Anti-money laundering and the struggle with risk-based legislation

Martin Dilly, CAMS-Audit Director, AML Solutions



Agenda

- 1. The AML/CFT Act
- 2. Risk-based Approach Benefits & Challenges
- 3. Observations



The Act

The AML/CFT Act sets out the high level obligations and responsibilities on reporting entities including:

- Developing and maintaining a risk assessment
- Developing and implementing a risk-based AML/CFT programme



The Act

- Increased customer identification and verification (know who your customers are, i.e. beneficial ownership and who exercises control)
- Ongoing customer due diligence and transaction monitoring
- Enhanced suspicious transaction reporting (STR)



The Act

- Improved record keeping requirements
- Employee vetting and training
- Independent auditing
- Annual reporting



The Act – Risk Assessment

Must have regard to the following:

- a) the nature, size, and complexity of its business
- b) the products and services it offers
- c) the methods by which it delivers products and services to its customers



The Act – Risk Assessment

- d) the types of customers it deals with
- e) the countries it deals with
- f) the institutions it deals with
- g) any applicable guidance material (e.g. Sector Risk Assessments)



A Risk-Based Approach

- Not a NZ invention.
- Based on international guidance, primarily Financial Action Task Force (FATF).
- See FATF's 'Guidance on the Risk-based Approach to Combating Money Laundering and Terrorist Financing -*High Level Principles and Procedures',* June 2007



A Risk-Based Approach - Benefits

- More efficient and effective use of limited resources
- Minimise burden on customers
- Makes it more difficult for criminals to launder due to:
 - increased focus on high risk activities
 - adapt more quickly



A Risk-Based Approach - Benefits

"An effective risk-based approach will allow financial institutions to exercise reasonable business judgment with respect to their customers."



A range of reporting entities:

- FMA issuers of securities, trustee companies, futures dealers, collective investment schemes, brokers, and financial advisers – 707 entities
- RBNZ banks, life insurers, and non-bank deposit takers – 60 entities



 DIA - casinos, non-deposit taking lenders, money changers, and other financial institutions not supervised by the FMA or RBNZ – 862 entities



- Subjectivity leads to uncertainty
- Need for expertise
- Staff uncomfortable making risk-based judgments:
 - Overly cautious
 - Disproportionate time spent
- Risk assessments are not static



- Supervisors and auditors:
 - A number of solutions to the same "problem"
 - Not a pass/fail exercise
 - Guidance may need to be high level to accommodate a number of approaches
 - Specifically, auditors are not expected to audit the judgment calls made in the risk assessment



Observations

- Not capturing all applicable products
- Not excluding exempt products
- Not including enough detail
- No consideration of Sector Risk Assessments
- Risk assessment doesn't flow through to the Programme



Observations

- Methodology:
 - Framing of risks
 - Overly complex methodology
 - Explaining risk levels



Observations

• "De-risking":

"A risk-based approach should not be designed to prohibit financial institutions from engaging with customers or establishing relationships with potential customers..."



Contact details

Martin Dilly CAMS-Audit Director AML Solutions Office: +64 9 520 1144 Mobile: +64 21 577 822 martin@amlsolutions.co.nz nz.linkedin.com/in/martindilly/ www.amlsolutions.co.nz

