CALL JILL WHITE
FOR MORE INFORMATION
888.495.7303

THE CASE AGAINST BOOK PRUNING

THE **BILL GOOD MARKETING SYSTEM®** IS FIRST AND FOREMOST A SYSTEM.

THAT MEANS IT COMBINES MANY ELEMENTS INTO A SINGLE UNIT.

WE DEFINE THE SYSTEM AS

A COMPUTER-BASED, CLIENT MARKETING, PROSPECTING, AND **PRACTICE MANAGEMENT** SYSTEM.

CONTENTS

AUTHOR'S NOTE

Since 1992, I have been trying to kill off the idea that you increase revenue by getting rid of clients.

The four articles here, all originally published in Research, are the definitive case against the idea. I am presenting them to you in the order they were written.

NEVER, EVER, EVER GIVE UP A CLIENT

Smaller accounts can be very profitable if managed correctly.

March 1992

Sometime in the early eighties I first encountered an interpretation of the 80-20 rule that I now believe to be nearly fatal to an individual business and possibly the cause of major damage to the industry itself.

The 80-20 rule, as I'm sure you know, simply says: 80 percent of an advisor's business comes from 20 percent of his or her book.

But the interpretation went like this: Since much more than 20 percent of our time is spent on the 80 percent that produces just 20 percent

of our business, then production should go up if we just eliminate the bottom part of our book. Over time, various trainers have recommended this, various firms have institutionalized book pruning, and countless FAs have practiced it on their own.

Bad-Year Phenomenon

I began to suspect something was wrong with this interpretation when I started to run into what I called the "bad-year phenomenon.'' In the course of a conversation with an FA, I would find he or she was having a bad year. But this was during the years of the great bull market, and bad years were unusual. In time, when I would encounter the "bad-year phenomenon." I would find myself asking the following questions:

Bill: A few years ago, did you give away a bunch of accounts?

FA: As a matter of fact, I did. For the past couple of years, I've been purging the bottom 20 percent of my book. Every January, the new kids are lined up. I just don't have time to talk to everybody. So I give them away.

Bill: What happened to production?

FA: Well, it initially went up, but for some reason, it's down now.

I'll say more about this connection below.

Morality of Book Pruning

Personally, I don't think a lot of the ethics of book pruning. If someone confided in you and trusted you, I think your continued care and attention comes with the territory. And as I'll show you, even

the smallest accounts--the ones you want to prune--can be highly profitable.

But even if that weren't true, I think it's a fairly low act to dismiss a client simply because they don't do sufficient business. How would you like it if the service department at your car dealership wouldn't deal with you because you didn't have sufficient damage? They'd have to tie you, gag you, and bind you to keep you quiet.

Well, what about your client who calls in frequently, but who buys only five units of a bond fund once every two years? That client is your worst nightmare, isn't he? Lots of work. Little return.

No one forced you to open that account. Unless you turn it down from the beginning, that little client is, in my book, entitled to the same first-class treatment that you give Mr. Big.

Now, having said all this, let me pose an even bigger reason:

Discounters and No-loaders Love Your Marginal Accounts

I cannot prove what I am about to say, but I believe it very strongly. The rise of the discounters, no-loaders and low-loaders exactly parallels the rise of the book pruning movement, and has contributed substantially to the competitive problems you now have.

As individual FAs have neglected or abandoned their small accounts, Fidelity--like the carnivorous plant in Little Shop of Horrors--kept singing "Feed Me, Feed Me!" In thousands of ads, the no- and low-loaders told small investors: "YOUR MONEY IS WELCOME HERE!" Many of the smaller accounts, wooed by this competition, grew up and became big accounts.

And as trillions of dollars pass from the WWII generation to their baby-boomer heirs, many of those accounts will become the "affluent investor" market that you have been urged to abandon your smaller accounts in favor of.

Even More Reasons to Keep Smaller Accounts

So far, we've got two really good reasons for keeping all accounts:

1. Abandoning smaller accounts is a crummy thing to do.
2. Feeding your competition creates monsters.

These should be sufficient reasons NEVER to give up a client, but in case these don't bite, I have a couple of other reasons:

You Never Know Where Next Year's 80% is Coming From

I owe this insight to my friend, Bill Tennison.

Some years ago, I asked all the seven-figure producers I knew to tell me their experience with the 80-20 rule, because there was something about it I still didn't understand.

One day, I asked Bill T.:

BG: Tell me, Bill, does the 80-20 rule work for you?

BT: Absolutely. In fact, for me it's more like 90-10. But I never, ever throw away a client because I never know where next year's top 20 percent is coming from. Bingo! I had it. This was the complete explanation for the "bad-year phenomenon" I had wrestled with.

Consider the source of next year's top 20 percent:

1. This year's top 20 percent. You can absolutely count on some repeaters.
2. Referrals from this year's top 20 percent.
3. New clients from prospecting campaigns.
4. Bottom 80 percent clients who either had money stashed somewhere or got more.
5. Referrals from bottom 80 percent.

Bill Good MARKETING

Bill T. told me about an elderly client of his who did a very modest amount of business. One day her sister, Velda Oldebucks, called. One thing led to another, and before long. Bill had one of his top 10 accounts.

So, by neglecting or pruning your bottom 80 percent, you cut off two out of five feeder lines into next year's top 20 percent. And that's just plain dumb.

If you still need more reasons for not feeding the Fidelity monster, try this:

You can do $2 Million Per Year on Smaller Accounts

That's right. You didn't misread this. No, you can't do it by yourself. You have to have a team. But consider the following example:

Suppose you've got a bunch of accounts that do $5,000 every two years of some fund or other. That's $200 a year in commission.

IF you have a team in place; IF you stay in touch by direct mail; and IF you only talk to your clients when they're ready to buy; then this little account is suddenly very profitable.

Ask yourself this: If my sales assistant calls every three months; if my smaller clients get letters every month; if my service assistant promptly handles any service requests; then how long will it take to close a

$200 order? Answer: 10 minutes.

- Question: What's your hourly rate? Answer: $1,200 an hour.
- Question: How many hours a day do you work? Answer: About eight.
- Question: So if you could spend your day handling $200 orders at the rate of six per hour, how much would you make gross a day? Answer: $9,600.
- Question: My calculations show that that's $48,000 for a 40-hour work-week. If you did that for 40 weeks, that's $1,920,000 a year, plus 12 weeks of vacation. Are you doing that now by throwing away your smaller accounts?

Smaller accounts can be VERY PROFITABLE if managed correctly. Don't abandon them. Don't give them away. Don't throw out two sources of next year's top 80 percent.

If you get an uncontrollable urge to waste valuable resources. I have another option. Just send me a check! You'll be better off. I'll be better off. Your clients will be better off. So there will be a net social gain.

Got it? Great!

Thankyouverymuch.

PRUNE YOUR BOOK: THE BAD IDEA THAT WILL NOT DIE

March 2001

I first saw the "Prune Your Book" idea pop up in the early to mid-eighties. By 1986-87, I had clearly associated this odd notion of getting rid of clients with what I then called the "Bad Year Phenomenon." I didn't fully understand the connection, just that there was one.

In this first great surge of the bull market, I frequently ran into (mostly) broker-types who would admit in the course of conversation that they were having a bad year. When most everyone was having a great year, it was odd to run into people having a lousy one. So I poked around, asked questions, and after quite a few such conversations, I settled in on a first question to ask whenever the "Bad Year Phenomenon" stuck its head up out of the mud.

"A couple of years ago," I would ask, "did you give away a bunch of accounts?" Many times-not always, because there are many reasons for having a bad year-the answer was, "Yes."

"And then what happened?"

"Oh, production went up immediately. I didn't have to handle all those stupid little pesky questions from little clients... blah, blah, natter, complain, moan, whine."

"What happened after that?" I usually asked.

"I don't know. I'm working harder. Something's missing. I don't know what's wrong."

This first wave of "Prune Your Book" promptly disappeared on October 19, 1987 when the market took its now historic plunge. No one was kicking out revenue sources.

But it surfaced again by 1989. I tried to kill it again and did a pretty good job of driving it out of one of the major firms. Like some critter in a radioactive waste dump, the damn thing has mutated again. Since I know this idea is bad for you, bad for the goodwill enjoyed by you and your firm, and just crummy personal ethics should you decide to go down this sorry road, I'll make another stab at driving a wooden stake into its heart.

The real issue is a complete misunderstanding of ...

The 80-20 Rule

Here's the logic of book pruning:

80% of your business comes from 20% of your book. True statement.

But you spend more than 20% of your time with the 80% of your clients who produce the 20% of your revenue. Also a true statement.

Therefore, if you chop off some of the clients at the bottom, you free up time to work with the 20% that produce the 80%. This increases your revenue. A true statement, in the short run.

Two years later, your business sags or even collapses. Also a true statement. To fully understand why this is the inevitable end of this sorry story, read, "Never, Ever, Ever Give Up A Client." (Research Magazine, November 1992. I have archived all articles I have written since 1984 at www.billgoodmarketing.com. Click on the Marketing Info link. I've put a special link to this article in Marketing Info.)

Book Pruning "Success" Stories

I did a round of seminars last November in Canada. Because so many people were wrestling with the issue, I took it on. It came up in January at a talk I did for some branch managers at one of the big bank brokerages. Many people have since told me they are glad I talked them out of throwing clients overboard.

In Canada, I heard two "success stories" on book pruning.

In the first instance, I was told of a broker with one of the major Canadian firms who had literally purged her book of the bottom 80%. Out of 250 clients, she threw 200 overboard so she could work with her top fifty. As the story was relayed to me, "She's starting to feel like she shouldn't have done it." I bet she was feeling that way because you see the 80-20 rule really, really is a law. 80% of her business will now have to come from 20% of her clients-all ten of them. **My prediction:** Within a year, she's moved on the to the elephant graveyard for FAs-the car lot.

In the second instance, I spoke with one of the top producers at one of Canada's premier firms. His book was many hundreds of millions of dollars. He took some expert's advice and offloaded every client with less than $50,000 in their account. About 400 clients got the heave-ho.

He told me, "I cannot go to the grocery store without someone coming up and berating me in public for doing what I did."

I asked him how he felt about it.

"Terrible. I wish I could undo it.

Key Question

So how do you grow your business when you can't afford to work with the little client?

The answer is: you build a team. You bring in associate FAs. You hire Service and Sales Assistants. You do exactly what I've been telling you to do since I started writing for this magazine in 1990. That little client who has $5000 to invest, if properly managed, is worth $1000 an hour to you...if you, personally, only have to talk with them when they have been thoroughly prepped by your staff. Period. End of argument. Thankyouverymuch.

I totally, absolutely and completely believe that the financial services industry not only will be, but also is being dominated by the large team. I have read estimates that you will need $250 million in assets to weather the competitive storms coming this way. Maybe. Maybe not.

But with banks, CPA firms (that used to send you referrals), insurance agents, enrolled agents, and who-knows-who-else piling into the financial services industry, does it make sense to give up revenue streams? Negative.

Does it make sense to chop off two of the five lines that feed your A-book two years from now? Hardly. And given all your good works to create goodwill, how much sense does it make to create ill will so intense that the clients you threw overboard will surface in a grocery store and chew you another one?

You know the answer.

So, when some alleged efficiency expert comes along and recommends you prune this or that percentage, I want you to do a little exercise before you do it. Get a list of the 20% that produce the 80%. Beside each, write down one of these five numbers:

- #1 = Referral from big client
- #2 = Referral from big client, and this big client was in turn referred somewhere down the chain by a small client.
- #3 = Formerly small client who came into money you would have never guessed. (This would be a client you are considering throwing off your truck were he or she a little client today.)
- #4 = Referral from a small client
- #5 = Came from some kind of prospecting campaign, cold calling, seminars, whatever.

Now add up the number of 1's, 2's, etc. Figure out what percentage of your clients came directly or indirectly from your small clients.

Then you decide if the person who is advising you to drown those little clients-people who helped bring you to the dance in the first place-really has your interests in mind.

If you do this study, please e-mail your responses to me at billgood@billgoodmarketing.com. I will do a future article on the information you send me.

BOOK PRUNING REVISITED

June 2001

So we are back where we started. The Gorilla CRM System for Financial Advisors is a computer-based, contact management, client marketing, prospecting and practice management system. It is a system—not a program.

It is designed for multi-million-dollar teams—not solo practitioners. It is a proven way to build your business. We hope to see you in Salt Lake for training soon.

In my March column, I did my best to drive a wooden stake in the heart of the book pruning movement. Since it still pulses with life, I thought I would try another stake- responses I received from my first article.

(For additional information, see my 1992 article, "Never, Never Give Up A Client Unless He or She Becomes a Jerk." You can read it in the Marketing Info section of my website at www.billgoodmarketing.com. All the articles I have written since January 1984 are also available there... and are FREE.)

As you might imagine, I received more responses from this article than from any other in some time. So, for the balance of this article, I am going to let my correspondents speak for themselves. In most cases, my correspondents are from national firms and their opinions are divergent from strategies being promoted by their employer. So, in order to protect the innocent, I am omitting their names.

Why Production Goes Down After Book Pruning

There are three reasons why production goes down, perhaps a year or two later:

1. A decent percentage of your top 20% isn't there.

   In "Bad Idea," I recommended that you analyze your top 20% and see how many of them came from bottom clients, through referrals or unexpectedly coming into money.

   Hi Bill, I did the exercise you described for my top 20% of my clients. I have 27% of my top fifth that came from smaller account relationships.

If 27% of your "A" book is producing for someone else, you've just signed up for a 20% income reduction plan. (27% times the 80%=21%)

2. The income reduction plan may in fact be much bigger than 20% because you miss out on rollovers, property sales, inheritances, i.e., the big stuff.

   I couldn't agree with you more. Also, as I am sure you know, the problem with discarding the 80% that don't give you business is that the composition of the top 20% is constantly changing. In effect, you will still get 80% from the 20% but which 20%?? I recently had a client give me $1.3MILLION... he and his wife had given me only about $1000 in revenue over last 4 years. But when his wife inherited the money, they moved from the 80% to the 20% section in a hurry!!! They were pleased that I could send them birthday letters and give them "90-Day No-Contact calls" every now and then so they want to do the business with me!

3. Book pruning absolutely rests on the theory that the pruners will use the extra time to prospect. Here's a view on what actually happens.

   Great article in Research this month! There's another fatal flaw in the seductive theory of pruning one's book that doesn't seem to get any attention.

   As you are aware, the theory is that if you prune your book, you'll actually have time to prospect and duplicate your top clients. Thus, you should double your business within a couple years because of the extra time to prospect.

   In reality, however, very few established financial consultants are motivated to break old habits and actually go out and prospect. That's the flaw in the theory. In reality, FCs will normally choose to work half as much rather than try to make twice as much.

   So, I think you're right. Business will slow down for the most part after pruning due to the fact that they're not replacing the lost income. Of course, FCs will continue to receive referrals from top clients, but those would come with or without the book pruning, right?

   I think the Management at many firms understand the economics of the 80-20 rule, but underestimate the FC's desire to go out and prospect. Stay tuned...

But Not Everyone Agrees

Oh Bill, Bill, Bill ...

Are you ever gonna get comments on your March article for Research! I should tell you that your organization is one of the best things to ever happen to this industry but I couldn't disagree with you more regarding "pruning."

My associate and I constantly look for better ways to service our clients and a primary tool for us is to regularly fire or re-assign clients. I don't think it's fair to any client that they not receive the very best service at all times and when you have clients that do not generate revenue, or are time-wasters or represent ongoing problems, they should either be terminated or passed on to other brokers. We won't waste our time with these kinds of clients but that doesn't mean they're not entitled to the best possible service, just not from us. Therefore we feel our best option is to pass them on to newer brokers who might be willing to deal with them. If they are totally incorrigible, we'll simply terminate them. Why would any broker want to keep these clients on their books? It seems to me that one of the great benefits of our profession is we can pick and choose who we want to do business with.

We have been actively "pruning" our book for over five years and our capital under management, gross production, and average assets per client have literally exploded to the upside. We now require a minimum of $100,000 (soon to be raised to $250,000) before we'll even consider doing business and virtually all of our new clients have to agree to put their money under professional management. We have about as close to a cookie cutter approach to our business as a person can have and a lot of it is due to "pruning."

I think your article misses a very important point and that is, the more time you devote to your poor quality clients the less time you have available to service your quality clients. Incidentally, I went through your drill of the top 20% of my clients and found that all but one client either came from one of my seminars or was a referral from a large client.

Comment: For you to continue to grow your business, you must:

a. Build it from clients who will be getting richer, even when you hit the maximum number you can handle,

b. You must build a team. I have proven over and again that a team approach enables average producers to become multi-million producers. Even Violet Bluehairre is worth more than $1000 in revenue per hour as long as you are not the primary relationship manager but have delegated that to team members. See my 1992 article, and

c. You prune your book and aggressively prospect.

I question the author of this last letter. At the time you started pruning, I will bet you dimes to dollars you implemented other strategies, which are primarily responsible for the explosion in business you have enjoyed.

With that said, there are two other reasons for NOT PRUNING YOUR BOOK.

1. Crummy ethics. Certainly, you are entitled to do business with whomever you please. But no one forced you to take the client in the first place. To gain someone's trust and then tell them, "Sorry, but you're not big enough" carries with it the same odor of crummy-ness as the guy or gal who will go to the dance with one person and go home with a younger prettier/bigger studlier model.

2. Generates bad will. You might be able to get away with it in a big city... and maybe not. I refer you to the anecdote in my "Bad Idea That Will Not Die." A pruner threw 400 clients off his truck, and as he related, "I can't even go to the grocery store without someone coming up to me and berating me in public."

My recommendation: Decide who to accept. Unless they become jerks, they're yours. Build a team to take care of them. Live happily ever after.

If you have any other thoughts or comments on book pruning, I would love to see them. I would especially like to hear from firm management.

THE UNDEAD RISE AGAIN: YET ANOTHER ATTEMPT TO KILL THE BOOK PRUNING MOVEMENT

Chances are you will have this copy of the magazine in hand on, or about Halloween. You either have, or shortly will have various ghostly phenomena. I would like to suggest that there is another ghostly phenomenon frequently breathing its foul breath in your face. It's there year-round.

It is the undead idea that you can increase revenue by getting rid of "non-ideal clients." Since 1992, I have been trying to drive a wooden stake into the heart of this idea. I have written four major articles in Research on it, and mentioned it another dozen times or so.

Yet it still rises, undead and destructive. My friend John Bowen, writing in Financial Planning, has dragged the undead corpse out once again. While I have failed (so far) in my efforts to kill it off, I've wounded it. And I'm ready to have another go at it.

In this article, I am not going to go into detail about the case I made against "book pruning." You will find my complete case against it at www.billgood.com/retention. Since the secret for growing your business is a bigger client base, not a smaller one, I have also put there another white paper, "Survival Strategy #1: Keep What You've Got." It outlines how to maintain client relationships.

Summary: The Case against Book Pruning

This notion that getting rid of clients is a good thing is:

1. A guaranteed income reduction plan. I have long since lost count of how many people I have spoken to over a period of many years whose income went down after severing client relationships.

   The reason this bad idea won't die, and wanders through the world of the undead is that it takes about two years for the effects of the amputation to work its way through your business. If book pruning were like sticking a paper clip into an electrical outlet, with its consequent and immediate ZAP, no one would preach it. But sadly, it takes a while to corrode your business.

2. Crummy ethics. A watchword today is "trusted advisor." You focus daily on creating and maintaining a trusted advisor relationship. Yet many of the clients, Bowen and others, would have you toss to the side of the road are the people that helped you come to the party when you were a pup.

   Perhaps you opened an account 15 years ago on a cold call. No one forced you to take the account. And now the little old lady who extended you her trust needs help. And you are going to sell the clients who helped you because they are no longer "ideal"? You are going to build trusted-advisor relationships, but first breach the trust with others? You are going to sleep at night?

3. A deep hole of intense ill will. Suppose you call your plumber, Savage Plumbing. A pipe breaks and you need help. After looking up your record, you are told in a voice dripping with sugar, "I'm so sorry. You are not a preferred client and we sold your account to Aw Ful Plumbing." How many of your friends would you tell about what Savage did to you?

   Now granted, Savage Plumbing wouldn't put it in those terms. Undoubtedly, the bag of dung you got handed would be wrapped in perfumed paper. But you would know what's in the package, wouldn't you? Your clients will also know they have been handed that same foul package when you follow the routine John recommends as the best way to say "Goodbye."

Special request: John Bowen uses survey data to help prove his point that getting rid of clients is a good thing. I think he surveyed the wrong people. The correct sample would be FAs who got rid of clients. What effects did that act have on your clients, your business, and you? If you did the deed, especially if you did it at least two years ago, please do not pass go, but proceed directly to: www.billgood.com/retention.

Special Offer: I will send a free copy of my new book to the first fifty people who did the deed AND complete the survey. I will write up the responses in a future issue of Research.

If you have not done it, but have been listening to the yammering of people who counsel this nonsense, go to my website now and download, "The Bad Idea that Will Not Die" and "Client Relationship Retention." Read those, and then drive your own wooden stake into its heart.

If enough people refuse to play, it will die, and I can stop having to run through the graveyard of the undead, clutching a wooden stake, mallet in hand. (OK, I know a wooden stake driven into the heart of a vampire will kill the creature. Maybe we are dealing with a vampire. Consider: the clients you toss are the lifeblood of your business 2–5 years from now.)

Should You Keep All Clients?

There are valid reasons to get rid of clients. "Non-ideal" status is not one of them.

The three categories of clients who should be pushed overboard are.

1. Jerks. These are the people you just cannot bear to talk to because of their rude, ill-mannered "communication skills." At my company, if someone swears at one of my staff, or is continually verbally abusive, they get a "manners enhancement" discussion with me.

   If they don't immediately straighten up, they are listening to the proverbial dial tone, never to hear from us again. Life is too short to spend any time dealing with these folks regardless of whether it's Bob Big or Les Little.

2. People who mostly will not follow your advice. The key word is "mostly." You are in the advice business, and if the relationship between you and a client is such they will not ever, or rarely take your direction, they need to go somewhere else for help.

3. People who will not communicate with you. One of the articles in "The Bad Idea that Will Not Die" shows you how to deal with this group. I've even included sample letters and phone scripts that lead to one of two forks in the road: client reforms and begins to communicate, or client is gently nudged to go elsewhere.

With that said, let's examine John Bowen's argument in favor of the "book pruning."

The Case for Book Pruning

In "Time to Say Goodbye" (Financial Planning, September 2008), John wrote:

"Consider CEG Worldwide®'s recent research on advisors' success. We grouped 2,094 advisors using two primary criteria: whether their net income was more or less than $300,000 and whether they served more than 150 clients, or 150 or fewer.

"One group of advisors—those with net incomes of more than $300,000 and 150 or fewer clients, on average—clearly excelled. This select group, representing a mere 12.8% of all advisors surveyed—earned an average net income of about $416,000. The next best group earned only $386,000, and these advisors had to serve more clients to generate that smaller income.

"Clearly, the select group of advisors has figured out how to generate high incomes from relatively few clients. *Other advisors would be wise to emulate these top advisors by working with fewer but better clients*. (Emphasis added.)"

There is a huge hole in this argument. The people who should have been surveyed are the people who actually threw clients off the truck and lived to tell about it. Just because one group has a smaller client base and makes more money is not at all evidence that shrinking your client base will help you increase your income. The smaller client base of bigger clients could be the result of superior investment skills, or even superior prospecting skill. The more affluent FAs could have prospected a high-net-worth market to begin with and so required fewer clients to meet their own income goals.

Case closed.

Another Solution

Let's pose the question: Why would someone you accepted as a client become "non-ideal"? Could it be a problem with you, not the client?

I have been told but cannot completely verify this datum: In the major firms, where the book pruning movement originated, most complaints and legal problems come from small clients, not big ones. That was the origin of book pruning. Get rid of your potential problems.

OK. Then let's ask: Why would small clients be such a source of trouble? Most likely answer: the advisor doesn't pay any attention to them. All of the focus goes to Mr. Big. Then the little guy, not getting any communication, service, or attention gets so upset, he or she files a complaint.

So the wet blanket thrown over this smoking mess is the idea that your revenue will go up if you get rid of all the little guys you have ignored. I don't think so.

Let me propose an alternate solution. What if you actually develop a team, and that team has primary responsibility to contact and maintain relationships with everyone. No one slips through the cracks. No one gets ignored.

Now granted, Mr. or Ms. Big should get extra attention, but there is a minimum amount of attention that every person you have accepted as a client should receive. I have fully outlined this in my white paper, "Client Relationship Retention."

If complaints and problems come from people ignored, wouldn't the solution be, "don't ignore them"? And what about this idea? As I have proven (see my White Paper "Surefire Team Development" also available from my client retention website), you are worth $1,000 an hour in gross revenue to your firm when you meet with, and talk to clients and prospects about investing.

If you are doing that full time, you should be generating around $2,000,000 per year. That's a lot more than what John Bowen is talking about. And you can do that, as I have proven countless times, with "the little guys." I know advisors in parts of the country where there aren't any big guys. Yet there we see multi-million dollar production from well-organized teams.

So—if you have thought bad thoughts, and are considering hurling a bunch of your small clients under the bus, go take a cold shower and then run, don't walk to my website. Study the issue before you act

"I designed MY SYSTEM **to help you** double **YOUR PRODUCTION OR WORK HALF** as much. Over the years, thousands of financial advisors have accomplished more in less time because they have followed MY TIME-TESTED, FIELD-PROVEN SYSTEM.

THE SYSTEM WORKS IF YOU DO."

BILL GOOD MARKETING, INC
6891 South 700 West, Suite 100
Midvale, UT 84047

billgoodmarketing.com