

Anti-money laundering (AML): latest updates and guidance

Mandeep Sandhu, Head of AML
Proactive Supervision, SRA

To cover

- Overview of AML supervision in the last year
- What firms are getting right and issues we're still seeing
- Trends in suspicious activity reports

In the last year...

- Three functions – proactive supervision, policy and investigations
- Doubled AML proactive work:
 - 545 AML inspections/reviews compared to 273 last year
 - increasing again this year
- 227 reports to us of AML breaches
- Started proactive sanctions inspections
- Thematic review – training
- Review of the results from independent audits

Financial sanctions

| Letter of guidance | Sanctions inspections | Sanctions controls checks – AML inspection | Sanctions controls checks – Forensic Investigation |
|---------------------------|------------------------------|---|---|
| 1,087 | 55 | 237 | 106 |

- Next round of sanctions inspections
- Look out for our webinar
- Sanctions risk assessment

Levels of compliance - AML

| | Compliant | Partially compliant | Not compliant |
|---------------------------|------------------|----------------------------|----------------------|
| Desk-based reviews | 29 | 160 | 69 |
| Inspections | 81 | 124 | 49 |
| Total | 110 | 284 | 118 |

- 254 inspections
- 258 desk-based reviews
- We helped 394 firms be compliant

Improvements seen

- Client and matter risk assessments – 51% ineffective last year compared to 12% this year
- Adequacy of identification and verification checks increased from 88% to 96%
- Improvements seen but still some way to go:
 - firm-wide risk assessments increased from 53% to 60%
 - AML policies increased from 35% to 51%

Firm-wide risk assessments (FWRA)



Solicitors
Regulation
Authority

- Reason why a firm would be rated 'not compliant':
 - template that is not tailored
 - one or more of the mandatory risks missing
- Important control – feed into client and matter risk
- Updated our template and guidance
- 12 firms did not have a FWRA

Policies, controls and procedures – Common issues

Out of date or not covering mandatory requirements

| Area | Desk-based reviews | Inspections |
|---|--------------------|-------------|
| 5MLD - Assessment and mitigation of the risks associated with new products and business practices | 54% | 60% |
| 5MLD - Reporting discrepancies to Companies House | 48% | 32% |
| Reliance | 37% | 30% |
| Simplified due diligence | 37% | 22% |

Tip: Look at our annual report for common missing areas:

sra.org.uk/aml-annual-report-2022-23

Source of funds

Next thematic review:

- 25% of files we reviewed did not contain information or evidence of source of funds
- Several firms were able to provide an explanation of the enquiries they made — but no audit trail
- In several cases, the transactions involved high risk work such as property purchases and cash transactions
- Both of which have been highlighted as high risk for money laundering in our sectoral risk assessment

Trends in suspicious activity reporting

- Submitted 23 SARs to the NCA involving money laundering, relating to funds amounting to over £75 million
- Conveyancing still the highest risk – 73% involved conveyancing. The majority related to residential properties, with a small number of commercial properties
- Lack of sufficient due diligence and source of funds was a key contributor

Trends in suspicious activity reporting



Solicitors
Regulation
Authority

- Some instances information obtained but not properly scrutinised
- Other trends (not exhaustive):
 - vendor fraud
 - client account used no underlying legal transaction
 - funds from high-risk jurisdictions and involvement of third parties

Guidance and resources

Visit our website:

sra.org.uk/aml-guidance

sra.org.uk/aml