

Response ID ANON-Z596-YZAJ-V

Submitted to AML/CFT Act review
Submitted on 2021-12-01 14:53:43

Tell us a bit about yourself

1 What age group are you in?

50-64

2 What is your ethnicity? (You can select more than one.)

NZ European

Please specify:

Not Answered

Please specify:

Not Answered

Please specify:

Not Answered

Please specify:

3 If you're responding on behalf of an organisation or particular interest group, please give details below:

Organisation or special interest group details:

Respaonding on behalf of a law firm.

I must say this survey is overly complex to the point it will put off businesses (especially law firms who are very busy at this time of year) contributing.

I have persevered as I wanted to get across my frustration at the complexity of the DIA's implementation of the Act.

4 If you would like to be contacted in the future about AML/CFT work, please include your email address below. (Note you are not required to provide your email address. You can provide your submission anonymously.)

Email address:

1. Institutional arrangements and stewardship

1.1 Are the purposes of the Act still appropriate for New Zealand's Anti-Money Laundering and Countering Financing of Terrorism (AML/CFT) regime?

Yes

If you answered 'no', what should be changed?:

If you think there are other purposes that should be added, please give details below.:

1.2 Should a purpose of the Act be that it seeks to actively prevent money laundering and terrorism financing, rather than simply deterring or detecting it?

No

Please comment on your answer.:

1.3 If you answered 'yes' to Question 1.2, do you have any suggestions how this purpose should be reflected in the Act, including whether there need to be any additional or updated obligations for businesses?

Please share your comments below.:

1.4 Should a purpose of the Act be that it also seeks to counter the financing of proliferation of weapons of mass destruction?

No

Please comment on your answer.:

1.5 If you answered 'yes' to Question 1.4, should the purpose be limited to proliferation financing risks emanating from Iran and the Democratic People's Republic of Korea?

Not Answered

Please give reasons for your answer.:

Not Answered

Please comment on your answer.:

1.6 Should the Act support the implementation terrorism and proliferation financing targeted financial sanctions, required under the Terrorism Suppression Act 2002 and United Nations Act 1946?

No

Please comment on your answer.:

1.7 What could be improved about New Zealand's framework for sharing information to manage risks?

Please share your comments below.:

1.8 Are the requirements in section 58 still appropriate?

No

Please comment on your answer.:

The risks impacting most lawyers is the same, why require each business to go through a risk assessment process (with no guidance), when the outcome is the same.

How could the government provide risk information to businesses so that it is more relevant and easily understood?:

Provide it in a form that is appropriate to lawyers. Don't require us to read multiple documents and come up with our own risk assessment. You could provide a framework for assessing the risk for lawyers and they could rate themselves within that framework, depending on the type of law they do.

1.9 What is the right balance between prescriptive regulation compared with the risk-based approach?

Please share your comments below.:

At the start of the regime the DIA said 'you know your client, you know the risk' but this has not been put into practice, The practice has been very prescribed with an assumption of guilt or wrong-going. In 99% of the cases we know our clients and what they are doing and they are legitimate. Why do we need to externally verify that information?

Does the Act currently achieve that balance, or is more (or less) prescription required?:

No, it should be risk based, not prescribed.

1.10 Do some obligations require the government to set minimum standards?

No

If you answered 'yes', please comment on how this could be done.:

What role should guidance play in providing further clarity?:

1.11 Could more be done to ensure that businesses' obligations are in proportion to the risks they are exposed to?

Yes

If you answered 'yes', please give reasons for your answer.:

Setting minimum standards for ID and address external verification, turns the CDD process into a tick box exercise and takes the mind away from the assessment of client risk. A focus on risk first and then if there is potential, external verification, would be much more effective and less of a burden on the majority of the public who are doing legitimate business when they visit their lawyer.

1.12 Does the Act appropriately reflect the size and capacity of the businesses within the AML/CFT regime?

No

Please give reasons for your answer.:

Smaller business know their clients and get referred clients, through people or clients they know. The blanket approach makes AML a large cost for small law firms, who then need to decide whether to build that into their fees to clients.

1.13 Could more be done to ensure that businesses' obligations are in proportion to the risks they are exposed to and the size of the business?

Yes

If you answered 'yes', please share your suggestions::

Yes, a framework that rates lawyers risk on the type of work they do, size of practice and general risk, then allows lawyers to determine what they need to verify based on their risk assessment, whether they know the client etc.

1.14 Are exemptions still required for the regime to operate effectively?

If not, how can we ensure AML/CFT obligations are appropriate for low-risk businesses or activities?:

If the practices did not pose such a burden on small businesses, then less would apply for exemptions. Have guidelines that are risk based, then require verification by exception.

Unsure

1.15 Is the Minister of Justice the appropriate decision maker for exemptions under section 157?

Unsure

If you answered 'no', should it be an operational decision maker such as the Secretary of Justice? Please comment below.:

1.16 Are the factors set out in section 157(3) appropriate?

Unsure

If you answered 'no', please give reasons for your answer::

1.17 Should it be specified that exemptions can only be granted in instances of proven low risk?

Unsure

Please give reasons for your answer.:

Assessed low risk, rather than proven low risk.

Should this be the risk of the exemption, or the risk of the business?:

1.18 Should the Act specify what applicants for exemptions under section 157 should provide?

Yes

Please give reasons for your answer.:

it should be consistent.

Should there be a simplified process when applying to renew an existing exemption?:

yes

1.19 Should there be other avenues beyond judicial review for applicants if the Minister decides not to grant an exemption?

Unsure

If you answered 'yes', what could these avenues look like?:

1.20 Are there any other improvements that we could make to the exemptions function?

Unsure

If you answered 'yes', please give details::

For example, should the process be more formalised with a linear documentary application process?:

1.21 Can the AML/CFT regime do more to mitigate its potential unintended consequences?

Yes

If you answered 'yes', please give details::

Base the processes on the risk associated with the person, not their ability to verify their identify and especially their address. Many members of society change addresses frequently, verification of addresses seems a pointless burden on these people. If they were to be prosecuted for AML/CFT offences, it is likely they will have moved on from their latest address.

1.22 How could the regime better protect the need for people to access banking services to properly participate in society?

Please share your comments below.:

see above.

1.23 Are there any other unintended consequences of the regime?

Yes

If you answered 'yes', what are they and how could we resolve them?:

As stated earlier - the prescribed nature of the verification takes the focus away from the actual risk posed by clients.

It is too complicated, so people focus on the bare minimum take 'ticks the boxes' .

1.24 Can the Act do more to enable private sector collaboration and coordination?

Unsure

If you answered 'yes', please give details::

1.25 What do you see as the ideal future for public and private sector cooperation?

Please share your comments below.:

Are there any barriers that prevent that future from being realised and if so, what are they?:

1.26 Should there be greater sharing of information from agencies to the private sector?

Unsure

If you answered 'yes', would this enhance the operation of the regime?:

1.27 Should the Act require have a mechanism to enable feedback about the operation and performance of the Act on an ongoing basis?

Unsure

If you answered 'yes', what is the mechanism and how could it work?:

1.28 Should the New Zealand Police Financial Intelligence Unit (FIU) be able to request information from businesses which are not reporting entities in certain circumstances (e.g. requesting information from travel agents or airlines relevant to analysing terrorism financing)?

Unsure

Please give reasons for your answer.:

1.29 If the FIU had this power, under what circumstances should it be able to be used and should there be any constraints on using the power?

Please share your comments below.:

1.30 Should the FIU be able to request information from businesses on an ongoing basis?

Unsure

Please explain your answer:

1.31 If the FIU had this power, what constraints are necessary to ensure that privacy and human rights are adequately protected?

What constraints are needed?:

Privledged information between lawyers and clients would need to be protected.

1.32 Should the Act provide the FIU with a power to freeze, on a time limited basis, funds or transactions in order to prevent harm and victimisation?

Unsure

If you answered 'yes', how could the power work and operate? In what circumstances could the power be used, and how could we ensure it is a proportionate and reasonable power? Please share your comments below.:

1.33 How can we avoid potentially tipping off suspected criminals when the power is used?

Please share your comments below.:

1.34 Should supervision of implementation of Targeted Financial Sanctions (TFS) fall within the scope of the AML/CFT regime?

Unsure

Please give reasons for your answer.:

1.35 Which agency or agencies should be empowered to supervise, monitor, and enforce compliance with obligations to implement TFS?

Please describe below and give reasons for your answer.:

1.36 Are the secondary legislation making powers in the Act appropriate, or are there other aspects of the regime that could benefit from having regulation making powers created?

Please share your comments below.:

The regime is not flexible

1.37 How could we better use secondary legislation making powers to ensure the regime is agile and responsive?

Please share your comments below.:

1.38 Are the three Ministers responsible for issuing Codes of Practice the appropriate decision makers, or should it be an operational decision maker such as the chief executives of the AML/CFT supervisors? Why or why not?

Please share your comments below and give reasons for your answer.:

The ability of opt-out of the identification verification code is not helpful, as no-one knows what would be "equally effective". If we could opt out of verification due to low risk, clients known to us etc. that would be helpful.

1.39 Should the New Zealand Police also be able to issue Codes of Practice for some types of FIU issued guidance?

Unsure

If you answered yes, what should the process be?:

1.40 Are Codes of Practice a useful tool for businesses?

Yes

If you answered 'yes', are there any additional topics that Codes of Practice should focus on? What enhancements could be made to Codes of Practice? Please share your comments below.:

1.41 Does the requirement for businesses to demonstrate they are complying through some equally effective means impact the ability for businesses to opt out of a Code of Practice?

Yes

If you answered 'yes', please give reasons for your answer.:

1.42 What status should be applied to explanatory notes to Codes of Practice? Are these a reasonable and useful tool?

Please share your comments below.:

1.43 Should operational decision makers within agencies be responsible for making or amending the format of reports and forms required by the Act?

Yes

Please give reasons for your answer.:

They can target the reports for the risks in their sectors.

1.44 If you answered 'yes' to the previous question (question 1.43), which operational decision makers would be appropriate, and what could be the process for making the decision? For example, should the decision maker be required to consult with affected parties, and could the formats be modified for specific sectoral needs?

Please share your comments below.:

They would need to communicate with their sector and give time to ensure they are collecting the data needed for the report.

1.45 Would AML/CFT Rules (or similar) that prescribed how businesses should comply with obligations be a useful tool for business?

Unsure

Please give reasons for your answer.:

Rules would be good, but NOT if they are more prescriptive regarding verification of ID, address and source of funds or wealth. Only if it related to assessing the risk, then making your own judgement regarding verification.

1.46 If we allowed for AML/CFT Rules to be issued, what would they be used for, and who should be responsible for issuing them?

Please share your comments below.:

Sector supervisors, based on their sectors.

1.47 Would you support regulations being issued for a tightly constrained direct data access arrangement which enables specific government agencies to query intelligence the FIU holds?

Unsure

Please give reasons for your answer.:

1.48 Are there any other privacy concerns that you think should be mitigated?

Unsure

Please share your comments below.:

1.49 What, if any, potential impacts do you identify for businesses if information they share is then shared with other agencies? Could there be potential negative repercussions notwithstanding the protections within section 44?

Please share your comments below.:

1.50 Would you support the development of data-matching arrangements with FIU and other agencies to combat other financial offending, including trade-based money laundering and illicit trade?

Unsure

Please give reasons for your answer.:

1.51 What concerns, privacy or otherwise, would we need to navigate and mitigate if we developed data-matching arrangements? For example, would allowing data-matching impact the likelihood of businesses being willing to file Suspicious Activity Reports (SARs)?

Please share your comments below.:

1.52 Should there be an AML/CFT-specific registration regime which complies with international requirements?

Yes

If you answered 'yes', how could it operate, and which agency or agencies would be responsible for its operation? Please share your comments below.:

Sector supervisors.

1.53 If such a regime was established, what is the best way for it to navigate existing registration and licensing requirements?

Please share your comments below.:

1.54 Are there alternative options for how we can ensure proper visibility of which businesses require supervision and that all businesses are subject to appropriate fit-and-proper checks?

Unsure

Please give reasons for your answer.:

1.55 Should there also be an AML/CFT licensing regime in addition to a registration regime?

No

Please give reasons for your answer.:

1.56 If we established an AML/CFT licensing regime, how should it operate? How could we ensure the costs involved are not disproportionate?

Please share your comments below.:

1.57 Should a regime only apply to sectors which have been identified as being highly vulnerable to money laundering and terrorism financing, but are not already required to be licensed?

Not Answered

Please give reasons for your answer.:

1.58 If such a regime was established, what is the best way for it to navigate existing licensing requirements?

Please share your comments below.:

1.59 Would requiring risky businesses to be licensed impact the willingness of other businesses to have them as customers? Can you think of any potential negative flow-on effects?

Please share your comments below.:

1.60 Would you support a levy being introduced for the AML/CFT regime to pay for the operating costs of an AML/CFT registration and/or licensing regime?

Please give reasons for your answer.:

No

1.61 If we developed a levy, who do you think should pay the levy (some or all reporting entities)?

Please share your comments below.:

1.62 Should all reporting entities pay the same amount, or should the amount be calculated based on, for example, the size of the business, their risk profile, how many reports they make, or some other factor?

Please share your comments below.:

1.63 Should the levy also cover some or all of the operating costs of the AML/CFT regime more broadly, and thereby enable the regime to be more flexible and responsive?

Not Answered

Please give reasons for your answer.:

1.64 If the levy paid for some or all of the operating costs, how would you want to see the regime's operation improved?

Please share your comments below.:

2. Scope of the AML/CFT Act

2.1 How should the Act determine whether an activity is captured, particularly for Designated Non-Financial Businesses and Professions (DNFBPs)?

Please share your comments below.:

Don't make it harder than it already is.

Yes

Please give reasons for your answer.:

Take away the ambiguity, but seek feedback from the sectors on what this would mean beforehand. Don't make it harder.

2.2 If 'ordinary course of business' was amended to provide greater clarity, particularly for DNFBPs, how should it be articulated?

Please share your comments below.:

2.3 Should 'ordinary' be removed?

No

If so, how could we provide some regulatory relief for businesses which provide activities infrequently? Are there unintended consequences that may result? Please share your comments below.:

2.4 Should businesses be required to apply AML/CFT measures in respect of captured activities, irrespective of whether the business is a financial institution or a DNFBP?

No

Please give reasons for your answer.:

Don't complicate it further.

2.5 If you answered yes to the previous question (Question 2.4), should we remove 'only to the extent' from section 6(4)?

Not Answered

Would anything else need to change, e.g. to ensure the application of the Act is not inadvertently expanded? Please share your comments below.:

2.6 Should we issue regulations to clarify that captured activities attract AML/CFT obligations irrespective of the type of reporting entity which provides those activities?

No

Please give reasons for your answer.:

2.7 Should we remove the overlap between 'managing client funds' and other financial institution activities?

Unsure

If you answered 'yes', how could we best do this to avoid any obligations being duplicated for the same activity? Please share your comments below.:

DNFBPs should not be captured for activities that are also captured for financial institutions. They should only be captured when dealing with "cash" or cryptocurrency (if it doesn't go through a financial institution that is captured).

DNFBPs handle 99.9% of transactions through banks, the banks are already monitoring transactions, why do they need to put this burden on their clients again.

2.8 Should we clarify what is meant by 'professional fees'?

No

If you answered 'yes', what would be an appropriate definition? Please share your comments below.:

2.9 Should the fees of a third party be included within the scope of 'professional fees'?

Yes

Please give reasons for your answer.:

2.10 Does the current definition appropriately capture those businesses which are involved with a particular activity, including the operation and management of legal persons and arrangements?

No

Please give reasons for your answer.:

How could it be improved?:

2.11 Have you faced any challenges with interpreting the activity of 'engaging in or giving instructions'?

No

If you answered 'yes', what are those challenges and how could we address them?:

2.12 Should the terminology in the definition of financial institution be better aligned with the meaning of financial service provided in section 5 of the Financial Service Providers (Registration and Dispute Resolution) Act 2008?

Unsure

If you answered yes, how could we achieve this?:

2.13 Are there other elements of the definition of financial institution that cause uncertainty and confusion about the Act's operation?

Unsure

If you answered 'yes', please give details::

2.14 Should the definition of high-value dealer be amended so businesses which deal in high value articles are high-value dealers irrespective of how frequently they undertake relevant cash transactions?

Unsure

Please give reasons for your answer.:

Can you think of any unintended consequences that might occur?:

2.15 What do you anticipate would be the compliance impact of this change?

Please share your comments below.:

2.16 Should we revoke the exclusion for pawnbrokers to ensure they can manage their money laundering and terrorism financing risks?

Unsure

Please give reasons for your answer.:

2.17 Given there is an existing regime for pawnbrokers, what obligations should we avoid duplicating to avoid unnecessary compliance costs?

Please share your comments below.:

2.18 Should we lower the applicable threshold for high value dealers to enable better intelligence about cash transactions?

Unsure

Please give reasons for your answer.:

2.19 If you answered 'yes' to the previous question (Question 2.18), what would be the appropriate threshold? How many additional transactions would be captured? Would you stop using or accepting cash for these transactions to avoid AML/CFT obligations?

Please share your comments below.:

2.20 Do you currently engage in any transactions involving stores of value that are not portable devices (e.g. digital stored value instruments)?

No

If you answered 'yes', what is the nature and value of those transactions?:

2.21 What risks do you see with stored value instruments that do not use portable devices?

Please share your comments below.:

2.22 Should we amend the definition of "stored value instruments" to be neutral as to the technology involved?

Unsure

If you answered 'yes', how should we change the definition? Please share your comments below.:

2.23 Should acting as a secretary of a company, partner in a partnership, or equivalent position in other legal persons and arrangements attract AML/CFT obligations?

No

Please give reasons for your answer.:

2.24 If you are a business which provides this type of activity, what do you estimate the potential compliance costs would be for your business if it attracted AML/CFT obligations?

Please share your comments below.:

How many companies or partnerships do you provide these services for?:

2.25 Should criminal defence lawyers have AML/CFT obligations?

No

If you answered 'yes', what should those obligations be and why?:

2.26 If you are a criminal defence lawyer, have you noticed any potentially suspicious activities?

Not Answered

If you answered 'yes', without breaching legal privilege, what were those activities and what did you do about them?:

2.27 Are there any unintended consequences that may arise from requiring criminal defence lawyers to have limited AML/CFT obligations, that we will need to be aware of?

Not Answered

If you answered 'yes', please give details::

2.28 Should non-life insurance companies become reporting entities under the Act?

No

Please give reasons for your answer.:

Don't make life harder than it is.

2.29 If you answered 'yes' to the previous question (Question 2.28), should non-life insurance companies have full obligations, or should they be tailored to the specific risks we have identified?

Not Answered

Please give reasons for your answer.:

2.30 If you are a non-life insurance business, what do you estimate would be the costs of having AML/CFT obligations (including limited obligations)?

Please share your comments below.:

2.31 Should we use regulations to ensure that all types of virtual asset service providers have AML/CFT obligations, including by declaring wallet providers which only provide safekeeping or administration are reporting entities?

Yes

If you answered 'yes', how should we do this?:

So it is consistent.

2.32 Would issuing regulations for this purpose change the scope of capture for virtual asset service providers which are currently captured by the AML/CFT regime?

Unsure

If you answered 'yes', please give reasons for your answer.:

2.33 Is the Act sufficiently clear that preparing or processing invoices can be captured in certain circumstances?

Unsure

If you answered 'no', please give reasons for your answer.:

2.34 If we clarified the activity, should we also clarify what obligations businesses should have?

Unsure

If you answered 'yes', please give reasons for your answer.:

2.35 Should preparing accounts and tax statements attract AML/CFT obligations?

No

Please give reasons for your answer.:

2.36 If you answered 'yes' to the previous question (Question 2.35), what would be the appropriate obligations for businesses which provide these services?

Please share your comments below.:

2.37 Should tax-exempt non-profits and non-resident tax charities be included within the scope of the AML/CFT Act given their vulnerabilities to being misused for terrorism financing?

Unsure

Please give reasons for your answer.:

Registered charities should not require verification of officers or source of wealth etc. all should be on the Charities register. Non-registered charities should be risk based.

2.38 If these non-profit organisations were included, what should their obligations be?

Please share your comments below.:

2.39 Are there any other regulatory or class exemptions that need to be revisited, e.g. because they no longer reflect situations of proven low risk or because there are issues with their operation?

Unsure

If you answered 'yes', please share your suggestions.:

2.40 Should the exemption for internet auctions still apply, and are the settings correct in terms of a wholesale exclusion of all activities?

Unsure

If you answered 'no', please give reasons for your answer.:

2.41 If it should continue to apply, should online marketplaces be within scope of the exemption?

Not Answered

Please give reasons for your answer.:

2.42 What risks do you see involving internet marketplaces or internet auctions?

Please share your comments below.:

2.43 If we were to no longer exclude online marketplaces or internet auction providers from the Act, what should the scope of their obligations be? What would be the cost and impact of that change?

Please share your comments below.:

2.44 Do you currently rely on this regulatory exemption to offer special remittance card facilities?

No

If you answered 'yes', how many facilities do you offer to how many customers?:

2.45 Is the exemption workable or are changes needed to improve its operation?

Please share your comments below.:

What would be the impact on compliance costs from those changes?:

2.46 Do you consider the exemption properly mitigates any risks of money laundering or terrorism financing through its conditions?

Not Answered

If you answered 'yes', please give reasons for your answer.:

2.47 Should we amend this regulatory exemption to clarify whether and how it applies to DNFBPs?

No

If you answered 'yes', please share your suggestions.:

2.48 Should we issue any new regulatory exemptions?

Not Answered

If you answered 'yes', please share your suggestions.:

Are there any areas where Ministerial exemptions have been granted where a regulatory exemption should be issued instead?:

2.49 Do you currently use a company to provide trustee or nominee services?

Yes

If you answered 'yes', why do you use them, and how many do you use? What is the ownership and control structure for those companies?:

To provide anonymity for some client transactions, for commercial sensitivity reasons.

We have one or two companies.

The shareholders and directors are owners of the DNFBP

2.50 Should we issue a new regulatory exemption to exempt legal or natural persons that act as trustee, nominee director, or nominee shareholder where there is a parent reporting entity involved that is responsible for discharging their AML/CFT obligations?

Yes

Please give reasons for your answer.:

It would be duplication to include them.

2.51 If so, what conditions should be attached to such an exemption to ensure it does not raise other money laundering or terrorism financing vulnerabilities?

Please share your comments below.:

Where the same individuals are involved.

2.52 Should we issue a new regulatory exemption to exempt Crown entities, entities acting as agents of the Crown, community trusts, and any other similar entities from AML/CFT obligations?

Yes

Please give reasons for your answer.:

Keep it simple.

2.53 If you answered 'yes' to the previous question (Question 2.52), what should be the scope of the exemption and possible conditions to ensure it does not raise other money laundering or terrorism financing vulnerabilities?

Please share your suggestions below.:

If they are covered by other regulations don't double handle it.

2.54 Should we issue an exemption for all reporting entities providing low value loans, particularly where those loans are provided for social or charitable purposes?

Unsure

Please give reasons for your answer.:

2.55 If so, what conditions should be attached to such an exemption to ensure it does not raise other money laundering or terrorism financing vulnerabilities?

Please share your comments below.:

2.56 Should the AML/CFT Act define its territorial scope?

Yes

Please give reasons for your answer.:

If its not clear it needs to be defined

2.57 If so, how should the Act define a business or activity to be within the Act's territorial scope?

Please share your comments below.:

3. Supervision, regulation, and enforcement

3.1 Is the AML/CFT supervisory model fit for purpose or should we consider changing it?

Unsure

3.1 Please indicate why? :

The supervisors need to be consistent.

3.2 If it were to change, what supervisory model do you think would be more effective in a New Zealand context?

Regulatory bodies as supervisors - eg. Law Society

3.2 Please provide context for your choice:

Regulatory bodies know their industry and the risks. They may also be collecting information for other purposes.

3.3 Do you think the Act appropriately ensures consistency in the application of the law between the three supervisors? If not, how could inconsistencies in the application of obligations be minimised?

Not Answered

3.3 Please provide options for how inconsistencies in the application of obligations could be minimised:

3.4 Does the Act achieve the appropriate balance between ensuring consistency and allowing supervisors to be responsive to sectoral needs? If not, what mechanisms could be included in legislation to achieve a more appropriate balance?

Not Answered

If not, what mechanisms could be included to achieve balance:

All sectors need to be risk based, but more prescriptive and consistent when there is a risk.

3.5 Are the statutory functions and powers of the supervisors appropriate or do they need amending? If so, why?

Yes - the functions and powers are appropriate

3.5 If so, why are the statutory functions and powers of the supervisors not appropriate:

The Act is fine, but the DIAs interpretation has caused the burden on law firms and their clients, as they have moved away from risk based to checking everything.

3.5 What amendments are required:

3.6 Should AML/CFT Supervisors have the power to conduct onsite inspections of REs operating from a dwelling house? If so, what controls should be implemented to protect the rights of the occupants?

Yes - AML/CFT Supervisors should be able to conduct onsite inspections where REs are operating from a dwelling house

Please explain your answer:

If it is the REs place of business and adequate notice is given.

What controls are required to protect the rights of occupants?:

3.7 What are some advantages or disadvantages of remote onsite inspections?

Please share your thoughts:

Yes that is fine.

3.8 Would virtual inspection options make supervision more efficient? What mechanisms would be required to make virtual inspections work?

Yes

Please explain your answer:

What mechanisms would be required to make virtual inspections work?:

3.9 Is the process for forming a designated business group (DBG) appropriate? Are there any changes that could make the process more efficient?

Unsure

Please explain your answer:

Are there changes that could make the process more efficient?:

3.10 Should supervisors have an explicit role in approving or rejecting formation of a DBG? Why or why not?

Yes

Why or why not?:

3.11 Should explicit standards for audits and auditors be introduced? If so, what should those standards be and how could they be used to ensure audits are of higher quality?

Yes

If yes, what should the standards be?:

Auditors need to be approved.

How could standards be used to ensure audits are of higher quality?:

3.12 Who would be responsible for enforcing the standards of auditors?

AML/CFT supervisors

If other, which agency/organisation would enforce the standards?:

It may be that different sectors have different audit standards.

Please explain your answer:

3.13 What impact would that have on cost for audits? What benefits would there be for businesses if we ensured higher quality audits?

Please share your thoughts:

We need to get the basics sorted first, if it was a genuinely risk based process then the audit compliance should be to high standards.

What benefits would there be for businesses if we ensured higher quality audits?:

3.14 Should there be any protections for businesses which rely on audits, or liability for auditors who do not provide a satisfactory audit?

Yes

Please explain your answer:

If yes, what protections would you want? What should be the nature of the liability for auditors?:

A business should be protected if the auditor is qualified. Protection from process issues, but not if there is evidence they have been involved in ML.

3.15 Is it appropriate to specify the role of a consultant in legislation, including what obligations they should have? If so, what are appropriate obligations for consultants?

No

Please explain your answer:

People need to do their own due diligence with consultants.

If a consultant's role should be specified in legislation, what are the appropriate obligations?:

3.16 Do we need to specify what standards consultants should be held to? If so, what would it look like? Would it include specific standards that must be met before providing advice?

Yes

Please explain your answer:

like auditors, there should be a standard.

If yes, what should the standards look like?:

3.17 Who would be responsible for enforcing the standard of consultants?

AML/CFT supervisor(s)

If other, please indicate which agency/organisation you see having responsibility:

Please explain your answer:

3.18 Do you currently use agents to assist with your AML/CFT compliance obligations? If so, what do you use agents for?

No

What do you use agents for?:

3.19 Do you currently take any steps to ensure that only appropriate persons are able to act as your agent? What are those steps and why do you take them?

Not Answered

If yes, what are the steps you take to ensure only appropriate persons act as your agent?:

3.20 Should there be any additional measures in place to regulate the use of agents and third parties? For example, should we set out who can be an agent and in what circumstances they can be relied upon?

Unsure

Please explain your answer:

3.20 If yes, what other additional measures would you like to regulate the use of agents and third parties? :

3.21 Does the existing penalty framework in the AML/CFT Act allow for effective, proportionate, and dissuasive sanctions to be applied in all circumstances, including for larger entities? Why or why not?

Unsure

Please explain your answer:

3.22 Would additional enforcement interventions, such as fines for non-compliance or enabling the restriction, suspension, or removal of a license or registration enable more proportionate, effective, and responsive enforcement?

Unsure

Please explain your answer:

3.23 Are there any other changes we could make to enhance the penalty framework in the Act?

Unsure

Please provide further detail:

3.24 Should the Act allow for higher penalties at the top end of seriousness to ensure sufficiently dissuasive penalties can be imposed for large businesses? If so, what should the penalties be?

Unsure

Please provide further information, including what the penalties could be:

3.25 Would broadening the scope of civil sanctions to include directors and senior management support compliance outcomes? Should this include other employees?

No

Please provide further detail:

3.26 If penalties could apply to senior managers and directors, what is the appropriate penalty amount?

Please share your thoughts:

3.27 Should compliance officers also be subject to sanctions or provided protection from sanctions when acting in good faith?

Please share your thoughts:

No

3.28 Should the Department of Internal Affairs (DIA) have the power to apply to liquidate a business to recover penalties and costs obtained in proceedings undertaken under the Act?

No

Please provide your comments in the box below:

3.29 Should we change the time limit by which prosecutions must be brought by? If so, what should we change the time limit to?

Unsure

Please provide your thoughts:

If you answered yes, what should we change the time limit to?:

4. Preventive measures

4.1 What challenges do you have with complying with your customer due diligence (CDD) obligations? How could these challenges be resolved?

What challenges do you have with complying with your CDD obligations?:

It costs us time and money to comply, we either wear that cost or have to pass it on to our customers. Adding extra cost to the customer, for no benefit to them as they go about their usual life milestones, e.g. buying a house.

Lawyers know their clients and why their clients are doing transactions, we know they are not benefiting from crime and are not terrorists.

If a lawyer knows the client, why do they need to verify the source of wealth?

How could these challenges be resolved?:

Stop requiring verification of addresses (as a minimum) it adds no value. A criminal will lie, or move, what is the purpose.

Make the focus on gathering the information, not verifying. If the client is new and there are red flags, then put the focus on verifying.

4.2 Have you experienced any situations where trying to identify the customer can be challenging or not straightforward? What were those situations and why was it challenging?

No

If yes, what were those situations and why was it challenging?:

4.3 Would a more prescriptive approach to the definition of a customer be helpful? For example, should we issue regulations to define who the customer is in various circumstances and when various services are provided?

Yes

Please share your thoughts:

4.4 If so, what are the situations where more prescription is required to define the customer?

What do you think?:

4.5 Do you anticipate that there would be any benefits or additional challenges from a more prescriptive approach being taken?

Please share your thoughts:

4.6 Should we amend the existing regulations to require real estate agents to conduct CDD on both the purchaser and vendor?

Unsure

Please provide comments below :

4.7 What challenges do you anticipate would occur if this was required? How might these be addressed? What do you estimate would be the costs of the change?

What challenges do you anticipate would occur if CDD was required on both parties?:

How might the challenges be addressed?:

Land Information NZ require identification when purchasing property. If the AML ID requirements matched the LINZ requirements (e.g. drivers licence only required), that would assist this.

What do you estimate the costs of the change would be?:

4.8 When is the appropriate time for CDD on the vendor and purchaser to be conducted in real estate transactions?

Not Answered

If you have indicated other above or have more comments to make please provide them in the box below:

4.9 Are the prescribed points where CDD must be conducted clear and appropriate? If not, how could we improve them?

No

Please provide further detail below:

Not appropriate. The DIA has now specified CDD is required on all pre-Act customers and specified Trusts must be enhanced. In many cases Trusts just hold the family home, or we have set up the Trust, so a lot of work is required for no risk.

Simplified CDD is rarely used as it is not simple. Make it simple (e.g.) for existing clients only require ID, not verifications, if no risk.

4.10 For enhanced CDD, is the trigger for unusual or complex transactions sufficiently clear?

Yes

Please provide further detail below:

It is, but the DIA needs to understand a simple Family Trust is not unusual or complex.

4.11 Should CDD be required in all instances where suspicions arise?

No

Please provide your comments in the box below:

I don't know how you would do that without tipping them off.

All with a business relationship should be.

4.12 If so, what level of CDD should be required, and what should be the requirements regarding verification? Is there any information that businesses should not need to obtain or verify?

Enhanced customer due diligence

What should be the requirements regarding verification?:

Enhanced should be attempted if you are suspicious.

Is there any information that businesses should not need to obtain or verify?:

4.13 How can we ensure that this obligation does not put businesses in a position where they are likely to tip off the person?

Please provide your comments in the box below:

4.14 What money laundering risks are you seeing in relation to law firm trust accounts?

Please provide your comments in the box below:

None.

4.15 Are there any specific AML/CFT requirements or controls that could be put in place to mitigate the risks? If so, what types of circumstances or transactions should they apply to and what should the AML/CFT requirements be?

Yes

Please share your thoughts:

It should be prescribed what lawyers should do when they receive more funds than required for a transaction, e.g. return to the source.

If you answered yes, what types of circumstances or transactions should they apply to and what should the AML/CFT requirements be?:

4.16 Should this only apply to law firm trust accounts or to any DNFBP that holds funds in its trust account?

Apply to any DNFBP that holds funds in its trust account

Please provide your comments in the box below:

4.17 What do you estimate would be the costs of any additional controls you have identified?

Please provide your comments in the box below:

4.18 Is the information that the Act requires to be obtained and verified still appropriate? If not, what should be changed?

No

Please share your thoughts:

There should be a non-verification option e.g. simplified when no risk.

4.19 Are the obligations to obtain and verify information clear?

Yes

Please provide your comments in the box below:

Clear but pointless for some things, e.g. addresses when buying own home, source of wealth when we are setting up the trust.

4.20 Is the information that businesses should obtain and verify about their customers still appropriate?

No

Please provide your comments in the box below:

it should be risk based, if there is risk then verification is needed.
Source of wealth or funds is pointless, most is apparent through the transaction or is held in property.

4.21 Is there any other information that the Act should require businesses to obtain or verify as part of CDD to better identify and manage a customer's risks?

Please provide your comments in the box below:

4.22 Should we issue regulations to require businesses to obtain and verify information about a legal person or legal arrangement's form and proof of existence, ownership and control structure, and powers that bind and regulate? Why?

No

Please provide your thoughts :

4.23 Do you already obtain some or all of this information, even though it is not explicitly required? If so, what information do you already obtain and why?

Not Answered

If so, what information do you already obtain and why?:

4.24 What do you estimate would be the impact on your compliance costs for your business if regulations explicitly required this information to be obtained and verified?

Please estimate the impact on your compliance costs in the box below:

4.25 Should we issue regulations to prescribe when information about a customer's source of wealth should be obtained and verified versus source of funds? If so, what should the requirements be for businesses?

Yes

Please provide further details below:

Guidance would be helpful.

If so, what should the requirements be for businesses?:

4.26 Are there any instances where businesses should not be required to obtain this information? Are there any circumstances when source of funds and source of wealth should be obtained and verified?

Yes

Please provide your thoughts:

When we have acted for the client.

4.27 Would there be any additional costs resulting from prescribing further requirements for source of wealth and source of funds?

Not Answered

Please provide your estimate of additional costs in the box below:

4.28 Should we issue regulations to require businesses to obtain information about the beneficiary/ies of a life insurance or investment-related insurance policy and prescribe the beneficiary/ies as a relevant risk factor when determining the appropriate level of CDD to conduct? Why or why not?

No

4.28 Please provide your comments on why or why not in the box below:

4.29 If we required this approach to be taken regarding beneficiaries of life and other investment-related insurance policies, should the obligations only apply for moderate or high-risk insurance policies? Are there any other steps we could take to ensure compliance costs are proportionate to risks?

Not Answered

Please provide your comments in the box below:

Are there any other steps we could take to ensure compliance costs are proportionate to risks?:

4.30 Have you encountered issues with the definition of a beneficial owner? If so, what about the definition was unclear or problematic?

No

If so, what about the definition was unclear or problematic?:

4.31 How can we improve the definition in the Act as well as in guidance to address those challenges?

Please provide your thoughts:

4.32 Should we issue a regulation which states that businesses should be focusing on identifying the "ultimate" beneficial owner? If so, how could "ultimate" beneficial owner be defined?

No

Please provide your thoughts:

If so, how could "ultimate" beneficial owner be defined:

4.33 To what extent are you focusing beneficial ownership checks on the "ultimate" beneficial owner, even though it is not strictly required?

Never

Please provide any comments you have on "ultimate" beneficial owner checks in the box below:

4.34 Would there be any additional costs resulting from prescribing that businesses should focus on the "ultimate" beneficial owner?

Yes

Please provide your thoughts:

This can be wide and far, could take a lot of time and be intrusive for someone with a small holding.

If yes, can you please indicate the level of costs you think apply:

4.35 Should we issue a regulation which states that for the purposes of the definition of beneficial owner, a person on whose behalf a transaction is conducted is restricted to a person with indirect ownership or control of the customer (to align with the Financial Action Task Force (FATF) standards)? Why or why not?

Unsure

Please provide your thoughts below:

Whatever simplifies it.

4.36 Would this change make the "specified managing intermediaries" exemption or Regulation 24 of the AML/CFT (Exemption) Regulations 2011 unnecessary? If so, should the exemptions be revoked?

Unsure

Please provide your thoughts:

4.37 Would there be any additional compliance costs or other consequences for your business from this change? If so, what steps could be taken to minimise these costs or other consequences?

Unsure

Please provide your thoughts:

4.38 What process do you currently follow to identify who ultimately owns or controls a legal person, and to what extent is it consistent with the process set out in the FATF standards?

NZ AML/CFT Supervisor guidance on Beneficial Ownership

To what extent is the process you follow consistent with the process set out in the FATF standards?:

We don't

4.39 Should we issue regulations or a Code of Practice which is consistent with the FATF standards for identifying the beneficial owner of a legal person?

Issue regulations

Please provide any further comments you have in the box below:

4.40 Are there any aspects of the process the FATF has identified that are not appropriate for New Zealand businesses?

Not Answered

If yes, please indicate what aspects they are and why they are not appropriate for New Zealand businesses:

4.41 Would there be an impact on your compliance costs by mandating this process? If so, what would be the impact?

Unsure

If so, what would be the impact?:

4.42 Should we issue regulations or a Code of Practice that allows businesses to satisfy their beneficial ownership obligations by identifying the settlor, the trustee(s), the protector and any other person exercising ultimate effective control over the trust or legal arrangement?

Issue a Code of Practice

Please provide any comments you have in the box below:

But be pragmatic.

4.43 Would there be an impact on your compliance costs by mandating that this process be applied? If so, what is the impact?

Yes

Please provide further details below:

Extra burden on clients and cost to us.

4.44 Are the standards of verification and the basis by which verification of identity must be done clear and still appropriate? If not, how could they be improved?

No

Please provide your thoughts:

The Act may give leniency in the verification, but the DIA don't, "reasonable steps" becomes exceptions by exhausting all other means and don't have too many!

Reliable and independent source does not recognise the relationship lawyers have with their clients and how clients are referred to them. It imposes an

undue burden on them and the clients.

4.45 Do you encounter any challenges with using Identity Verification Code of Practice (IVCOP)? If so, what are they, and how could they be resolved?

No

4.48 If so, what are they, and how could they be resolved?:

No, but it is over the top. Why does LINZ accept a Driver Licence on its own but we can't.

4.46 Is the approach in IVCOP clear and appropriate? If not, why?

Yes

Please provide your comments in the box below:

4.47 Should we amend or expand the IVCOP to include other AML/CFT verification requirements, e.g. verifying name and date of birth of high-risk customers verifying legal persons or arrangements, ongoing CDD, or sharing CDD information between businesses?

Unsure

What other verification requirements could be included?:

If we could easily share CDD between businesses that would be useful.
Ongoing CDD needs to be less arduous not more.

4.48 Are there any identity documents or other forms of identity verification that businesses should be able to use to verify a customer's identity?

Please provide your comments in the box below:

A driver licence on its own should be acceptable.

4.49 Do you have any challenges in complying with Part 3 of IVCOP in relation to electronic verification? What are those challenges and how could we address them?

No

What challenges have you faced? :

How could those challenges be addressed?:

4.50 What challenges have you faced with verification of address information? What have been the impacts of those challenges?

What challenges have you faced with verification of address information?:

People live in flatting or boarding situations and cannot verify their address.
Like above, the bank will change their address without any checking, so what's the point.

4.53 What have been the impacts of those challenges?:

A lot of time trying to explore address options and frustration from customers.

4.51 In your view, when should address information be verified, and how should that verification occur?

When should address information be verified?:

Only if there is a high risk and it cannot be verified through publicly held informations, like land records.

How should verification occur?:

Not by posting a letter to them - not a long term option.

4.52 How could we address challenges with address verification while also ensuring law enforcement outcomes are not undermined? Are there any fixes we could make in the short term?

How could we address challenges with address verification while also ensuring law enforcement outcomes are not undermined? :

Criminals are transient - what are you achieving by this?

We could also amend IVCOP to include how businesses should verify address information to ensure a consistent and robust approach. YES but only if

HIGH RISK only

We could also change the basis for verifying address information and enable verification through other means, such as businesses sending their customer a letter. NO

Are there any fixes we could make in the short term?:

Change to this now

in the short term, we could issue regulations to only require address verification to occur for higher risk customers that are natural persons. YES

4.53 Do you currently take any of the steps identified by the FATF standards to manage high-risk customers, transactions or activities? If so, what steps do you take and why?

No

If you answered yes, what steps do you take and why?:

Because complying with the AML/CFT act is such a burden on our business and customers and we are very low risk, due to knowing our customer and where they come from, we do the basics to get through. But the time the basics take mean staff are not always thinking about the real risks.

4.54 Should we issue regulations or a Code of Practice which outlines the additional measures that businesses can take as part of enhanced CDD?

Issue a Code of Practice

Please provide any further comments you have in the box below:

As long as it is optional - ie not all ECDD only if ECDD is due to high risk. Remember most Family Trusts are not high risk.

4.55 Should any of the additional measures be mandatory? If so, how should they be mandated, and in what circumstances?

No

If you answered yes, what measures should be mandatory?:

How should we make the measures mandatory?:

When should the measures be mandatory?:

4.56 Are there ways we can enhance or streamline the operation of the simplified CDD obligations, in particular where the customer is a large organisation?

Unsure

Please provide further detail below :

We have never used Simplified CDD

4.57 Should we issue regulations to allow employees to be delegated by a senior manager without triggering CDD in each circumstance? Why?

Unsure

Why? Please provide your response in the box below:

4.58 Should we remove the requirement for enhanced CDD to be conducted for all trusts or vehicles for holding personal assets? Why or why not?

Yes

Why or why not? Please elaborate:

It should only be required if high risk or complex, to the point of causing red flags.

Must Family Trusts are transparent, explained and simple.

4.59 If we removed this requirement, what further guidance would need to be provided to enable businesses to appropriately identify high risks trusts and conduct enhanced CDD?

Please provide further detail below:

Guidance on what is considered complex or high risk.

4.60 Should high-risk categories of trusts which require enhanced CDD be identified in regulation or legislation? If so, what sorts of trusts would fall into this category?

No

Please provide further detail below:

No guidance should cover it.

If so, what sorts of trusts would fall into this category?:

4.61 Are the ongoing CDD and account monitoring obligations in section 31 clear and appropriate, or are there changes we should consider making?

No

Please provide further detail below:

Lawyers know their clients, why do we need to maintain this information. If there are unusual patterns of behaviour or transactions, then it might be appropriate. Expecting clients to bring up to date passports in to be sighted is unrealistic.

Address verification is pointless ongoing, as stated above.

Why require ID and address verification of clients that were known well before the legislation came in?

What changes should we consider making to clarify CDD and account monitoring obligations in section 31?:

If a red flag is alerted, then do ongoing CDD.

4.62 As part of ongoing CDD and account monitoring, do you consider whether and when CDD was last conducted and the adequacy of the information previously obtained?

Yes

Please provide any further comments in the box below:

we consider if what we hold is current and if it meets the current standard, but we only do this when the client reengages with us, not as IDs expire.

4.63 Should we issue regulations to require businesses to consider these factors when conducting ongoing CDD and account monitoring? Why?

No

Why? Please provide your comments in the box below:

Don't make it harder than it already is.

4.64 What would be the impact on your compliance costs if we issued regulations to make this change? Would ongoing CDD be triggered more often?

What would be the impact on your compliance costs if we issued regulations to make this change?:

A lot!

Yes - ongoing CDD would be triggered more often

4.65 Should we mandate any other requirements for ongoing CDD, e.g. how frequently it needs to be conducted?

No

Why? Please provide further detail below:

Keep it simple - or should I say make it simple!

Please provide any other examples of mandated requirements for ongoing CDD in the box below:

4.66 If you are a DNFBP, how do you currently approach your ongoing CDD and account monitoring obligations where there are few or no financial transactions?

Please provide your response in the box below:

We undergo it when we engage with the client next.

4.67 Should we issue regulations to require businesses to review activities provided to the customer as well as account activity and transaction behaviour? What reviews would you consider to be appropriate?

No

Please provide further information below:

What reviews would you consider to be appropriate?:

4.68 What would be the impact on your compliance costs if we issued regulations to make this change?

What would be the impact on your compliance costs if we issued regulations to make this change?:

Huge!

4.69 Do you currently review other information beyond what is required in the Act as part of account monitoring? If so, what information do you review and why?

No

If so, what information do you review and why?:

4.70 Should we issue regulations requiring businesses to review other information where appropriate as part of account monitoring? If so, what information should regulations require businesses to regularly review?

No

Please provide further information below:

If you answered yes, what information should regulations require businesses to regularly review?:

4.71 How could we ensure that existing (pre-Act) customers are subject to the appropriate level of CDD? Are any of the options appropriate and are there any other options we have not identified? What would be the cost implications of the options?

None of the above

Why? Please provide further details below:

Definitely not the sinking lid. A legal client may only use their law firm whenever they busy a house, that could be 10+ years. How do you ask someone you dealt with 10 years ago to provide ID?

Are there any other options for ensuring existing (pre-Act) customers are subject to the appropriate levels of CDD?:

It should be risk based. We know these clients, we should only need to CDD them when there is risk.

What would be the cost implications of the options?:

Sinking lid is a huge cost.

4.72 Should the Act set out what can constitute tipping off and set out a test for businesses to apply to determine whether conducting CDD or enhanced CDD may tip off a customer?

Yes

Why? Please provide more information below:

4.73 Once suspicion has been formed, should reporting entities have the discretion not to conduct enhanced CDD to avoid tipping off?

Yes

Please provide any further information below:

If it is reported.

4.74 If you answered yes to question 4.73, in what circumstances should this apply? For example, should it apply only to business relationships (rather than occasional transactions or activities)? Or should it only apply to certain types of business relationships where the customer holds a facility for the customer (such as a bank account)?

Other

If other, please provide details in the box below:

Discretion of the business

Why? Please provide further detail below:

4.75 Are there any other challenges with the existing requirements to conduct enhanced CDD as soon as practicable after becoming aware that a SAR must be reported? How could we address those challenges?

No

What are those challenges?:

It really doesn't happen.

If yes, how could we address those challenges?:

4.76 Do you have any challenges with complying with your record keeping obligations? How could we address those challenges?

No

Please provide more detail below:

If yes, how could we address those challenges?:

4.77 Are there any other records we should require businesses to keep, depending on the nature of their business?

No

If yes, what are the other records and why should they be kept?:

4.78 Does the exemption from keeping records of the parties to a transaction where the transaction is outside a business relationship or below the occasional transaction threshold hinder reconstruction of transactions? If so, should the exemption be modified or removed?

No

If so, should the exemption be modified or removed?:

Why? Please provide any additional information:

4.79 Do you have any challenges with complying with the obligations regarding politically exposed persons? How could we address those challenges?

Yes

Please provide any additional information below:

Without paying a 3rd party provider, who do we effectively check these? A google search and then what are we looking for.

If you answered yes, how could we address those challenges?:

Guidance is needed on how we can determine a PEP

4.80 Do you take any additional steps to mitigate the risks of politically exposed persons (PEPs) that are not required by the Act? What are those steps and why do you take them?

No

If yes, what are those steps and why do you take them?:

4.81 How do you currently treat customers who are domestic PEPs or PEPs from international organisations?

How do you currently treat customers who are domestic PEPs or PEPs from international organisations?:

We do not record or check domestic PEPs. We have not struck any international PEPs.

4.82 Should the definition of "politically exposed persons" be expanded to include domestic PEPs and/or PEPs from international organisations? If so, what should the definitions be?

No

Please provide any additional information below:

What is the risk in NZ? really?

If you answered yes, how do you think these terms should be defined?:

4.83 If we included domestic PEPs, should we also include political candidates and persons who receive party donations to improve the integrity of our electoral financing regime?

No

Please provide any further comments in the box below:

Outside of the regime.

4.84 What would be the cost implications of such a measure for your business or sector?

4.84 What would be the cost implications of such a measure for your business or sector?:

Costly.

4.85 How do you currently treat customers who were once PEPs?

4.85 How do you currently treat customers who were once PEPs?:

haven't had any

4.86 Should we require a risk-based approach to determine whether a customer who no longer occupies a public function should still nonetheless be treated as a PEP?

Yes

4.86 If you want to elaborate on your choice please provide your comments in the box below:

4.87 Would a risk-based approach to former PEPs impact compliance costs compared to the current prescriptive approach?

Not Answered

4.87 Please provide any further comments you would like to make in the box below:

4.88 What steps do you take, proactive or otherwise, to determine whether a customer is a foreign PEP?

4.88 What steps do you take, proactive or otherwise, to determine whether a customer is a foreign PEP?:

Ask them & google them.

4.89 Do you consider the Act's use of "take reasonable steps" aligns with the FATF's expectations that businesses have risk management systems in place to enable proactive steps to be taken to identify whether a customer or beneficial owner is a foreign PEP? If not, how can we make it clearer?

Yes

4.89 If not, how can we make it clearer?:

4.90 Should the Act clearly allow businesses to consider their level of exposure to foreign PEPs when determining the extent to which they need to take proactive steps?

Yes

4.90 Please provide any further comments you would like to make in the box below:

4.91 Should the Act mandate that businesses undertake the necessary checks to determine whether the customer or beneficial owner is a foreign PEP before the relationship is established or occasional activity or transaction is conducted?

No

4.91 Please provide any further comments in the box below:

4.92 How do you currently deal with domestic PEPs or international organisation PEPs? For example, do you take risk-based measures to determine whether a customer is a domestic PEP, even though our law does not require this to be done?

Do you take risk-based measures to determine whether a customer is a domestic PEP

4.92 If there are other ways you currently deal with domestic PEPs or international organisation PEPs please indicate what you do in the box below:

4.93 If we include domestic PEPs and PEPs from international organisations within scope of the Act, should the Act allow for businesses to take reasonable steps, according to the level of risk involved, to determine whether a customer or beneficial owner is a domestic or international organisation PEP?

Yes

4.93 Please provide any further comments in the box below:

4.94 What would the cost implications of including domestic PEPs and PEPs from international organisations be for your business or sector?

4.94 What would the cost implications of including domestic PEPs and PEPs from international organisations be for your business or sector?:

a lot

4.95 Should businesses be required to take reasonable steps to determine whether the beneficiary (or beneficial owner of a beneficiary) of a life insurance policy is a PEP before any money is paid out?

No

4.95 Please provide any comments you have in the box below:

4.96 What would be the cost implications of requiring life insurers to determine whether a beneficiary is a PEP?

4.96 What would be the cost implications of requiring life insurers to determine whether a beneficiary is a PEP?:

4.97 What steps do you currently take to mitigate the risks of customers who are PEPs?

4.97 What steps do you currently take to mitigate the risks of customers who are PEPs?:

4.98 Should the Act mandate businesses take the necessary mitigation steps the FATF expects for all foreign PEPs, and, if domestic or international organisation PEPs are included within scope, where they present higher risks?

No

4.98 Please provide your comments in the box below:

4.99 What would be the cost implications of requiring businesses to take further steps to mitigate the risks of customers who are PEPs?

4.99 What would be the cost implications of requiring businesses to take further steps to mitigate the risks of customers who are PEPs?:

4.100 Should businesses be required to assess their exposure to designated individuals or entities?

Yes

Please provide your comments in the box below:

We are very low risk, so should have a low risk approach

4.101 What support would businesses need to conduct this assessment?

Please provide your comments in the box below:

guidance.

4.102 If we require businesses to assess their proliferation financing risks, what should the requirement look like? Should this assessment be restricted to the risk of sanctions evasion (in line with FATF standards) or more generally consider proliferation financing risks?

Please provide your comments in the box below:

We have minimal involvement with international citizens - we just need to know where to look if we are dealing with someone in a higher risk country.

4.103 Should legislation require businesses to include, as part of their AML/CFT programme, policies, procedures, and controls to implement TFS obligations without delay? How prescriptive should the requirement be?

Please provide your comments in the box below:

no

4.104 What support would businesses need to develop such policies, procedures, and controls?

Please provide your comments in the box below:

not applicable to us, why do it

4.105 How should businesses receive timely updates to sanctions lists?

Please provide your comments in the box below:

4.106 Do we need to amend the Act to ensure all businesses are receiving timely updates to sanctions lists? If so, what would such an obligation look like?

Please provide your comments in the box below:

No

4.107 How can we support and enable businesses to identify associates and persons acting on behalf of designated persons or entities?

Please provide your comments in the box below:

4.108 Do you currently screen for customers and transactions involving designated persons and entities? If so, what is the process that you follow?

Please provide your comments in the box below:

no

4.109 How could the Act support businesses to screen customers and transactions to ensure they do not involve designated persons and entities? Are any obligations or safe harbours required?

Please provide your comments in the box below:

not applicable

4.110 If we created obligations in the Act, how could we ensure that the obligations can be implemented efficiently and that we minimise compliance costs?

Please provide your comments in the box below:

don't do it

4.111 How can we streamline current reporting obligations and ensure there is an appropriate notification process for property frozen in compliance with regulations issued under the United Nations Act?

Please provide your comments in the box below:

not applicable

4.112 If we included a new reporting obligation in the Act which complies with UN and FATF requirements, how could that obligation look? How could we ensure there is no duplication of reporting requirements?

Please provide your comments in the box below:

don't

4.113 Should the government provide assurance to businesses that have frozen assets that the actions taken are appropriate?

Yes

Please provide your comments in the box below:

4.114 If so, what could that assurance look like and how would it work?

Please provide your comments in the box below:

4.115 Are the requirements for managing the risks of correspondent banking relationships set out in section 29 still fit-for-purpose or do they need updating?

Unsure

Please provide your comments in the box below:

4.116 Are you aware of any correspondent relationships in non-banking sectors? If so, do you consider those relationships to be risky and should the requirements in section 29 also apply to those correspondent relationships?

No

Please provide your comments in the box below:

4.117 If you are a money or value transfer service (MVTs) provider which uses agents, how do you currently maintain visibility of how many agents you have?

Please provide your comments in the box below:

4.118 Should a MVTs provider be required to maintain a current list of its agents as part of its AML/CFT programme?

Not Answered

Please provide your comments in the box below:

4.119 Should a MVTs provider be explicitly required to monitor and manage its agents for compliance with its AML/CFT programme (including vetting and training obligations)?

Not Answered

Please provide your comments in the box below:

4.120 Should the Act explicitly state that a MVTs provider is responsible and liable for AML/CFT compliance of any activities undertaken by its agent? Why or why not?

Not Answered

Why or why not?:

4.121 If you are an MVTs provider which uses agents, do you currently include your agents in your programme, and monitor them for compliance (including conducting vetting and training)? Why or why not?

Not Answered

Why or why not?:

4.122 Should we issue regulations to explicitly require MVTs providers to monitor and manage its agents for compliance with its AML/CFT programme (including vetting and training obligations)? Why or why not?

Not Answered

Why or why not?:

4.123 What would be the cost implications of requiring MVTs providers to include agents in their programmes?

Please provide your comments in the box below:

4.124 Who should be responsible for the AML/CFT compliance for sub-agents for MVTs providers which use a multi-layer approach? Should it be the MVTs provider, the master agent, or both?

Please provide your comments in the box below:

4.125 Should we issue regulations to declare that master agents are reporting entities under the Act in their own right? Why or why not?

Not Answered

Why or why not?:

4.126 What would be the cost implications of requiring MVTs providers to include agents in their programmes?

Please provide your comments in the box below:

4.127 What risks with new products or technologies have you identified in your business or sector? What do you currently do with those risks?

Please provide your comments in the box below:

4.128 Should we issue regulations to explicitly require businesses to assess risks in relation to the development of new products, new business practices (including new delivery mechanisms), and using new or developing technologies for both new and pre-existing products? Why or why not?

Yes

Why or why not?:

help us - guidance would be better than regulations

4.129 If so, should the risks be assessed prior to the launch or use of any new products or technologies?

Please provide your comments in the box below:

as they become relevant.

4.130 What would be the cost implications of explicitly requiring businesses to assess the risks of new products or technologies?

Please provide your comments in the box below:

how often are we dealing with them - no much if we have guidance

4.131 Should we issue regulations to explicitly require businesses to mitigate risks identified with new products or technologies? Why or why not?

No

Why or why not?:

4.132 Would there be any cost implications of explicitly requiring business to mitigate the risks of new products or technologies?

Unsure

If yes, what are your views?:

4.133 Are there any obligations we need to tailor for virtual asset service providers? Is there any further support that we should provide to assist them with complying with their obligations?

Unsure

Please provide your comments in the box below:

4.134 Should we set specific thresholds for occasional transactions for virtual asset service providers? Why or why not?

Unsure

Why or why not?:

4.135 If so, should the threshold be set at NZD 1,500 (in line with the FATF standards) or NZD 1,000 (in line with the Act's existing threshold for currency exchange and wire transfers)? Why?

Unsure

Why?:

4.136 Are there any challenges that we would need to navigate in setting occasional transaction thresholds for virtual assets?

Unsure

Please provide your comments in the box below:

4.137 Should we issue regulations to declare that transfers of virtual assets to be cross-border wire transfers? Why or why not?

Unsure

Why or why not?:

4.138 Would there be any challenges with taking this approach? How could we address those challenges?

Unsure

Please provide your comments in the box below:

4.139 What challenges have you encountered with the definitions involved in a wire transfer, including international wire transfers?

Please provide your comments in the box below:

You have used the phrase Enhanced Due Dilligence in relation to wire transfers, but a different set of criteria is required. This is very confusing and makes it more difficult to comply.

4.140 Do the definitions need to be modernised and amended to be better reflect business practices? If so, how?

Unsure

If so, how?:

4.141 Are there any other issues with the definitions that we have not identified?

Yes

If yes, what are your views?:

as above.

4.142 What information, if any, do you currently provide when conducting wire transfers below NZD 1000?

Please provide your comments in the box below:

We ensure we have done CDD

4.143 Should we issue regulations requiring wire transfers below NZD 1000 to be accompanied with some information about the originator and beneficiary? Why or why not?

No

Why or why not?:

Don't make this process harder

4.144 What would be the cost implications from requiring specific information be collected for and accompany wire transfers of less than NZD 1000?

Please provide your comments in the box below:

A lot of time to submit this information to the FIU

4.145 How do you currently treat wire transfers which lack the required information about the originator or beneficiary, including below the NZD 1000 threshold?

Please provide your comments in the box below:

Standard CDD

4.146 Should ordering institutions be explicitly prohibited from executing wire transfers in all circumstances where information about the parties is missing, including information about the beneficiary? Why or why not?

No

Why or why not?:

It could stop legimate business transactions for long standing clients (prior to the regime)

4.147 Would there be any impact on compliance costs if an explicit prohibition existed for ordering institutions?

Yes

If yes, what are your views?:

undue burden and stress on clients and cost to deal with

4.148 When acting as an intermediary institution, what do you currently do with information about the originator and beneficiary?

Please provide your comments in the box below:

n/a

4.149 Should we amend the Act to mandate intermediary institutions to retain the information with the wire transfer? Why or why not?

Unsure

Why or why not?:

4.150 If you act as an intermediary institution, do you do some or all of the following:• keep records where relevant information cannot be passed along in the domestic leg of a wire transfer where technical limitations prevent the information from being accompanied?• take reasonable measures to identify international wire transfers lacking the required information?• have risk-based policies in place for determining what to do with wire transfers lacking the required information?

Unsure

Please provide your comments in the box below:

4.151 Should we issue regulations requiring intermediary institutions to take these steps, in line with the FATF standards? Why or why not?

Unsure

Why or why not?:

4.152 What would be the cost implications from requiring intermediary institutions to take these steps?

Please provide your comments in the box below:

4.153 Do you currently take any reasonable measures to identify international wire transfers that lack required information? If so, what are those measures and why do you take them?

No

If so, what are those measures and why do you take them? :

4.154 Should we issue regulations requiring beneficiary institutions to take reasonable measures, which may include post-event or real time monitoring, to identify international wire transfers that lack the required originator or beneficiary information?

No

If yes, what are your views?:

4.155 What would be the cost implications from requiring beneficiary institutions to take these steps?

Please provide your comments in the box below:

A lot, mostly these are not our clients.

4.156 Are the prescribed transaction reporting requirements clear, fit for purpose, and relevant? If not, what improvements or changes do we need to make?

Unsure

If not, what improvements or changes do we need to make?:

4.157 Have you encountered any challenges in complying with your prescribed transaction reporting (PTR) obligations? What are those challenges and how could we resolve them?

Yes

If yes, what are those challenges and how could we resolve them?:

They look a while to get right, now we can do them reasonably quickly

4.158 Should we issue regulations or a Code of Practice to provide more clarity about the sorts of transactions that require a PTR?

No

Please provide your comments in the box below:

4.159 If so, what transactions have you identified where the PTR obligation is unclear? What makes the reporting obligation unclear, and how could we clarify the obligation?

Please provide your comments in the box below:

4.160 Should non-bank financial institutions (other than MVTs providers) and DNFBPs be required to report PTRs for international fund transfers?

No

Please provide your comments in the box below:

The banks should not the DNFBPs

4.161 If so, should the PTR obligations on non-bank financial institutions and DNFBPs be separate to those imposed on banks and MVTS providers?

Please provide your comments in the box below:

if required, it would be helpful if it relates to DNFBP terminology not banking.

4.162 Are there any other options to ensure that New Zealand has a robust PTR obligation that maximises financial intelligence available to the FIU, while minimising the accompanying compliance burden across all reporting entities?

Yes

Please provide your comments in the box below:

4.163 Should we amend the existing regulatory exemption for intermediary institutions so that it does not apply to MVTS providers?

Unsure

Please provide your comments in the box below:

4.164 Are there any alternative options that we should consider which ensure that financial intelligence on international wire transfers is collected when multiple MVTS providers are involved in the transaction?

Not Answered

If yes, what are your views?:

4.165 Are there any other intermediary institutions that should be included in the exemption?

Unsure

If yes, what are your views?:

4.166 Are there situations you have encountered where submitting a PTR within the required 10 working days has been challenging? What was the cause of that situation and what would have been an appropriate timeframe?

Yes

Please provide your comments in the box below:

When we shutdown over Christmas

4.167 Do you consider that a lower threshold for PTRs to be more in line with New Zealand's risk and context? If so, what would be the appropriate threshold for reporting?

No

If so, what would be the appropriate threshold for reporting?:

4.168 Are there any practical issues not identified in this document that we should address before changing any PTR threshold?

Unsure

Please provide your comments in the box below:

4.169 How much would a change in reporting threshold impact your business?

Please provide your comments in the box below:

Extra time submitting reports for small (genuine) amounts, e.g. overseas royalties or estate distributions

4.170 How much time would you need to implement the change?

Please provide your comments in the box below:

?

4.171 Do you use any of the reliance provisions in the AML/CFT Act? If so, which provisions do you use?

Yes

If so, what provisions do you use?:

Section 33

4.172 Are there any barriers to you using reliance to the extent you would like to?

Yes

Please provide your comments in the box below:

Receiving original documentation, as we scan all files.
The age of some of the verification is too old to meet the guidelines.

4.173 Are there any changes that could be made to the reliance provisions that would mean you used them more? If so, what?

Yes

If so, what?:

Make it the requirements around age of documents and needing to sight originals easier for reporting entities to use

4.174 Given the 'approved entities' approach is inconsistent with FATF standards and no entities have been approved, should we continue to have an 'approved entities' approach?

Yes

Please provide your comments in the box below:

4.175 If so, how should the government approve an entity for third party reliance? What standards should an entity be required to meet to become approved?

Please provide your comments in the box below:

4.176 If your business is a reporting entity, would you want to be an approved entity? Why or why not?

Unsure

Why or why not?:

4.177 Are there any alternative approaches we should consider to enable liability to be shared during reliance?

Unsure

Please provide your comments in the box below:

4.178 Should we issue regulations to enable other types of businesses to form DBGs, if so, what are those types of businesses and why should they be eligible to form a DBG?

Unsure

If so, what are those types of businesses and why should they be eligible to form a DBG?:

4.179 Should we issue regulations to prescribe that overseas DBG members must conduct CDD to the level required by our Act?

Unsure

Please provide your comments in the box below:

4.180 Do we need to change existing eligibility criteria for forming DBGs? Why?

Unsure

Why?:

4.181 Are there any other obligations that DBG members should be able to share?

Unsure

Please provide your comments in the box below:

4.182 Should we issue regulations to explicitly require business to do the following before relying on a third party for CDD:• consider the level of country risk when determining whether a third party in another country can be relied upon;• take steps to satisfy themselves that copies of identification data and other relevant documentation will be made available upon request without delay; and• be satisfied that the third party has record keeping arrangements in place.

Yes

Please provide your comments in the box below:

4.183 Would doing so have an impact on compliance costs for your business? If so, what is the nature of that impact?

Unsure

If so, what is the nature of that impact?:

4.184 Are there any other issues or improvements that we can make to third party reliance provisions?

Unsure

Please provide your comments in the box below:

4.185 Are there other forms of reliance that we should enable? If so, how would those reliance relationships work?

Unsure

If so, how would those reliance relationships work?:

4.186 What conditions should be imposed to ensure we do not inadvertently increase money laundering and terrorism financing vulnerabilities by allowing for other forms of reliance?

Please provide your comments in the box below:

4.187 Are the minimum requirements set out still appropriate? Are there other requirements that should be prescribed, or requirements that should be clarified?

No

Please provide your comments in the box below:

There needs to be further guidance

4.188 Should the Act mandate that compliance officers need to be at the senior management level of the business, in line with the FATF standards?

Unsure

Please provide your comments in the box below:

4.189 Should the Act clarify that compliance officers must be natural persons, to avoid legal persons being appointed as compliance officers?

Yes

Please provide your comments in the box below:

4.190 If you are a member of a financial or non-financial group, do you already implement a group-wide programme even though it is not required?

Please provide your comments in the box below:

4.191 Should we mandate that groups of financial and non-financial businesses implement group-wide programmes to address the risks groups are exposed to?

Not Answered

Please provide your comments in the box below:

4.192 Do we need to clarify expectations regarding reviewing and keeping AML/CFT programmes up to date? If so, how should we clarify what is required?

Yes

If so, how should we clarify what is required?:

The audit is expensive.

4.193 Should legislation state that the purpose of independent audits is to test the effectiveness of a business's AML/CFT system?

No

Please provide your comments in the box below:

4.194 What other improvements or changes could we make to the independent audit or review requirements to ensure the obligation is useful for businesses without imposing unnecessary compliance costs?

Please provide your comments in the box below:

4.195 How can we better enable businesses to understand and mitigate the risk of the countries they deal with, and determine whether countries have sufficient or insufficient AML/CFT systems and measures in place? For example, would a code of practice (rather than guidance) setting out the steps that businesses should take when considering country risk be useful?

Please provide your comments in the box below:

Yes code of practice

4.196 Should we issue regulations to impose proportionate and appropriate countermeasures to mitigate the risk of countries on FATF's blacklist?

No

Please provide your comments in the box below:

4.197 If so, what do you think would be appropriate measures to counter the risks these countries pose?

Please provide your comments in the box below:

4.198 Is the FATF blacklist an appropriate threshold? If not, what threshold would you prefer?

Unsure

If not, what threshold would you prefer?:

4.199 Should we use section 155 to impose countermeasures against specific individuals and entities where it is necessary to protect New Zealand from specific money laundering threats?

Unsure

Please provide your comments in the box below:

4.200 If so, how can we ensure the power is only used when it is appropriate? What evidence would be required for the Governor-General to decide to impose a countermeasure?

Please provide your comments in the box below:

4.201 How can we protect the rights of bona fide third parties?

Please provide your comments in the box below:

4.202 Should there be a process for affected parties to apply to revoke a countermeasure once made? If so, what could that process look like?

Not Answered

If so, what could that process look like?:

4.203 How can we improve the quality of reports received by the FIU and avoid low-quality, defensive reporting?

Please provide your comments in the box below:

4.204 What barriers might you have to providing high quality reporting to the FIU?

Please provide your comments in the box below:

Fear of tipping off

4.205 Should the threshold for reporting be amended to not capture low level offending?

Unsure

Please provide your comments in the box below:

4.206 Should we expand the circumstances in which SARs or SAR information can be shared? If so, in what circumstances should this information be able to be shared?

Not Answered

If so, in what circumstances should this information be able to be shared?:

4.207 Should there be specific conditions that need to be fulfilled before this information can be shared? If so, what conditions should be imposed (e.g. application to the FIU)?

Unsure

If so, what conditions should be imposed (e.g. application to the FIU)?:

4.208 Should we issue regulations to state that a MVTs provider that controls both the ordering and beneficiary ends of a wire transfer is required to consider both sides of the transfer to determine whether a SAR is required? Why or why not?

Not Answered

Why or why not?:

4.209 If a SAR is required, should it be explicitly stated that it must be submitted in any jurisdiction where it is relevant?

Not Answered

Please provide your comments in the box below:

4.210 Should we extend additional AML/CFT obligations to high value dealers? Why or why not? If so, what should their obligations be?

Not Answered

Why or why not? If so, what should their obligations be?:

4.211 Should all high value dealers have increased obligations, or only certain types, e.g., dealers in precious metals and stones, motor vehicle dealers?

Not Answered

Please provide your comments in the box below:

4.212 Are there any new risks in the high value dealer sector that you are seeing?

Not Answered

Please provide your comments in the box below:

5. Other issues or topics

5.1 Should the AML/CFT Act define the point at which a movement of cash or other instruments becomes an import or export?

Unsure

If you answered 'yes', please give reasons for your answer.:

5.2 Should the timing of the requirement to complete a BCR be set to the time any Customs trade and/or mail declaration is made, before the item leaves New Zealand, for exports, and the time at which the item arrives in New Zealand, for imports?

Unsure

If you answered 'yes', please give reasons for your answer.:

5.3 Should there be instances where certain groups or categories of vessel are not required to complete a BCR (for example, cruise ships or other vessels with items on board, where those items are not coming off the vessel)?

Unsure

If you answered 'yes', please give reasons for your answer.:

5.4 How can we ensure the penalties for non-declared or falsely declared transportation of cash are effective, proportionate, and dissuasive?

Please share your suggestions below.:

5.5 Should the Act allow for Customs officers to detain cash even where it is declared appropriately through creating a power, similar to an unexplained wealth order that could be applied where people are attempting to move suspiciously large volumes of cash?

Unsure

If you answered 'yes', please give reasons for your answer.:

5.6 If you answered 'yes' to the previous question (Question 5.5), how could we constrain this power to ensure it does not constitute an unreasonable search and seizure power?

Please share your suggestions below.:

5.7 Should BCRs be required for more than just physical currency and bearer-negotiable instruments and also include other forms of value movements such as stored value instruments, casino chips, and precious metals and stones?

Unsure

If you answered 'yes', please give reasons for your answer.:

5.8 Does the AML/CFT Act properly balance its purposes with the need to protect people's information and other privacy concerns?

Unsure

If you answered 'no', how could we better protect people's privacy?:

5.9 Should we specify in the Act how long agencies can retain information, including financial intelligence held by the FIU?

Unsure

Please give reasons for your answer.:

5.10 If you answered 'yes' to the previous question (Question 5.9), what types of information should have retention periods, and what should those periods be?

Please share your suggestions below.:

5.11 Does the Act appropriately protect the disclosure of legally privileged information?

Yes

If you answered 'no', please give reasons for your answer.:

Are there other circumstances where people should be allowed not to disclose information if it is privileged?:

5.12 Is the process for testing assertions that a document or piece of information is privileged set out in section 159A appropriate?

Yes

If you answered 'no', please give reasons for your answer.:

5.13 What challenges or barriers have you identified that prevent you from harnessing technology to improve efficiencies and effectiveness?

Please share your comments below.:

We don't know which providers are reputable.

How can we overcome those challenges? Please share your suggestions below.:

Certify providers

5.14 What additional challenges or barriers may exist which would prevent the adoption of digital identity once the Digital Identity Trust Framework is established and operational?

Please share your comments below.:

Sounds like it could help.

How can we overcome those challenges?:

5.15 Should we achieve greater harmonisation with Australia's regulation?

Yes

If you answered yes, tell us why and any suggestions you have for how we could achieve this.:

We get feedback or documents from Australia that do not meet our requirements, e.g. photo ID certified without saying 'likeness'

5.16 How can we ensure the AML/CFT system is resilient to long- and short-term challenges?

Please share your suggestions below.:

The regime needs to be simplified for it be resilient. It is currently overly complicated and takes the focus away from the risk towards being, have I gained every little piece of information and verification, in the right form - if I have, done! Without thinking about why we have AML.

The criminals will not comply, it is the good businesses with good clients undergoing legitimate life and business transactions that have to be asked intrusive questions, provide information, get it verified, etc. and either we or the client pay for all of this.

6. Minor changes

6.1 What are your views regarding the minor changes we have identified?

Please share your comments below.:

Are there any changes you don't support? Please tell us what they are and why you don't support them.:

Re "Issue a regulation which explicitly requires businesses to verify any new information obtained through ongoing CDD."

This is a burden on clients and lawyers for what risk? This does not reflect reality for 99.99% of lawyers and their clients. The burden on lawyers is disproportionate to the risk. 'Bad' lawyers won't comply, 'good' lawyers have to wear the cost. Why add a further burden verify information on an ongoing basis.

Re "Issue a regulation which requires businesses to keep records of prescribed transaction reports for five years." Why!!!! We lodged everything in GoAML, isn't it up to FIU to keep these? Each report has an internal reference, so they can come back to us if they want to. Again, the 'bad' lawyers will not complete it fully, why punish the 'good' ones.

Re" Issue a regulation which requires businesses to retain copies of records in New Zealand to ensure they can be easily accessible when required." We do not keep paper copies, electronic copies may be stored in the cloud, e.g. Office365 , which houses data offshore. Do not prescribe NZ, unless you include or in electronic form.

6.2 Are there any other minor changes that we should make to the Act or regulations?

Yes

If you answered 'yes', please share your suggestions.:

Stop needing to verify addresses - it is pointless and time consuming.