





Project against Economic Crime (PECK)

Explanatory meetings on Questionnaires for the antimoney laundering/combating the financing of terrorism (AML/CFT) and anti-corruption (AC) components

11 – 12 July 2012

Module 16

Risk, Customer Due Diligence, PEPs, Secrecy, Reporting, Protection and Shell Banks

Sections 3.1 to 3.4, Sections 3.6 to 3.8







Project against Economic Crime (PECK)

Section 3.1

Risk of Money Laundering or Terrorist Financing







Project against Economic Crime (PECK)

Risk – who are the national players?

- National policy-makers (for systemic risk issues)
- Law enforcement (for national typologies)
- Regulators (for approach to risk in supervisory procedures)
- Financial institutions (for approach to managing risk in their business)







Project against Economic Crime (PECK)

Overview of Risk

- Risk is a complex area for several reasons:
 - Issues have potential impact across a large number of the FATF Recommendations
 - Risk assessment is an art not a science
 - Risk factors will vary from jurisdiction to jurisdiction
 - Many jurisdictions have a limited experience of a risk-based approach
 - We must ensure that we are talking the same language







Project against Economic Crime (PECK)

Risk Treatment in the FATF Recommendations

- FATF Recommendations contain multiple references to ML/FT risk and risk management
- Key elements that we need to identify are:
 - coverage within definition of financial institutions
 - application of CDD measures
 - scope of supervision by competent authorities







Project against Economic Crime (PECK)

Response to Risk

- Response to risk works both ways:
 - reduced measures where risk is proven to be low
 - increased measures where risk is perceived to be high
- It is not mandatory to apply a risk-based approach, except when dealing with high or specifically identified risks:
 - Jurisdictions cannot be criticised for adopting strictly rules-based approach







Project against Economic Crime (PECK)

Systemic Risk

- In the case of financial institutions, there is some scope to limit or not apply standards:
 - to a particular financial activity or type of institution "in strictly limited and justified circumstances, and based on a proven low risk of money laundering…"
 - to entities "when a financial activity is carried out by a person or entity on an occasional or very limited basis...such that there is little risk of money laundering..."







Project against Economic Crime (PECK)

FATF has produced extensive guidance on application of RBA

- Type of Guidance:
 - Sector-specific documents on FATF website
 - Produced in cooperation with the private sector
- Guidance does not constitute change to the Standard, but should help for informed discussions and application.
- Guidance Documents structured to address:
 - Purpose of risk-based approach
 - Guidance for public authorities Some high level principles and key implementation issues
 - Guidance for private sector Key risk categories, application of RBA and internal controls







Project against Economic Crime (PECK)

Questions for discussion – Sec 3.1 (Risk)

- Has a decision been taken not to apply certain required AML/CFT measures to a particular financial sector based on an analysis of ML and TF risks?
- If so, what is the outcome? Under what basis?
- Has a decision been taken to apply a risk based approach for CDD by the financial sector?
- Is a risk based approach applied for supervisory purposes?







Project against Economic Crime (PECK)

Section 3.2 – Recommendation 5

Customer Due Diligence







Project against Economic Crime (PECK)

Key Features and Objectives of Recommendation 5

- Recommendation 5 is a particularly complex area
- Large number of detailed points: 18 EC
- Criteria have to be applied to all 13 financial activities, as applicable
- CDD is an area where the risk-sensitive approach may be widely used in certain jurisdictions
- Recommendation 5 sets the triggers for other important Recommendations, and in particular for reporting purposes







Project against Economic Crime (PECK)

Key players for Recommendation 5

- Policy-makers (for overview of regulatory framework)
- Financial services regulators (for details of objectives, structures, resources and procedures)
- Private sector institutions (for their perception of regulatory requirements and procedures and implementation issues)
- Professional associations (for industry-wide perspective)







Project against Economic Crime (PECK)

What is Customer Due Diligence (CDD)?

- CDD is more than simple customer identification i.e. more than taking the name of the customer. CDD is:
 - a) Identifying the customer & verifying customer's identity from independent sources
 - b) Identifying and verifying beneficial ownership and control
 - c) Establishing intended purpose and nature of the business relationship
 - d) Conducting ongoing due diligence and scrutiny of the relationship and transactions & keep records up to date







Project against Economic Crime (PECK)

Core Identification Measures

General principle is to establish customer's identity using reliable, independent source documents, data or information (which will vary from jurisdiction-to-jurisdiction) (EC.5.3)— hence anonymous accounts not allowed (EC5.1)

- For natural persons, typically obtain
 - Name, date of birth and nationality
 - Address and other contact details
- For legal persons or arrangements, obtain
 - Proof of incorporation/creation
 - Identity of signatories, directors, trustees
 - Legal authority of signatories to act







Project against Economic Crime (PECK)

When is CDD required?

- Establishing business relationships
- Occasional single or series of transactions of €15,000 and over
- Occasional wire transfers of €1,000 and over
- There is suspicion of ML or FT irrespective of any thresholds
- There are doubts on veracity of customer identification data obtained







Project against Economic Crime (PECK)

Required CDD measures (1/2)

- Customer whether permanent or occasional, natural or legal person - and verify information
- For legal persons ensure authorisation of person acting on behalf of and identify and verify information
- For legal persons verify legal status
- For legal persons identify and verify beneficial owner
- For all customers determine whether customer is acting on behalf of another – identify and verify both







Project against Economic Crime (PECK)

Required CDD measures (2/2)

- For legal persons understand ownership and control structure
- For legal persons identify mind and management
- Understand purpose and intended nature of business relationship
- Conduct ongoing due diligence of relationship through scrutiny of transactions and updating data obtained under the CDD process





Project against Economic Crime (PECK)

Beneficial Ownership (1/2)

- Financial institutions should identify and take reasonable steps to verify the beneficial owner
- Beneficial owner refers to the natural person(s) who ultimately owns or controls the customer and/or the person on whose behalf a transaction is being conducted. It also incorporates those persons who exercise ultimate, effective control over a legal person or arrangement







Project against Economic Crime (PECK)

Beneficial Ownership (2/2)

- Two primary scenarios
 - Individuals behind legal persons (concepts of ultimate ownership/control and "mind and management")
 - Person on whose behalf account is held or transaction conducted (but who is not the declared account holder customer)
- It is not necessary to establish beneficial ownership of listed public companies that are subject to regulatory disclosure requirements (i.e. stock exchange)







Project against Economic Crime (PECK)

Risk in Recommendation 5

- Financial institutions shall apply enhanced due diligence for higher risk categories of customers, business relationships or transactions
- Jurisdictions may allow financial institutions to apply reduced or simplified due diligence where there are low risk of money laundering or financing of terrorism – but not when there is suspicion
- Competent authorities shall produce guidance for financial institutions where simplified due diligence is allowed







Project against Economic Crime (PECK)

Timing of Verification

- Basic rule Verify identity before or during establishment of relationship or undertaking a transaction
- Exception Delayed verification permissible when essential not to interrupt business, but only when:
 - ML risk is controlled through specific, applied measures
 - Verification takes place as soon as possible 6 months is too long

See Methodology examples







Project against Economic Crime (PECK)

Failure to complete CDD

- Where CDD cannot be satisfactorily completed account should not be opened, business relationship not established and consider filing a suspicious transaction report
- Where business has been established and CDD cannot be completed relationship to be stopped and consider filing suspicious transaction report

CDD measures to be applied to all existing customer on basis of materiality – in all instances where there is anonymity.







Project against Economic Crime (PECK)

Common Problems (1/2)

- Inadequate risk assessments leading to exemptions or simplifications where there is no proven low risk
- CDD requirements not contained in law or regulation
 - EC 5.1-5.3, 5.5, 5.7 (asterisked) or "Requirement"
 does not constitute other enforceable means (OEM)
- Scope problem
- ID Documents not sufficiently reliable
- Obligations do not cover all CDD situations EC 5.2







Project against Economic Crime (PECK)

Common Problems (2/2)

- Beneficial ownership not covered
- Lack of obligations to understand the purpose of relationship and to undertake ongoing CDD
- Low risk provides for complete exemption, rather than reduction in measures, or is too broad in scope
- High risk no obligation for enhanced CDD
- No/inadequate measures for existing customers.







Project against Economic Crime (PECK)

Questions for discussion – Sec 3.2 Rec 5 (CDD)

- Are there any laws allowing for anonymous business relationships, account opening and transactions?
- When is identification of customer to be applied?
- How is beneficial ownership defined? Is there an obligation to identify the beneficial owner in all cases?
- Can financial institutions apply CDD on a risk sensitivity basis? – Any guidance from the authorities?
- How does the financial sector industry react to the CDD obligations?







Project against Economic Crime (PECK)

Section 3.3 – Recommendation 6

Politically Exposed Persons







Project against Economic Crime (PECK)

Scope of Recommendation 6

- Rec 6 addresses risks posed by certain types of customers or counterparts that require enhanced procedures and scrutiny.
- Generally, the target measures are in addition to Rec 5 requirements, not a substitute
- Non-compliance with Rec 5 principles would impact compliance with Rec 6
- Financial Institutions must be required specifically to address these issues: reliance simply on general risk-based approach is not adequate







Project against Economic Crime (PECK)

Key Features and Obligations of Recommendation 6

- Main goal of Rec 6: to fight against the laundering of the proceeds of corruption related offences
- Rec 6 aims to make sure that FIs apply enhanced measures and scrutiny over the specific category of PEPs
- PEPs defined as persons who have been entrusted with prominent public functions in a *foreign* country (but jurisdictions encouraged to include domestic PEPs)
- In addition to normal due diligence required by Rec 5,
 Fls must take several additional initiatives







Project against Economic Crime (PECK)

Additional measures for PEPs

- Appropriate risk management systems to identify a PEP
- Obtain senior management approval for establishing relationship
- Reasonable measures to identify source of wealth and source of funds
- Conduct enhance ongoing monitoring of the business relationship







Project against Economic Crime (PECK)

Some identified deficiencies (1/2)

- PEPs are broadly defined and hence not all relevant PEPs are captured by FIs
- Enhanced procedures may also extend to members of the immediate family of such persons (issue rarely addressed in laws/regulation and difficult to assess in practice)





Project against Economic Crime (PECK)

Some identified deficiencies (2/2)

- Some additional obligations for FIs are considered difficult to comply with:
 - establishing source of wealth,
 - identifying origin of funds,
 - lack of definition of "enhanced ongoing monitoring of a relationship with a PEP",
 - PEPs behind legal entities...



Project against Economic Crime (PECK)

Questions for discussion – Sec 3.3 Rec 6 (PEPs)

- How are PEPs defined in the laws or regulations?
 Close associates and family included?
- Are there legal obligations for identifying and monitoring PEPs by Financial Institutions? – Domestic? Foreign? Both?
- Do the legal obligations, if any, apply to identifying beneficial owner PEP status? – See Rec 5 re BO
- What are the main problems encountered by the Financial Institutions in complying with PEP requirements?







Project against Economic Crime (PECK)

Section 3.4 - Recommendation 4

Secrecy Laws







Project against Economic Crime (PECK)

Key Features and Obligations of Recommendation 4

- Financial Institutions secrecy does not inhibit the implementation of FATF Recommendations in particular in:
 - ability of competent authorities to access information for AML/CFT purposes;
 - sharing of information between competent authorities on a domestic and international level
 - sharing of information between financial institutions where this is required under the FATF Recommendations







Project against Economic Crime (PECK)

Gateways

- Overriding provisions in AML/CFT Law lifting secrecy obligations imposed by other laws for AML/CFT purposes
- Specific gateways in particular financial and other laws lifting secrecy obligations imposed by that law on Financial Institutions







Project against Economic Crime (PECK)

Questions for discussion – Sec 3.4 Rec 4 (Secrecy)

- Do secrecy laws inhibit financial institutions and the authorities from access to and sharing of information?
- Do secrecy laws cover sharing of information by the authorities with the foreign counterparts?
- What gateways are in place for lifting bank or professional secrecy?







Project against Economic Crime (PECK)

Section 3.6 Recommendation 13 and SR IV

Suspicious Transaction Reporting





Project against Economic Crime (PECK)

Key Players involved

- FIU Reporting obligations and processes, guidance and levels of reporting across and within sectors.
- Supervisors/regulators of reporting entities nature/scope of the obligation, guidance and levels of compliance with STR-related obligations etc.
- Range of reporting entities (banks and other FIs) understanding of obligations and experience in complying with requirements, quality of guidance and feedback.







Project against Economic Crime (PECK)

Key Features and Obligations of Rec. 13 and SR IV

- Need explicit, direct obligation to report for both ML and TF as defined by the FATF (this must be in law or regulation).
- Reporting must relate at least to all Rec 1 predicate offences as defined by the FATF.
- Must also apply to attempted transactions.
- No threshold must be obligation to report <u>ALL</u> suspicious transactions, including attempted transactions, regardless of amount.







Project against Economic Crime (PECK)

Typical deficienies

- Only some Financial Institutions covered.
- Deficiencies in ML offence / TF offence / range of predicates limit reporting requirement.
- Cannot simply rely on TF being a predicate offence for ML.
- Not required by law or regulation (reporting obligation in OEM or guidance only).
- Attempted transactions not covered.
- Lack of effective implementation:
 - Low number of STRs.
 - Uneven reporting with and across sectors.
 - Poor quality STRs.







Project against Economic Crime (PECK)

Questions for discussion – Sec 3.1 Rec 13 SR IV (STRs)

- Are financial institutions required to report suspicious transactions and/or activities?
- Under what circumstances should they report? Is this related to all predicate offences?
- Are they required to report attempted transactions?
- Is there a threshold for reporting?
- Are FIs required to report when the suspicion involves tax matters?







Project against Economic Crime (PECK)

Section 3.7 – Recommendation 14

Protection and Tipping-off







Project against Economic Crime (PECK)

Key Features and Objective of Recommendation 14

- Legal protection of Financial Institutions, their directors, officers and employees from both criminal and civil liability for breach of confidentiality if they report their suspicion
- Prohibition for Financial Institutions, their directors, officers and employees (permanent or temporary) from disclosing that an STR or related information is being reported or provided to the relevant authorities (FIU) "tipping off"







Project against Economic Crime (PECK)

Questions for discussion – Sec 3.7 Rec 14 (Protection & Tipping off)

- If FIs, directors, officers and employees are protected for bona fede reporting does this protection cover both criminal and civil liability? Is the protection specific to AML/CFT matters or generic?
- Are there legal provisions against "tipping off"? Gateways?
- Do these include instances where disclosure relates to an ongoing investigation?
- Are the names and other details of officers filing an STR kept confidential by the FIU? Legal requirement?







Project against Economic Crime (PECK)

Section 3.8 – Recommendation 18

Shell Banks







Project against Economic Crime (PECK)

What is a Shell Bank?

"A bank that has no physical presence in the jurisdiction in which it is incorporated and licensed, and which is not affiliated with a regulated financial services group that is subject to effective consolidated supervision"

Physical presence means meaningful mind and management located within the jurisdiction. The existence simply of a local agent or low level staff does not constitute physical presence







Project against Economic Crime (PECK)

Key Features and Objectives of Recommendation 18

- Jurisdictions should not approve the establishment or accept the continued operation of shell banks.
- FIs should not be permitted to enter into, or continue, correspondent banking relationships with shell banks.
- Fls should be required to satisfy themselves that respondent financial institutions in a foreign country do not permit their accounts to be used by shell banks.







Project against Economic Crime (PECK)

What should the authorities do? (1/2)

Guidance from supervisors encouraging FIs:

- to pay special attention to ensure no business relationships with shell banks, and
- to adopt measures that will ensure that they do not enter into correspondent banking relationships with shell banks via a respondent bank.







Project against Economic Crime (PECK)

What should the authorities do? (2/2)

Supervisors should:

- Review correspondent account files and look for evidence that the bank has conducted enhanced due diligence in managing ML/TF risks associated with correspondent banking;
- look for evidence that the bank has requested information and documentation from respondent banks and verifies that the respondent is a regulated bank, is not a shell bank and does not deal directly or indirectly with shell banks.







Project against Economic Crime (PECK)

Questions for discussion – Sec 3.8 Rec 18 (Shell Banks)

- Is the concept of shell banks prohibited by law?
- What mechanisms do the authorities have to ensure they do not licence a shell bank?
- What rules or regulations are in place guiding banks not to enter into business relationships with shell banks or banks that allow their accounts to be used by shell banks?
- What tools or mechanisms are applied by the supervisor to ensure that banks comply?