















#### Transaction Monitoring and STR Questionnaire

- FSC launched a Transaction Monitoring and Suspicious Transaction Report Thematic Questionnaire in October
- Purpose: additional information to the FSC on the effectiveness of the STR function sector-wide
- Targeted licensees: 280

| Sub-Sector                    | Number of targeted entities |
|-------------------------------|-----------------------------|
| Management Companies          | 116                         |
| CIS managers                  | 51                          |
| Funds                         | 79                          |
| Investment Advisors           | 17                          |
| Long Term Insurance Companies | 5                           |
| Payment Intermediary Services | 12                          |



# Main Findings on Survey on STR 251 Respondents

| Factors  | Percentage |
|--|------------|
| Systematic monitoring done by the licensee / MLRO  | 88%        |
| Policies and procedures in place that govern transaction monitoring                          | 88%        |
| Rules to indicate suspicious transactions  | 86%        |
| The first line of defence of the licensee have transaction monitoring responsibilities       | 82%        |
| All transactions are reviewed by the second line of defense / MLRO                           | 30%        |
| Impacted by Remote Working   | 76%        |
| The MLRO reported to the Board about STRs  | 67%        |
| The effectiveness of transaction monitoring and STR reporting processes reviewed by licensee | 38%        |



## Suspicious Transaction Monitoring and Reporting – AML Findings

- $\succ$  Suspicious Transaction Monitoring and Reporting –
- No policies and procedures for handling complex, unusual or large transactions
- MLRO / Staff are not properly trained to detect suspicious transactions
- Inadequate resources for monitoring of transactions
- Inadequate transaction monitoring for potentially risky clients
- Staffs not aware of procedures to make internal disclosure to MLRO





## **Suspicious Transactions Reporting - Statistics**

| Reporting person type        |     |     |     | 2020 (up to 18 November<br>2020) |  |
|------------------------------|-----|-----|-----|----------------------------------|--|
| Bank                         | 474 | 534 | 579 | 703                              |  |
| Corporate Trustees           | 1   |     |     |                                  |  |
| oreign Exchange Dealer       | 22  | 38  | 19  | 37                               |  |
| unds (Including CIS and CEF) | 1   | 1   | 3   | 5                                |  |
| nsurance Companies           | 2   | 13  | 15  | 22                               |  |
| nvestment Advisers           |     | 1   |     | 4                                |  |
| nvestment Dealers            |     | 1   | 2   | 8                                |  |
| .easing companies            |     | 3   | 3   | 3                                |  |
| fanagement Companies         | 56  | 54  | 82  | 126                              |  |
| ayment Intermediary Services |     |     |     | 15                               |  |
| CIS Managers                 |     |     |     | 1                                |  |
| Treasury Management          |     |     |     | 1                                |  |
| redit Finance                |     |     |     | 2                                |  |
| Grand Total                  | 556 | 645 | 703 | 927                              |  |



### Targeted Financial Sanctions - National Framework





## Targeted Financial Sanctions – AML Findings

## **Targeted Financial Sanctions:**

There were no policies and procedures for screening or for dealing with designated persons. There was no screening of clients or where screening done it is not documented. The screening is not done on an ongoing basis.

## TFS Obligations of the Private Sector:

When licensees identify a positive match, they must freeze the assets and make a report to the National Sanctions Secretariat and the FSC.

#### Licensees should ensure that:

- all relevant sanction lists are being searched (including any domestic designations that are not included on the
  mass market software).

- mass market software),

   the correct settings are being on the software of the correct settings are being on the software of the correct settings are being the setting star being the lists are updated and on a frequent periodic basis and at client on-boarding,

   all clients and their beneficial owners are being screened, and

   appropriate the diligence is applied in the case of a partial match and that records are kept of this due diligence and screening results.



## NPO- RISK ASSESSMENT

Recommendation 8 and Immediate Outcome 10 states that countries should:

•Identify which subset of organizations fall within the FATF definition of NPO

•Identify the features and types of NPOs which by virtue of their activities or characteristics, are likely to be at risk of terrorist financing abuse

•Identify the nature of threats posed by terrorist entities to the NPOs which are at risk as well as how terrorist actors abuse those NPOs





