

COMMENTS ON CFP BOARD'S PROPOSED CHANGES TO THE COMPETENCY STANDARDS

CFP Board invited public comments on its proposed *Competency Standards for CFP® Certification*. The comment period ran from December 17, 2024 through March 3, 2025. The comments received are posted below.

Please comment on your level of support or opposition to the proposed change:

New language: By completing all four certification requirements—education, examination, experience, and ethics—professionals demonstrate to the public that they have attained the competency level necessary to practice independently as a financial planner.

First name	Last name (c/o firm name, if applicable)	Response
Hamid	Abdollahi	I have diligently studied for two years, taking the exam twice. I will attempt it again, but I remain uncertain about how new language might impede access to knowledge, mentorship, and inclusion within the industry's network. I worry that these barriers may inadvertently exclude individuals based on their ethnicity and national origin, particularly those of Iranian descent. My life has been significantly impacted by these challenges. I am unsure how to fully compensate for the emotional pain I have experienced, except by living a healthy lifestyle and maintaining unwavering faith that one day I will become a successful Financial Planner and be fully accepted as a valued member of the industry!
Jessica	Adams	No issues.
Laurie	Adams	Current language is much stronger and more reflective of how we apply knowledge to help clients. I use it to explain to clients why the board exam requirement is superior to designations that just test how well you remember what you studied.
Lucas	Adams	These four words speak for themselves and help clarify for the public what a CFP designation represents
Dennis	Adler	I don't understand this change??? Are you saying eliminate the exam?? Then my answer is no. Studying and taking the exam was useful and necessary to show competency in the subject matter.
Aaron	Ahlstrom	Makes sense
Mitchell	Allen	Makes sense
Christopher	Amenita	That sounds perfectly reasonable.
Ramzan	Amiri	The clarity in the proposed language is better.
Srihari	Angara	4 E principle is great.
Anonymous	Anonymous	It's a test. Promote the designation to the public and people will want to acquire the designation.
Jaycob	Arbogast	Yes. I very strongly agree with this change. Being a CFP Professional is more than just taking an exam. I think the current image that the process portrays is that everything else is just a checkbox and all that really matters is the exam. We

CFP BOARD

CERTIFIED FINANCIAL PLANNER BOARD OF STANDARDS, INC.

First name	Last name (c/o firm name, if applicable)	Response
		should be putting equal value on all parts of the 4 E's. If they aren't all valuable, then why include them at all.
Stephen	Archer	Maintains high standards.
Laura	Armstrong	Proposed verbiage is indicative of what is required
Christopher	Arnold	I agree that all four certification requirements should be included.
Raymond	Backers	Passing the exam alone does not show the public competency, so expanding the explanation is helpful.
Luisa	Baker	The CFP designation should be difficult and encompass enough knowledge that those that have the certification should be able to attain the competency to practice independently as a financial planner.
Dave	Balakrishnan	The proposed language is confusing. With it being tied to the Examination competency standard, does it imply that only experience people can take the exam. Does this reduce the intake from eligible individuals entering the industry transitioning from another career.
Christopher	Barker	that sounds reasonable.
Lloyd	Barnhardt	This makes sense.
Tejuana	Baskerville (National Association of Personal Financial Advisors)	Stating what the exam does assess, and what passing it indicates, seems like something that should be articulated. HT
CRaig	Baum	The education, experience, and ethics components were always necessary along with the exam so restating this is not needed.
Geoff	Beck	I only support this if the experience requirement remains competency in all seven steps of the planning process. Otherwise, I believe this language would be very misleading.
Leslie	Beck	I do not believe you can teach ethics. You can certainly have an ethics requirement to achieve the mark, but we can't say that passing an ethics requirement means someone is ethical and will practice as such.
Thomas	Begley	I do appreciate the expanded language to clarify the certification requirements.
Brettq	Beimers	Anything that makes things clearer to the public is a plus in my book.
Claudia	Bellars	This seems to already be the case. Just updating the language.
Chet	Bennetts	The proposed revision to the Examination standard language provides a more holistic representation of the CFP® certification process by emphasizing that competency to practice independently is achieved through meeting all four certification requirements—education, examination, experience, and ethics. This updated language better reflects the comprehensive nature of the certification process and aligns with the multifaceted expectations placed on CFP® professionals. However, while this change acknowledges the importance of all certification components, it may inadvertently downplay the unique significance of the examination itself as the primary assessment of a candidate's ability to

*Comments are verbatim, not edited for grammar or spelling.

CFP BOARD

CERTIFIED FINANCIAL PLANNER BOARD OF STANDARDS, INC.

First name	Last name (c/o firm name, if applicable)	Response
		integrate and apply financial planning knowledge. It may be worth considering how to retain the emphasis on the exam's critical role while still acknowledging the equal importance of the other certification requirements in demonstrating overall competency.
Joseph	Billerman	Better communicates and emphasizes the various certification requirements and more clearly affirms the value of the CFP marks.
Kathryn	Blake	Merely passing the exam doesn't mean you're competent to practice independently as a financial planner; candidates are currently required to complete all four E's, so really this is an update that reflects current requirements for certification.
Nick	Bodnar	No comment
James	Boles	Agree with this statement
Becky	Boston	Makes sense.
Christopher	Bowman	Agree. Holding the CFP is way more than being able to pass a test.
Scott	Bown	Seems more concise and easier to understand.
Phillip	Bracey	good adjustment
Cindy	Bragdon	YES! I believe all four of the E's (education, exam, experience and ethics) are appropriate to qualify a candidate for CFP. NOT the exam only!
Nathan	Bragg	It sounds more sophisticated and succinct.
Jason	Branch	This seems appropriate.
Tina	Brannan	No opinion.
Melissa	Brennan	Such a claim should not be made by the board. It would be giving a false impression to the public that all licensees have the same level of competency.
Sarah	Brice	Clarification of the standards to the general public will greatly impact the opinion and trust in the CFP designation and the professionals who are honored to hold that designation. I vigorously support Any clarification in the verbiage that would be viewed by the public to explain this designation and its scope.
Sterling	Brightman	Agree. Passing the exam alone does not replace experience needed to function independently
Emily	Brown	Less guaranteed language seems fair.
Gail	Brown	The more you can help the public feel confident and comfortable with the CFP's qualifications and integrity, the better.
James	Brown	I do believe we need all four to demonstrate competency.
Kasey	Buckner	This helps strengthen the CFP brand, in my opinion. Support.
Emily	Bushong	all components are necessary so updating the language is positive. Just passing an exam means you know how to take a test. Education, experience, and ethics are very important
John	Butcher	sure
Cassidy	Butler	All elements are important. This is a good change.
Jeff	Butterfield	I think the use of the word independently would cause confusion for clients of CFP practitioner's at firms such as UBS, Morgan Stanley, RBC, or Merrill Lynch. Those of us at these firms run our practices in silos, we still aren't considered

*Comments are verbatim, not edited for grammar or spelling.

CFP BOARD

CERTIFIED FINANCIAL PLANNER BOARD OF STANDARDS, INC.

First name	Last name (c/o firm name, if applicable)	Response
		'independent' and I feel introducing that language would cause clients to think even though I work for XYZ firm, I'm independent or on my own when that's not the case.
Chad	Campbell	I am opposing because this wording is confusing to me.
Gordon	Carpenter	adding ethics doesn't make them ethical.
Michael	Carretta	Being more specific adds clarity.
Charlie	Carroll	The language change is more in line with a wholistic expectation that our market place expects from our industry.
Anthony	Carter	I strongly support this proposal
Shaun	Chelf	I own a firm and have dealt with many planners. I do not support this language change for the simple fact it just isn't true in enough cases to state it so bluntly. Some certainly are, but some aren't. The main factor is 'experience.' Some take more experience than others to be able to relate to clients and have the wisdom to guide them.
Jeffrey	Chesner	I agree. All 4 requirements are necessary to show competency in becoming a CFP certificant.
Susan	Chesney	Ethics is already a part of the certification, so including it as one of the pillars seems fine.
Christopher	Chestnut	i think the board is making it easier for people to get the CFP...there are a lot of people who have gotten it in my own firm that i would not want my family to work with if I was no longer in the business. We need to raise the bar for requirements...seems like you are chasing money with allowing so many to 'pass' the exam when the total number of FAs is declining.
Jonathan	Childs	I believe the new language specifies the requirements and the standard that the candidates are held to.
Daniel	Clothier	I believe this is a well reasoned and appropriate change.
Monique Rene	Coates	I am in opposition to this language change because I believe that all new / newer CFP certification candidates will need mentoring for a minimum amount of time (5 - 10 years or better?) before being considered truly VIABLE as 'independent' financial advisors. Most CFAs on your CFP blog & website do work for a main Financial Advisory company. Thank you.
Lisa	Cochran	Proposed changes encompass the definition of the CFP certification standards.
Steven	Coker	I have mixed feelings on the timing of the experience requirement for new CFP professionals. Not all 'new' CFP professionals will practice independently or without supervision. I don't believe financial planning should go the way of public accounting, which pretty much has 'slave labor' for two years for recent college graduates.
Akil	Cole	It's clearer. Practically the same, but clearer.
Daniel	Conroy	I agree with the proposed language.
Jose	Cuevas	No. Not everyone should be independent. I'm independent. It's challenging and it's not for everyone.
Rachel	Currington	Love the wording

*Comments are verbatim, not edited for grammar or spelling.

CFP BOARD

CERTIFIED FINANCIAL PLANNER BOARD OF STANDARDS, INC.

First name	Last name (c/o firm name, if applicable)	Response
Eric	Curry	I strongly support the more concise and descriptive language.
Michael	Curry	I think this change to the language is great.
Michael	Daley	This more clearly articulates the Board's position---and highlights the importance of all the emphasized areas to financial planning engagements and expertise. This change would be a big win.
Nicholas	Dally	This change more clearly communicates what a certificant was assessed on to obtain the CFP certification.
Vincent	Damiani	New language is more explanatory and should help anyone, particularly someone seeking a CFP professional, understand what they should be getting in return from a certified practitioner.
Galan	Daukas	Good idea
Patricia	Davis	I like that this takes a comprehensive integration of the standards and that its not only about the test.
Matthias	Day	The current language currently needs updating. Passing the exam does not at all mean that someone is competent to practice on their own.
Michael	Dechiario	That is a more accurate description of the competency.
Leonard	Del Gallo (DFS, LLC)	CFP applicants should have to work for 2 years as a financial planner after passing the exam before receiving the certification. Many take the exam and never work as a planner just to have the certification title.
Miguel	Delgado	No comment
Bob	DePasquale	The language and expectations are more clear.
Dan	Devine	More clarity and able to put different requirements under clear headers/categories.
Ashish	Dhamal	This is a good change with respect to verbiage from the previous standard.
Francisco	Diaz	Financial planning and counsel is, in its maximum expression, an art form. Ultimate competency is reflected in intangibles that can neither be measured nor predicted by a successful exam score. The exam does not factor life experience, which, in capable hands, can be more important than any mastery of mathematics and financial theory. If anything, examinations should be in essay form (similar to what is submitted in a capstone course) and graded by three competent practitioners either independently, or in conjunction.
Katherine	Dibbern	Many people are coming into this already acting as a fiduciary thanks to prior credentials, and need to continue working towards experience hours. Those individuals are competent but not yet certified. Consider making people ineligible to take exam until they have 25-50% of hours logged to ensure that once they've passed the exam they are reasonable competent.
Michael	DiGrazia	This makes more sense.
Ryan	Dillon	I believe the current standard is sufficient is does not need to be changed.
Douglas	Dirksen	The new language reinforces the core tenets of the CFP certification
David	Doherty	I feel all four certification requirements are important to demonstrate competency, not just the exam.
Boyan	Doytchinov	Excellent proposed change

*Comments are verbatim, not edited for grammar or spelling.

CFP BOARD

CERTIFIED FINANCIAL PLANNER BOARD OF STANDARDS, INC.

First name	Last name (c/o firm name, if applicable)	Response
John	Duda	No strong opinion here. The industry is beset with examples of horror stories; a practitioner should be a shining beacon for the public. Our certification should assure the public they are working with a selfless servant leader who is humble, approachable and credible.
Michael	Dunlop	I support this proposed change because it better reflects what it truly takes to become a CFP® professional. It's not just about passing a test—it's about meeting all four requirements: education, examination, experience, and ethics. This well-rounded approach is what sets CFP® professionals apart and gives clients confidence that they're working with someone fully equipped to provide comprehensive financial planning. I believe this change strengthens the integrity of the designation and helps the public better understand the value a CFP® brings.
Blaine	Dunn	If I am reading this correctly, the New Language is stronger than the Current Language regarding competency. If so, I would support the new and stronger language.
Dylan	Dwyer	This is semantic and not meaningfully impactful, in my opinion
Peyton	Eckert	Clear.
Richard	Eddy	I'm not sure the specific proposed language chosen is what I would ultimately use, but expanding beyond 'passing the exam' is valuable.
Ivy	Emerick	The four certification requirements, not just the exam, are important to demonstrating competency.
Angela	Epley	Appreciate the use of semantics to rebalance the value/weight attribution to exams in general, and for CFP certification in particular
Joshua	Escalante Troesh (Purposeful Strategic Partners)	The new language feels generic. I think it would be better as a preamble to a broader statement about each of the elements with the old language being specific about the exam element.
Amanda	Farr	Not many people understand what is required to obtain a CFP certification. I believe this new language will help.
Ray	Ferrara	I believe this was implied in the old standard, but it is good to be explicit.
Emerson	Fersch	I have had literally one person in the last eight years, asked me if I had professional credentials as a condition to consider hiring me as an advisor. I actually removed all the credentials from business cards, our website, email signature and everything else because the truth is nobody knows the difference from one to another and truthfully nobody cares. I've been in this industry for well over 30 years, and work with awesome people. Were interested in the kind of person I am how many classes I've taken.
Shelby	Ferstl	Agree / support
Russell	Fields	highlights it is more than just passing a test. In favor.
Alice	Finn	See end
Tim	Fliam	I feel the changes reflect what the standard of a CFP professional truly is. I support.

CFP BOARD

CERTIFIED FINANCIAL PLANNER BOARD OF STANDARDS, INC.

First name	Last name (c/o firm name, if applicable)	Response
Kathryn	Flom	This change is in direct contradiction of allowing professionals with other designations to pick up the CFP designation without the proper education and experience.
Ed	Foltz	Feel like CFP Board is playing semantics to justify all the money that is charged to maintain certificate. Leave this stuff as is, reduce staff, and reduce annual renewal costs.
Adam	Fowler	Seems concise.
Hank	Fox	The proposed revision clearly conveys the competency requirements to become a CFP professional and should enhance the public's understanding of the benefit of using a CFP professional.
Mike	Fox	Practice independently just from passing the exam? Comical. It's too easy to pass the exam. 70%+ pass rates?!? Stop trying to win the PR war by inflating the number of certificants. Quality, not quantity. The ease of passing the exam degrades the value of existing certificants.
Kerry	Franklin	This makes sense as you have to do much more than just pass the test.
Janelle	Fuhrmann	You should have MINIMAL mandates around experience and easy reporting. People already have many roadblocks to getting into this profession you're just making it more difficult. Many states already have additional requirements under the RIA and those advisors especially don't need more.
Guy	Fulcher	However, a CPA already has proven a significant level of experience by passing the CPA exam
John	Galbraith	The new language accurately reflects all the requirements.
Rachel	Garner	Clarity is always a good thing especially when it comes to expectations.
Stephen	Garrett	i do not feel the education alone is enough they need to pass cap stone and exam
Kenneth	Garwood	New language only strengthens the existing language. Good addition.
Ara	Gasparian	As these are the requirements for attaining the marks, I am not opposed to this change.
Michael	Gazsi	Very relevant.
Marc	Genereux	I believe this is the core competency level for the profession and so support it.
Victor	Gersten	No opinion
Michael	Gibney	This looks to me like it is simply re-wording.
Amy	Gierak	Sounds more comprehensive than just passing the exam.
Sarah	Gilkeyson	I think the language is basically stating the same thing, there is a multi-step process that each candidate must go through in order to obtain their CFP certification.
Jonathan	Gilliam	Reads great to me.
Joseph	Gitto	Language is clearer
Charles	Glassey	This language more clearly summarizes the necessary requirements required to become a CFP.
Bruce	Glor	Sounds better
Peyton	Glover	This is in line with what one might expect that at a minimum a CFP should represent

*Comments are verbatim, not edited for grammar or spelling.

CFP BOARD

CERTIFIED FINANCIAL PLANNER BOARD OF STANDARDS, INC.

First name	Last name (c/o firm name, if applicable)	Response
John	Godfrey	Well Done.
Andrew	Griffith	This is consistent with many other highly recognized professional certifications.
Kathryn	Grover	This is already the requirement, we should advertise the competency better.
Joshua	Guadarrama	Sounds fair.
Phil	Guerrero	yes, puts more weight on the big picture by including education, examination, experience, and ethics vs. just the exam. Note...since including experience here, please do not diminish the experience with the other standard potential changes being considered to use the marks or sit for the exam. If the board opts to lessen the experience qualification for the exam or marks, then the board should remove experience from the wording on this item. Can't have it both ways.
Jake	Guller	This change helps clarify that one must meet multiple criteria, and the CFP is not earned by passing an examination alone.
Kayla	Gunderson	Sounds more concise.
Levi	Gunn	Ethics and morals is the name of the game.
Michael	Hadley	Why are we making this easier? The pass numbers are up, the test seems to be easier than years past, there are more CFP's than ever now, why are we watering it down further, if anything the test should be getting harder and this should be the 'super bowl' in financial planning not common place.
Ted	Haley	I see no problem with the current language. The exam demonstrates competency, the use of the CFP designation is dependent on the other factors. I don't see the benefit of qualifying the significance of the exam.
Andrew	Hall	I would appreciate more background as to the the thought behind making this change as it appears a distinction without a difference
Trent	Hamilton	Makes us sound good and gives the new designation holders confidence
Kade	Hammes	This reads much more in line with what is required to earn the CFP and illustrates the competency level better.
Allison	Hanley	it's more clear and helpful
Parker	Hanson-Harden	Important to have all 4 E's listed.
Mingming	Hao	Better description
Dean	Harris	After education and passing the exam individuals are very capable to of providing CFP level financial advice. The proposed change will only raise the barrier to entry into the field and lower the amount of future CFPs hurting the field in the long run.
Jessica	Harris	The language isn't as important as restructuring the exam to be more aligned with what you are actually allowed to advise on. The exam is known to be written to purposely trick people, why? If it's about testing your knowledge and capability purposely trying to deceive test takers is actually extremely unethical
Josh	Harris	Seems reasonable
Adele	Harrison	New language provides clarity to candidates and those assessing the value of the certification as to the depth of the CFP professional's qualifications.
Stephanie	Hays	It's more concise.
Daniel	Heidel	This revision to the language seems to further clarify the standards of CFP certification.

*Comments are verbatim, not edited for grammar or spelling.

CFP BOARD

CERTIFIED FINANCIAL PLANNER BOARD OF STANDARDS, INC.

First name	Last name (c/o firm name, if applicable)	Response
Brenton	Helms	This should be changed, as it will help with demonstrating to the public what each of us has done to earn the letters.
Tyler	Helton	I don't think there is any actionable change aside from wording.
Bradley	Herdt	The test alone has never sufficed.
Matthew	Hess	this increasing the publics understanding of the rigor required to be a candidate and become certified
Joshua	Hester	This seems like a well written change, however if too many groups are allowed to bypass the education components.
Sam	Heveroh	I think this is semantics personally. My recommendation would be if you were going to use the word independently in this verbiage to actually require advisors who are not independent to have to state as such. There are plenty of advisors who would fall under a biased or non-independent standard due to their relationship with their BD or Captive mothership. Those individuals are not independent and should not hold themselves out as such.
Jesse	Hindson	Passing the exam alone does not prepare one to provide complete financial advice. However, I would argue that adding the other three elements does.
Deb	Hinton-Brown	While education, examination and experience can all be quantified, how does one quantify ethics in demonstration there of?
Mark	Hoemann	Why? let's throw more roadblocks up
Patrick	Hoffman	I like the detail of what's required
James	Honaker	I strongly support provided their experience comes from a true Financial Planning firm
Aaron	Horne	I do not see this in the code and conduct standards or fitness standards documents. I did not see a competency standards document. I began looking around and could not find it via browsing the site or using google or even chatgpt to help. If you see this could you direct me there? I don't see a problem with this one specifically as it relates to 'practicing independently as a financial planner'.
Landon	Horne	Yes, the new verbiage doesn't put as much weight on the test to just reflect 'good test takers', but also highlights the other critical parts of becoming a CFP professional.
Jim	Houghton	All four points are important.
Kyle	Householder	I think this is a better description.
Johanne	Hove	This a good way to enhance the profession
Alec	Hubbard	CFP standards are higher than simply passing a test. Reflecting the language of the examination standard reinforces the importance of all elements of CFPs rigor without a discernable harm.
Joel	Huet	No real opinion on this...fine with either.
Jacob	Ivey	Fine language change
Dominic	Javier	Dito
Robert	Jeter	This is a great change. It accurately reflects that this is not just a 'test'.
Carol	Johnson	No opinion. It is fine as it is

*Comments are verbatim, not edited for grammar or spelling.

CFP BOARD

CERTIFIED FINANCIAL PLANNER BOARD OF STANDARDS, INC.

First name	Last name (c/o firm name, if applicable)	Response
Kevin	Jordan	The Exam has a reputation for being extremely rigorous, which leads the public to associate the certification with excellence. Lawyers and Doctors have plenty of regulatory and ethics requirements, but most people see one of those professionals and know they are reliable because they must have passed the Bar Exam or Board Exam. Many go to school or have internship experience, but only the cream of the crop have passed the exam. I want the same association for CFP professionals.
j	k	The exam should be 1 question. You get it right, you pass. You get it wrong, you are banned from the industry forever.
Henry V	Kaelber	Proposed change seems less meaningful to the general public's understanding
Melanie	Kahrs	Love that this is easy to remember all e's!
Michelle	Kaicener	This seems redundant. One doesn't get the CFP marks until all the steps are completed anyway. The examination standard is the examination standard, and the other steps are related to the marks.
Hooman	Karbasion	Not sure this is much of a change but rather different use of words.
Jennifer	Karch	This is more detailed in general so offers more information as to why a CFP is competent
Kit	Kenny	The Board currently looks at 1)grades on exams 2) experience 3) ethics. I see no changes needed.
Henry	Kincaid	Is this different than current?
David	Kinder, RFC, ChFC, CLU	More words that mean absolutely nothing. CFP holders are already holding themselves at a fiduciary level regardless of method of compensation, so this is just words.
Andrew	Kish	I support this change. It shows greater competence that is gained from sources other than an exam.
Ryan	Kittrell	That language makes the public more likely to seek out a financial planner.
Alan	Kneale	Is aligned with actual requirements
Robert	Kocembo	good
Joseph	Kochera	This speaks for itself.
Joel	Koon	I think this is a better statement than previously.
Paul	Kopey	That's better.
Brian	Korb	Yes, this needs to be clear, so the new language is a great step toward clarification of the requirements.
Ross	Krause	Yes i agree that the experience and ethics are all important parts of being a CFP proffesional
Austin	Kunzler	More holistic view of the requirements.
Bryan	Kupchik	Experience under apprenticeship is optimal.
Julia	Kwok	Adding the real world experience wording increases the perception of competency of the profession..
Ching	Lam	The current standard is already reflecting the competency
Jamie	Lapin	Actually, they demonstrate that to the Board by passing the exam. They demonstrate their competence to the public by practicing well. To the public, they

*Comments are verbatim, not edited for grammar or spelling.

CFP BOARD

CERTIFIED FINANCIAL PLANNER BOARD OF STANDARDS, INC.

First name	Last name (c/o firm name, if applicable)	Response
		demonstrate by examination and experience that they have the competency, ethics and education necessary to... Your improper word order renders this a marketing piece rather than the attestation of competence that CFPs deserve. Rather reminds me of the 'be a CFP' ad you did of the college kid sleeping on his desk. No connection to who we are and what we take most seriously about our chosen path. Words matter. Images matter.
James	Larson	This separates us from lower standards of uncredentialed RIA and 'insurance professionals' who can put an entire persons life savings in an annuity and collect a 5% commission and be allowed to think it's acceptable as a 'financial professional'
Daniel	Lash	More concise.
Laura	LaTourette	yes, love this
Danielle	LeChard	Great wording. Agree
Kristen	LeClair	I think these are close enough.
Shan	Lei	The language of 'To practice independently' is too strong
David W	Lentz	Again, seems like an obvious improvement over the present standard
Nan	Li	Agree to increase the standard of competency
Darren	Liberski	I feel that this new language is encompassing and specific.
Jordan	Liss	i am not sure i even understand the exact difference in practice here
Vance	Litchfield	I understand the need to increase membership. However, as you lower your standards you increase the chances of another organization being perceived as the symbol of excellence. People need to respect the designation and feel they achieved something. If everyone has one, it's not a way to distinguish yourself. The designation looses relevance.
Chad	Lively	Better wording.
Noah	Londer	Nothing
Paulo	Lopes	I support the proposed update to the Examination standard language. Competency to practice independently as a financial planner is not demonstrated by passing the exam alone but by fulfilling all four certification requirements—education, examination, experience, and ethics. This clarification better reflects the holistic nature of CFP® certification and reinforces the importance of each component in preparing professionals for independent practice. It provides a clearer message to the public about what CFP® certification truly represents.
Susan	Lopez	N/A
Alicia	Love	Provides clarity
Kristina	Love	Wording isn't important
David	Lowe	The new language correctly emphasizes the importance of education, examination, experience, and ethics (rather than just the examination). Merely passing an examination is not sufficient to be a good financial planner. The other three components are equally important, if not more important.
Alejandro	Lozano	this better reflects the experience and education requirements.

*Comments are verbatim, not edited for grammar or spelling.

CFP BOARD

CERTIFIED FINANCIAL PLANNER BOARD OF STANDARDS, INC.

First name	Last name (c/o firm name, if applicable)	Response
Ali	Mahbod	CFP CERT SHOULD HAVE AT LEAST A COLLEGE DEGREE FROM A RESPECTED UNIVIERSITY
DJ	Mahler	Support
Bonnie	Maize	This would bring CFPs in line with other professions, such as attorneys and doctors. There are influential voices in the profession who discourage this and the CFP Board taking this stance would help to enforce the standard and make it easier for new CFPs to choose the career path most appropriate for them.
Marco	Maldonado	It lets the public know in more detail the WHY and HOW a CFP has attained the competency level that is needed to practice as a financial planner, and builds more trust by highlighting the essential components needed to be CFP certified.
Mason	Malozzi	I do not understand what is changing here
Josh	Mancell	I'd suggest it may be slightly more beneficial to further define each of the four requirements.
David	Mannaioni	This aligns with what the public expects from CFP professionals anyway, so it will be good to put it in writing.
Santo	Marasco	Seems like adding language for the sake of adding language. Don't boast to the public and professional community about how rigorous your exam is and then diminish it by saying it's just one of four standards.
John	Marchand	See my previous comments; passing the exam demonstrates competence.
David	Marotta	This seems like a change without a reason. I suspect there is a hidden agenda.
Leo	Marte	Passing an exam in and of itself is not a sufficient criteria to demonstrate competence. Adding education, experience, and ethics is key to continue to build the public's trust in the marks.
Bruce	Martin	This may VERY WELL make the barrier of attaining your CFP designation too high. People expect persons that are new at something need time to become good at it. Leave it to the clients to discern whether they want to work with someone. This barrier to entry is too high in my opinion and may act as a deterrent for someone wanting to attain their CFP.
Mitchell	Mass	The new language is more clear and concise.
Kevin	Matthews	Support is conditioned on the understanding that the bachelor's degree is not in a set program. I feel that a bachelor's degree in anything coupled with a master's degree in business or financial planning is actually better, but that is my opinion.
Rick	Mayo	Ok? Not sure that there's a difference in old and new. Now there's a '4 point' approval? That's already baked in the cake of the CFP. If you really want to improve competency, go back to the subjective nature of examination and require candidates to do case work as part of the examination
Noah	Mazur	Individually specifying core competencies to becoming a CFP makes it easier for the public to understand it isn't just 'passing a test' that makes a CFP.
Jeffrey	McClure	That closely aligns with the 'Journeyman' requirements in the traditional progress of a developing professional.
Steve	McConnell	My opposition is that the phrasing of the change is not grammatically parallel and/or is unclear. Is the phrase intended to be read as '...demonstrated by

*Comments are verbatim, not edited for grammar or spelling.

CFP BOARD

CERTIFIED FINANCIAL PLANNER BOARD OF STANDARDS, INC.

First name	Last name (c/o firm name, if applicable)	Response
		completing the education requirements, exam requirements, experience requirements, and ethics requirements for CFP® certification'? If so, is it true that ethics requirements are ever 'completed'? It seems to me that the more accurate phrasing would be something like, '...demonstrated by completing the education, exam, and experience requirements and committing to ongoing professional development and professional conduct that is consistent the CFP® ethics requirements.'
Jack	McCormick	The process goes beyond just an exam so having all four I think is important.
Kyle	McCune	This is a good way to highlight the high standard to earn the CFP designation. However, I believe the requirements need to maintain strict and standardized in order to fit this definition. Allowing professionals with other designations or experiences that fit only part of the comprehensive content waters down the certification and makes this statement false.
Justin	McCurdy	The new language is very generic and not tied to the exam alone.
Ryan	McGhee	This more clearly defines what it means to be a CFP.
Thomas	McGrath	yes
Alan	McGrew	The new wording is more direct and succinct.
Aidan	McGuire	Each aspect is of certification is important and falls into being able to competently and independently offer financial advice
Tricia	McIntosh	The candidate for CFP certification is currently required to meet the CFP Board's standards of experience, education, examination and ethics (the 4 E's). Amending the examination-standard language to reflect this is reasonable, edifying and compelling.
Ariane	McSellers	It should be clear that it is the completion of all four requirements, and not just one.
Kiernen	McTaggart-Ivezic	Since planners are generally generalists, competency is hard to judge and enforce. Being an independent planner is hard and competency depends on your clientele, not just your having the CFP, which is a qualification.
Greta	Messarra Woodward	love the language update
Christine	Messmer	This matters so that is why I support it.
Cynthia	Meyer	This builds on the value of the certification but explaining in full what's really required.
Jordan	Miles	Since a person isn't a certificant without completing all four parts, it makes sense that they shouldn't be certified as such unless they have completed all four portions.
Aaron	Miller	Provides the public a better picture of what the CFP designation means and the work it takes to get there.
Dan	Miller	Must maintain at least three years working under a CFP to be able to use the marks!
Ronald	Mims	I have been in the financial industry for 30+ years. I truly enjoyed reviewing the study material as a refresher. I have a B.S degree from Georgia State University.

*Comments are verbatim, not edited for grammar or spelling.

CFP BOARD

CERTIFIED FINANCIAL PLANNER BOARD OF STANDARDS, INC.

First name	Last name (c/o firm name, if applicable)	Response
		With a major in Risk Mgmt and Insurance. I worked for a securities transfer agent as a service rep and trainer. The purpose of getting my CFP was to increase knowledge, refresh information and earn the CFP certification.
Zachary	Mineur	Good clarification.
Michelle	Minisci	More clear definition.
Lucianna	Molinari	Again, you are continuing to make access to this career unusually difficult.
Michael	Montante	I would add fiduciary standard in there to show difference with a broker (car salesman).
Lisa	Moore	I support the changes and have provided feedback as to the areas of potential improvement.
Scott	Morley	Sounds better
Caden	Mumford	Reflects better on the CFP standard and the requirements needed to achieve the marks.
Kahlela	Mungin	None
Thomas	Murphy	I don't see a practical difference. The public is not going to dig down to see the four 'e' requirements.
Lori	Nadglowski	No comment
Gregory	Nebel	Yes it is agreed that all of these components are necessary to the proper functioning of a CFP professional.
Tammie	Neeley	Please consider recognizing the AICPA's PFS exams as equivalent to passing the CFP exam. They are challenging and cover more material than the CFP exam. Thanks
Devin	Neitzel	Semantics and does not really change anything, so neither support nor oppose
Jack	Nelson	Well written
Jordan	Neuschwander	This makes the public aware of what all pertains to achieving a CFP designation.
Jeff	Nevlida	This disadvantages current CFP candidates that are working under the old system. More regulation does NOT create better financial planners.
Vu	Nguyen	Please reduce education requirements
Santine	Ngwe	I agree
Anthony	Nigro	RFI- Im not understanding the word COMPLETE in the new language? This is what I would like the new language to say; Candidate has met the minimum expectations (and list each part of the exam) and standards to practice independently as a financial planner. I think its redundant to list the education experience and ethics. To me those are qualifications you must have in order to sit for the exam. If I COMPLETE the exam but fail it does that allow me to attain the CFP? To me this new language can be challenged by an attorney.
Paramjit	Nijjar	I think ethics is not something you can effectively test with multiple choice questions. One should clearly understand and embody the ethics required to be a CFP. It should be an ongoing education, awareness and attestation.
Ilie	Nistor	seems about the same doesn't make a difference
John	Northrop	I support this but also agree that the team approach is what many of my clients are looking for. Do I need to know everything...my clients don't expect that. Do they

*Comments are verbatim, not edited for grammar or spelling.

CFP BOARD

CERTIFIED FINANCIAL PLANNER BOARD OF STANDARDS, INC.

First name	Last name (c/o firm name, if applicable)	Response
		expect me to know the person who has the answers: absolutely. Not sure how much the word 'independent' adds to the image the CFP(R) Board is looking to portray.
Johnny	Nuanes	More clarity is good
William	Oakland	Agreed
Sean	Oday	Education yes, Experience absolutely and ethics of course. The examination, I have taken twice and they are not real life situations in most cases. I have 15 plus years of experience in the industry in finance. I also do accounting and my own taxes and tax planning as a result of learning this from my college years and staying on top of tax laws that pertain to my clients. The exam is not realistic, nor should it take 6 hours to complete. I have taken it twice and won't again until things change in regards to this. Just because you don't pass a test doesn't mean you don't understand the topics that affect your clients. I was never a good test taker in college and only completed my finance degree program through speeches. Everyone learns differently. I was an A student with speeches for testing requirements in college, and a C-D student multiple choice testing. That is why I went to a college that allowed me to thrive in testing differently this way. Knowledge is not necessarily based on a test, but how it is presented in different ways to different individuals learning styles. Hopefully in the near future, like what my company is doing for financial planning, they view years of experience as a way to bypass most of the testing requirements for financial planning. Just my two cents worth.
Cherry	Ohms	Isn't it true that all four certification requirements (education, examination, experience, and ethics) are ALREADY CURRENTLY required for CFP certification?
Kelli	Olsheski	This supports the fiduciary role.
John	Oluwaleye	used by professions and governments to define the qualifications required for professionals to practise in a discipline. They define a range of levels of competency and the capabilities that are assumed to be achieved at these levels.
Daniel	O'Mealey	If the intent is to raise the perceived level of competence for our profession to that of a CPA, attorney, etc., the bar should be high.
Andrew	Oster (Triton Financial Group Inc)	I support this standard update. However, this standard necessarily cuts against allowing candidates without any actual financial education (JDs) to be exempt from the education standard.
Jason	Palmer	I fully agree that the clarification is helpful. Similar segmentation exists in other Licensed Professional Exams/Processes.
Jonathan	Panning	The new language is more accurate and better reflects the process that candidates must undergo to become CFP practitioners.
Jonathan	Panzica	Shows the candidate is a better fit to practice independently and shows they passed an ethical portion rather than just knowledge.
John	Parrillo	Exam is a must!
Jeff	Pasternack	No comment
Jammy	Pate	Clarity here is helpful

*Comments are verbatim, not edited for grammar or spelling.

CFP BOARD

CERTIFIED FINANCIAL PLANNER BOARD OF STANDARDS, INC.

First name	Last name (c/o firm name, if applicable)	Response
Jennifer	Patterson	This language better reflects the fact that all certification requirements, not just an exam, are what, collectively, demonstrate to the public that they have attained the competency level necessary to practice independently as a financial planner. To many people consumers are confused by individuals who list the fact that they have passed the CFP exam but have not met any of the other requirements.
Jason	Peck	Makes it more clear to the public what to expect.
Julia	Peloso-Barnes	I assume that the discussion regarding the intent of the exam in the original standard - 'designed to assess a candidate's ability to integrate and apply a broad base of financial planning knowledge in the context of real-life financial planning situations' - will be included somewhere in client-facing material. Making clear that it takes all four certification requirements to demonstrate the required competency provides clarity to the public.
Trent	Perry	I agree with this change.
Kris	Persinger	I am OK with this change
Kenneth	Peterson	How do you apply this standard to those who are employed by larger firms who actively retard the financial planner's ability to fully utilize their skills?
Michael	Peterson	This language helps educate those reading the description.
Zulma	Petty	New language clearly defines the 4 areas required for certification to obtain CFP.
Zach	Pidgeon	I like this wording adjustment.
Susan	Pilon	I like the expanded requirement language.
Daniel	Pinard	Yes, but as implied by this statement, all CFP professionals should be required to complete the entire CFP coursework requirement. There should be no exceptions for holding other credentials like ChFC, CLU, CPWA, etc.
Natalie	Pine	Several of our staff would not be able to practice independently after doing all this. They need more experience with clients to do no harm.
Kevin	Podell	I feel the new language is more appropriate.
James	Powell	Good clarification with an emphasis on ethics.
John	Power	That is the standard, not just the exam.
Hunter	Prasch	The wording makes sense and is easier to explain to the general public that don't know what the CFP certification requires.
Jacqueline	Price	No objection
Beverly	Provost	strengthens the brand and highlights what makes CFPs different than other advisors
Melissa	Pyle	Seems in line. Say what you mean and mean what you say, right? It's just more explicit.
Dana	Randall	I think what we have been doing for the last 30 years is good.
David	Raney	Good change, add.
Lawrence	Ransom	Far more concise.
Alan	Ray	This revision is not logical. Make the statement that the exam demonstrates the candidate's ability to apply the education to practical scenarios and perform the work independently. Liken it to board exams of the other professions requiring them. The proposed new language refers to all the certification requirements

*Comments are verbatim, not edited for grammar or spelling.

CFP BOARD

CERTIFIED FINANCIAL PLANNER BOARD OF STANDARDS, INC.

First name	Last name (c/o firm name, if applicable)	Response
		together. It shouldn't be here any more than it should be used to describe one of the other three.
Robert	Reay	YES!
Alyssa	Reed	Good - It spells out exactly what a CFP(R) has undergone so the public can understand and respect the designation.
Daniel	Rendler	Looks good/
Jacob	Rhodes	Support
Loredana	Rickard	Strongly support because passing the exam alone does not necessarily qualify someone to be a financial planner.
Finley	Robinson	yes, this seems more clear
Jody	Robinson	This wording is more clear and concise
Blake	Robson	N/a
Jeffrey	Roe	In my experience the real-life of financial planning carries more significant standing with the public, I wouldn't abandon that wording. The psychology of planning for the client is one of the most important pieces in achieving their goals.
David	Rowland	I support this.
Marsha	Rubin	Common sense.
Patricia Ann	Rudy-Baese	Keeps someone from sliding by in an area.
Jonathan	Russell	If I understand correctly, I support as I believe it is more the whole of 'education, exam, experience, and ethics' rather than solely the examination that demonstrates competency.
Chris	Russo	More through description.
Gary	Rychtanek	Seems reasonable.
Amanda	Rysiewicz	Shows the rigor of the process in an appropriate way and the mention of ethics is helpful
Joseph	Sachetta	All four requirements are necessary to demonstrate competency.
Melissa	Sanchez	It is required so not sure why it needs to be stated.
Seth	Sartain	I agree, all four E's are what ensure competency, not just the exam.
Laura	Satin	The public isn't necessarily comforted by someone passing an exam. Plenty of new lawyers who passed the bar exam do NOT yet have any idea what they are doing. The new proposed changes make sense to me.
James	Saulnier	If a consumer wants to hire someone with just three years experience, that should be their prerogative. But I don't think the CFP Board should essentially 'endorse' any advisor. I would endorse this if you remove the word 'independently', as that word implies you are endorsing their complete and total competency to practice.
Rob	Schaefer	I feel 'real-life' is actually a strong phrase and a differentiator of CFP vs other certs. I would leave that in.
Kyle	Schau	Unnecessary change to ultimately say the same thing. Adds additional work to update disclosures on materials, email signatures, websites, etc.
Charles	Schillicci	I attained my CFP certification in 1990. Since that time we have gone from unknown to being recognized as professionals that assist the public in a positive way. I advocate all standards that promote high standards for CFP Professionals.

*Comments are verbatim, not edited for grammar or spelling.

CFP BOARD

CERTIFIED FINANCIAL PLANNER BOARD OF STANDARDS, INC.

First name	Last name (c/o firm name, if applicable)	Response
Margery	Schiller	All of these skills are need in personal financial planning so they should be part of certification.
Erika	Schleifman	The exam indicates that the candidate has completed the study of the required areas of competency. In neither case ('old' vs. 'proposed') the candidate should not take his/her educational credential as carte blanche to offer full financial planning services. Experience is a better teacher of practices and issues in the practice of financial planning. Perhaps provide an 'Interim' planning designation for use to help widen the candidates' perspective and specific experience in the chosen field of Financial Planning.
Joy	Schlie	This seems reasonable.
William	Schretter	I like the old language better because it is focused on the benefit to the client, not compliance with an organizational rule. There is public value to the statement 'candidate's ability to integrate and apply a broad base of financial planning knowledge in the context of real-life financial planning situations'
Michael	Scott	I dontknow what you are proposing here it is poorly described ?
Byrke	Sestok	This makes more sense. The test is challenging. However its the combination of these 4 that demonstrate preparedness to hold oneself out as a CFP Professional.
Viney	Sethy	I support this change. However, do not weaken each of these components by taking backward looking initiatives that don't meet today's challenges. After three attempts, candidates should be timed-out. They should not be allowed to take the exam after three attempts. A minimum of 6 months wait time must be imposed, before taking the exam again.
Renee	Sewall	Good summary
Amy	Sharp	Agreed.
Cameron	Sharpe	It makes sense since these are all requirements.
James	Short	Sounds meaningful.
Tyler	Simonds	I support the change
Alisa	Skatrud	I support the language change, however I also support an education and exam process that more completely aligns to real-life financial planning situations - particularly as they may be tiered for clients in different financial situations. Right now, the test does not help newly minted CFPs understand which parts of their learning apply to mass-affluent vs. HNW vs. UHNW, and that is a disservice to both candidates and the public.
Garrett	Smith	I am in favor of this language change because passing the exam alone does not fully demonstrate a candidate's competency.
James	Smith	Better language
Roger	Smith	Letters without experience are useless
Scott	Smith	I think the new language is representative of the goal of the profession and seems more specific in scope than the current standard.
Eric Brian	Smith, Jr.	I think the language that talks about 'broad base of financial planning knowledge in the context of real-life financial planning situations' is better and more concise and should be left alone.

*Comments are verbatim, not edited for grammar or spelling.

CFP BOARD

CERTIFIED FINANCIAL PLANNER BOARD OF STANDARDS, INC.

First name	Last name (c/o firm name, if applicable)	Response
Fred	Soule	Much clearer
Kevin	Spencer	As a applicant that has failed twice on this exam, and the only area that I did poorly in was the ethic area, I would like the board to look at the responses to those questions. I feel that there is the correct CFP answer and several others that are ethically correct. If they are ethically correct, that is correct response to me. Certain firms have different standards that have ethical differences from the CFP board, but are still ethically correct. Those answers should be given consideration when compared to the CFP answers, as they are technically correct.
William	Stade	Except the 15 years experience prior to obtaining the credentials. This is just crazy.
Albert	Stanton	Updated verbiage sounds fine to me.
Jael	Stebbins	Higher standards = higher competency.
Matthew	Stewart	I think this language is more encompassing stating that the whole process demonstrates competency - rather than just the exam.
Scott	Stewart	The public doesn't even really know what financial planning is. This is simplifying the word count but not making the actual standard's language more accessible to the non-financial planning public.
Eric	Strom	I prefer the old one. We are talking about the examination alone within that language, so why would it need to address the other E's.
Bryan	Strong	All of this certification requirements are important prior to being awarded the CFP designation
Charles	Swanson	I don't see how this recommended change will have a significant impact on anyone's decision about obtaining a CFP certification. The problem continues to be the limited experience that qualifies a candidate.
Anastasia	Taber	No strong opinion on this - sounds okay to me.
John	Talleur	No strong feelings one way or another.
Christopher	Tasik	I do feel like you have watered down the exam dramatically which diminishes the value of the CFP designation.
Don	Taylor	The original standard is too one note, and the proposed change captures the total requirements of a candidate being allowed to be certified as a financial planning professional.
Travis	Taylor	I agree that it is the totality of the process that is important, not just the passing of the exam.
Victor	Tedesco	It would provide greater trust
Andrew	Thibeault	superfluous
John	Thomas	Sure fine.
Karrie	Thomas	Agree that all facets should be incorporated, not just passing of the exam.
Mark	Thompson	clarity of knowledge and application
Sarad	Tomlinson	not all CFPs may have an independent planning practice
Kieth	Tong	Exam should return to a 2 day 10 hour each day exam. It's obvious pass rates have increased due to less challenging path to obtain CFP. It's dumbed down!
Lynn	Tramontano	No opinion

*Comments are verbatim, not edited for grammar or spelling.

CFP BOARD

CERTIFIED FINANCIAL PLANNER BOARD OF STANDARDS, INC.

First name	Last name (c/o firm name, if applicable)	Response
Patrick	Trimp	No comment
Nicholas	Tupaj	I do not have an opinion on this measure. The language does seem to have a veil of approval from the Board as to the professionals prowess, which is something that should be taken into consideration when updating this language, but otherwise it does not seem to make much an effect any one way.
Spencer	Turkal	From personal experience I don't find this to be the case.
Inderdeep Singh	Uppal	Use of basic language and to make plans more worthy language is very important.. A cantonese peaker can influence a person who speaks the language properly as his questions can be ansqered wasily and the client feels more confortable
Andrea	Vaioli	Again, what kind of role they are in matters. They should have to complete apprenticeships and be doing actual financial planning in their day to day work to be allowed to use the marks.
Hannah	Varnado	I am ok with this either way
Cristal	Vernon	Good idea
Andrew	Vidal	I do not have a strong preference for one over the other. I believe both effectively communicate a similar message. I slightly prefer the updated language as it is more concise.
Gregory	Virant	No strong opinion but I like the emphasis on the four E's in the new wording.
Garrett	Von Behren	I like the old verbiage better, sounds more applicable to our clients' lives.
David	Voth	I think it is important to clarify this to candidates, practitioners, and the general public.
Kyle	Walchli	Na
Zach	Wallace	No change
Jennefer	Walsh	Passing the exam is not enough to prove that someone has attained a competency necessary to practice independently. Working with the public, or for the public, is a lot different than showing proficiency on a test, so I agree that including the 3 additional requirements is a positive change.
Lori	Walters	Completely agree. Becoming a CFP is more than knowing enough to pass a test. Calling out the four requirements reiterates the weight of the certification for people outside the industry.
Cody	Ward	I'm not certain that certification alone is enough to warrant this kind of judgement. If anything, maybe it's enough to signal that one is capable, but not much more than that.
Saviez	Wazir	I oppose it.
Rhonada	Weaver	I believe real-life FP situations should out weigh any other standard. You are adding way too much fluff. Education and Experience are more than enough.
James	Webb	Good with this.
Curt	Weil	Simple language is always better; emphasis on the four requirements makes this standard easier for the public to understand and appreciate.
Angella	Welcome	The new language is too complicated. Using the marks already comprises the four criteria. Let's not make it more confusing for the public to understand how to find a qualified advisor.

*Comments are verbatim, not edited for grammar or spelling.

CFP BOARD

CERTIFIED FINANCIAL PLANNER BOARD OF STANDARDS, INC.

First name	Last name (c/o firm name, if applicable)	Response
Mark	Wells	I like the change.
Jensen	Weynands	All of those are components to earning the designation, so it makes sense that they would all be mentioned.
Lanita	Wheetley	I support the proposed change and new language, but I still think that you need to be engaging in financial planning on a regular basis after passing the exam.
Marian	White	More precise and descriptive
Gaius	Whitfield	This seems like a necessary change.
Tyler	Wiegert	Seems unnecessary, but changing some words on the website can't cost all that much, so no real opinion.
Jacqueline	Willilams	I don't believe it is necessary to include the following language: 'By completing all four certification requirements—education, examination, experience, and ethics.' It is already implied that these standards have been met when the individual receives the CFP certification.
Roger	Wilson	I think it's a good idea for the proposed change
Alexander	Winstead	This only needs to be done if the experience portion is changed. based on prior feedback experience requirements should not be changed. The test, expectation and ethics requirements have direct correlation to one's performance years of experience do not.
Todd	Wnuk	I support only if all candidates for certification complete these requirements, not just get a CFP designation because they were a CPA or CFA. In my experience, working with individuals with those designations lack the depth and breadth of knowledge that completing the education program provides to candidates.
James	Wood	More comprehensive
Leah	Woodly	The new language is clear and concise, while highlighting the four Es.
Mark	Woodruff	Makes sense to uphold the certification standard.
Laura	Woods	The current standard is adequate. The proposed change seems unnecessary and overly complicates the certification process.
Laurence	Wulker	You have attained a professional level of competency but that level of competency is constantly under attack. Unless you practice independently and are compensated by the powers to be to maintain and upgrade it, you quickly lose it, Give it ten years and a fervent desire to maintain the level without any compensation. Again, it is not realistic.
Stephen	Yoskowitz	As mentioned previously, acknowledging the various ways in which one may be competent and qualified to practice as a CFP® is just logical given the diverse nature of the backgrounds of CFP® candidates.
Machaka	Young	No further comment
Z	Z	It sounds better
Ian Zabel	Zabel	I couldn't discern the difference
Erica	Zacharie	Will this change the timeline for licensure? How will the experience portion be assessed? Again, ambiguous in drafting. Suggest revision.
Daria	Zalewska	This sounds good to me. Yes, by completing all 4 requirements professionals are competent to practice independently. The exam is just one part of this. Although

*Comments are verbatim, not edited for grammar or spelling.

CFP BOARD

CERTIFIED FINANCIAL PLANNER BOARD OF STANDARDS, INC.

First name	Last name (c/o firm name, if applicable)	Response
		by completing the exam, you have also attained the education requirement, but all four are needed.
Mark	Zeigler	I think the proposed language is more clear.
E	A	I don't think that the examination (the current or the proposed) demonstrates the competency to practice independently as a financial planner.