



Executive summary

- The meeting recognised the role of the CMS as the core “system of record” from which advisers will manage all activities both platform and non-platform.
- To assist in developing business cases FTFC will work with advisers to develop clear priorities for the different areas of integration.
- There was general acceptance that it is important to move to two way integration between platforms and CMS forward in a timely fashion.
- Overleaf is a summary of the main issues raised at the meeting and the solutions put forward to address them.
- Whilst theoretically the standards approach may be attractive in practice the time taken to develop standards would delay delivery and such is the urgency of the needs that individual organisations would develop one to one integrations rather than waiting for standards to be delivered.
- It was agreed that the best compromise would be to agree “good practice”.
- FTFC asked parties to confirm whether they felt it would be beneficial to continue the process to:
 - Review the outcomes of all the actions that were agreed at this meeting.
 - Address the remaining issues from this meeting which could not be addressed due to time constraints.
- Members feel this this is desirable.
- FTFC proposed a further session in December with bi-monthly meetings thereafter. Increasing the regularity if meetings should accelerate the speed at which solutions can be agreed and delivered. FTFC to propose 2009 dates at next meeting.

Executive summary cont.

ISSUES	IMPACT	PROGRESSED	RECOMMENDATION
Require clarity on end user (adviser) requirements – what do advisers actually want?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Development is based upon software provider requirements, not necessarily end adviser needs. Not necessarily delivering customer focussed solutions. The need to be versatile and flexible, necessitating additional costs. 	✓	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> FTRC have agreed to poll all distributors part of Adviser Forum on their integration priorities. The information will be collated and passed back to both CMS vendors and platforms.
Inconsistencies in standards and processes for delivery makes any development hard going and more resource intensive than it should be.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Fundamentally, what takes the most time and effort is every CRM having to talk to every Provider to get specific details about their particular implementation. 	✓	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Where existing standards are being used it is agreed that it would be good practice for all platforms to create a “standards variation document” to address this specific issue.
Documentation provided by third parties is not always in line with their development.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Documentation provided by third parties is not always in line with their development As these issues only come to light on testing the cost of change is greater than if these issues were discovered at analysis stage. 	✓	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There was general agreement that the level and quality of documentation held by parties needs to be improved. On the issue of good practice for data protocols it was agreed that FTRC will contact all parties to gather and collate information concerning their documentation.
Testing	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Platforms stress their concern at being unable to see how their messages are being displayed to the end user. For example, platforms pass data to a CMS and assume that this information is displayed to the end user in the same way. Without knowing this for sure, platforms often struggle to deal with advisers who contact them directly to query the information they have received from the platform via their CMS i.e. valuations or commissions data. 	✓	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> It is agreed that good industry practice would be for all platforms to have copies of the client management systems software to allow them to see how their information was being displayed to the end user. There is a general view that advisers need to be brought into the testing phase much earlier on as this could help to identify issues prior to release.



Executive summary cont.

ISSUES	IMPACT	PROGRESSED	RECOMMENDATION
<p>Dealing with adviser queries once a service has been implemented with the CMS is proving problematic</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Advisers complain and platform reputation suffers as time is spent resolving issues that aren't ours to own. A very high percentage of Contract Enquiry messages that are failing. In most cases the users do not appear to realise they are making the requests. Therefore there is a lot of unnecessary processing occurring. 	✓	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This issues is being progressed via the Wider Stakeholder Group as it also affect L&P Providers. FTRC are pursuing a recommendation by members to develop a tripartite frame. The objective of this document is to improve the efficiency of new and current adviser implementations of Contract Enquiry. Having a formal process in place between advisers, client management systems, providers, and platforms prior to launch of a Contract Enquiry should help to tackle such issues.
<p>Communication can be fragmented, and protracted.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Time cost for analysing, fixing and Project Managing issues with Third Party. Quality of service delivered and reduced trust in electronic interface versus manual. 	✗	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ran out of time, deferred to next session
<p>Delivery mechanisms e.g. issues around file security and data protection.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Additional testing and deployment costs to ensure third party data and files can be taken into the Managed Service environment securely. 	✗	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ran out of time, deferred to next session