not. We were victims of the Sterling First Ponzi collapse. After the collapse in 2019 we were told to submit an application to AFCA for resolution. We provided all information required to the case manager at a cost of \$100 to ourselves being a thumb drive with al details. We kept contacting them for updates as they were not providing us with any. Getting no answers was difficult for us as we had lost \$325000. So our answer to your question is AFCA was not fair, not efficient, not timely and not independent. It was initially held up due to covid so we left our application on hold. Much later after us approaching them again for an update they informed us the case was on hold because there was no CSLR. We are left to make up our own minds because there is no further advice from them as to a resolution.

1.1 Is AFCA's dispute resolution approach and capability producing consistent, predictable and quality outcomes, no. There has been no outcome from the complaint we submitted to AFCA. Nothing is predictable or consistent and it has all been a waste of time and effort. We still have no idea if AFCA will produce any results.

1.2 Are AFCA's processes for the identification and appropriate response to systemic issues arising from complaints effective.

We did not feel sufficiently satisfied after our initial interview and providing of our details that our case was progressing and as time went on we felt ignored and left in the dark.

1.3 Do AFCA's funding and fee structures impact competition? Are there enhancements to the funding model that should be considered by AFCA to alleviate any impacts on competition while balancing the need for a sustainable fee for service model?

I have no idea to be applying a fee and funding structure for a service when there is no hope for a resolution is not practical.

2 Do the monetary limits on claims that may be made to, and remedies that may be determined by, AFCA in relation to disputes about credit facilities provided to primary production businesses, including agriculture, fisheries and forestry businesses remain adequate?

How would we know that?

3 AFCA's independent assessor has the ability to review complaints about the standard of service provided by AFCA in resolving complaints. The independent assessor does not have the power to review the merits or substance of an AFCA decision

3.1 Is the scope, remit and operation of AFCA's independent assessor function appropriate and effective?

We would not say so on a summary of that information.

4 Is there a need for AFCA to have an internal mechanism where the substance of its decision can be reviewed? How should any such mechanism operate to ensure that consumers and small businesses have access to timely decisions by AFCA?

No. An internal mechanism reeks of cover ups and invites corruption. An independent body only if it has the power to improve the process.

ALLAN AND DIANA BARRETT.