Commission of Inquiry into Money Laundering in British Columbia

Public Hearing

Commissioner

The Honourable Justice
Austin Cullen

Held at:

Vancouver, British Columbia via video link

Monday, June 15, 2020

APPEARANCES

Brock Martland, QC Patrick McGowan Kyle McCleery

Cullen Commission

Cherisse Friesen Chantelle Rajotte Jacqueline Hughes B.C. (Ministry of Finance and Gaming Policy

and Enforcement Branch)

Hanna Davis Katherine Shelley

Canada

Ludmila Herbst, QC Catherine George Law Society of B.C.

Ron Usher Society of Notaries Public of B.C.

William Smart, QC B.C. Lottery Corporation

Mark Skwarok Melanie Harmer **Great Canadian Gaming Corporation**

Christine Mainville Robert Kroeker

Robin McFee, QC Maya Ollek James Lightbody

Chris Weafer Patrick Weafer B.C. Real Estate Association

Jitesh Mistry B.C. Government and Service Employees' Union

Carina Chiu BMW

Megan Tweedie B.C. Civil Liberties Association

Jo-Anne Stark Kevin Westell Canadian Bar Association, B.C. Branch

Kevin Westell Criminal Defence Advocacy Society

Kevin Comeau Transparency International Coalition

TABLE OF CONTENTS

		PAGE
Wit	ness called for the Commission:	
	SIR ROBERT WAINWRIGHT Examination by Mr. McCleery Examination by Ms. George Examination by Mr. Smart	1 70 72
EXI	HIBITS	
63 64	Sir Robert Wainwright - Curriculum Vitae Europol - Why Is Cash Still King?: A Strategic Report on the Use of Cash by Criminal Groups as a Facilitator for Money Laundering	2 14
	Europol - From Suspicion to Action Europol - Does crime still pay?	28 55

Robert Wainwright (for the Commission) Examination by Mr. McCleery, Counsel for the Commission

1 Vancouver, B.C. 2 June 15, 2020 3 4 THE REGISTRAR: Good morning. Thank you for your 5 patience. The hearing is resumed. 6 THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you, Madam Registrar. 7 McCleery, do you have conduct of the examination 8 of the next witness? 9 I do, Mr. Commissioner. MR. MCCLEERY: Today we have 10 Sir Rob Wainwright, who is a partner with Deloitte and the former executive director of 11 12 Sir Rob is scheduled to give evidence Europol. 13 today and tomorrow, and I expect we should have 14 ample time to complete his evidence. 15 And Madam Registrar, I understand that Sir 16 Rob will affirm. 17 THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you. 18 THE REGISTRAR: Sir Robert, would you please unmute 19 your mike. I think you are -- thank you. 20 [Affirmation] Sorry, could you please say it 21 again? 22 MR. WAINWRIGHT: Do you hear me now? 23 THE REGISTRAR: Yes. 24 MR. WAINWRIGHT: Maybe you could just ask me again for 25 the record, please. 26 27 ROBERT WAINWRIGHT, a witness 28 called for the Commission, 29 affirmed. 30 31 THE REGISTAR: Please state your full name and spell your first name and last name for the record. 32 33 My name is Sir Robert Mark Wainwright. 34 R-o-b-e-r-t, Wainwright, W-a-i-n-w-r-i-g-h-t. 35 THE REGISTRAR: Thank you very much. 36 THE COMMISSIONER: Yes, Mr. McCleery. Thank you. 37 MR. MCCLEERY: Thank you. 38 39 EXAMINATION BY MR. MCCLEERY:

40 41

42

43 44

45

46 47

- Good morning, Sir Rob, can you hear me?
- Good morning, Kyle. Α Yes.
- Good morning. I'd like to begin by asking you to tell us a little bit about your background and professional experience. You've provided us with a copy of your curriculum vitae.
- MR. MCCLEERY: And Madam Registrar, I wonder if you

Robert Wainwright (for the Commission) Examination by Mr. McCleery, Counsel for the Commission

1 might pull up Sir Rob's CV, which I believe is document number 41 on your list.

- Q And Sir Rob, can you confirm that this is the first page of the CV you have provide to us, just with some contact information redacted?
- A Yes, it is, Kyle.
- Q Thank you.
- MR. MCCLEERY: Mr. Commissioner, I'd ask this be marked as the next exhibit.
- THE COMMISSIONER: Very well. That will be Exhibit 63.

THE REGISTRAR: Exhibit 63.

EXHIBIT 63: Sir Robert Wainwright - Curriculum Vitae

- MR. MCCLEERY: And Madam Registrar, we can take that document down now. Thank you.
- Q Sir Rob, I understand you've been a partner with Deloitte since June 2018; is that correct?
- A That's correct.
- Q And can you please tell us a little bit about the nature of the work that you do in that role.
- A Yes. I'm a partner with Deloitte. I'm based in Europe but I work globally, serving global organizations and some national governments, providing advice, at senior executive level, in the management of cyber risk, financial risk and related areas.
- Q And can you tell us the extent to which that work relates to the issue of money laundering.
- A I spend a lot -- a lot of my time speaking to some governments and a lot of the global banks about the challenge they face in fighting money laundering as part of the wider financial crime agenda. And I do that by leveraging my background, my career background, which we'll come on to discuss.
- Q Thank you. Yes. Why don't we move then to the beginning of your career. I understand from your CV you spent approximately 11 years as an intelligence officer with the British Security Service. Can you tell us a little bit about that organization and what your role was there.
- A Yes. It's -- it's the domestic security service of the United Kingdom. It has a responsibility for safeguarding the national security of the UK,

principally from threats of espionage, terrorism and other threats to national security. For 11 years I was an intelligence officer specializing in a range of fields relating to the work of that agency, including helping to set up its organized crime department and, as part of that, to transfer some of the learning lessons as an agency we had from fighting national security threats, particular terrorism, to the organized crime agenda, to help some of the national policing institutions take a more effective response to organized crime, now that included, of course, money laundering as a constituent part of the threat from organized crime.

And the premise we took therefore of maximizing our intelligence base and what we call taking an intelligence-led policing approach from that counter-terrorist domain included, for example, the premise of following the money, which I think is now well known in the field of combating financial crime.

- Q Thank you. And then I understand from there you moved on, and from 2000 to 2003, you worked as the head of the United Kingdom's Liaison Bureau with Europol. Can you explain that position.
- A Yes. I became engaged there for -- in helping to lead the UK's efforts to coordinate its activities against organized crime within the international community of similar agencies, and that included my first posting at Europol in the period that you mentioned, head of the UK Liaison Bureau. Europol is the European Union law enforcement agency that has responsibility for coordinating the fight against organized crime and terrorism across the EU, in particular through its means by which it can manage a very large information-sharing platform.

Each member state of the European Union, and indeed other countries that have a cooperation agreement with Europol, have liaison offices established in the headquarters of Europol in the Netherlands. And these liaison offices are [inaudible - break in recording] --

- Q Sorry, sir. I think we've lost your audio again. There, it seems to be back now.
- A Is that --

Q That's working for me. I'm not sure if it's --

46 47 Robert Wainwright (for the Commission)
Examination by Mr. McCleery, Counsel for the
Commission

1 Α Kyle, can you hear me now? 2 Q Yes, I can hear you now. That seems to be --3 I'm sorry. I've been having these technical 4 problems for a couple of days. I've tried to 5 resolve them. If it continues I'll have to 6 switch to a different microphone set-up, which 7 will be less clear but will perhaps be more 8 reliable. So maybe we continue. If it happens 9 again, I'll have to switch. 10 Certainly. If we need to do that, we can certainly take a break and allow that change to 11 12 happen. But it does seem quite clear now, so 13 hopefully we'll be fine from here on. 14 But -- please. You were describing the role 15 of the liaison bureaus with the EU when we last 16 lost you. 17 Yes. So --. Α 18 MR. MCCLEERY: Mr. Commissioner, I wonder if -- it 19 seems like the audio is cutting in and out. 20 wonder if it might make sense to take a short 21 break to see if we can sort these issues out and 22 I understand that someone from our IT team will 23 contact Sir Rob and we can hopefully --24 THE COMMISSIONER: Yes, I think that makes sense. 25 we'll adjourn, I think. Let's do it for 10 26 minutes and we'll check in again at the end of 27 that just to see where we're at. Does that make 28 sense? 29 MR. MCCLEERY: Yes, I think so. Thank you very much. 30 THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you. We'll stand down for 10 31 minutes. 32 THE REGISTRAR: The hearing is stood down for 10 33 minutes until 9:49 a.m. Please mute your mike 34 and turn off your video. Thank you. 35 36 (WITNESS STOOD DOWN) 37 38 (PROCEEDINGS ADJOURNED) 39 (PROCEEDINGS RECONVENED) 40 41 THE REGISTRAR: Thank you for your patience. The 42 hearing is now resumed. 43 44 ROBERT WAINWRIGHT, a witness,

THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you. I understand that the

recalled.

Robert Wainwright (for the Commission)
Examination by Mr. McCleery, Counsel for the
Commission

problems have been dealt with, so Mr. McCleery,
 please carry on.
MR. MCCLEERY: Thank you.

EXAMINATION BY MR. MCCLEERY, continuing:

Q Sir Rob, you can hear me and see me?

A Yes, I can. I can. And apologies to the Commissioner for those problems.

O That's quite all right. I can hear you loud and

clear now so it seems we've resolved them.

I think when we left off, you were -- had

just begun to talk about the role of the liaison bureaus within Europol. Do you want to maybe pick up there and tell us a little bit about what those liaison bureaus do within Europol?

A

Sure. So as I was saying, Europol is the EU's law enforcement agency and it has -- it coordinates operations across very many countries in the EU and beyond. Each member state and each country with which it has a cooperation agreement has liaison offices embedded in the headquarters in The Hague for the purposes of facilitating the exchange of information with national authorities and Europol as the coordinating agency.

My period at Europol as the head of the UK Liaison Bureau between 2000 and 2003 involved my running, therefore my being responsible for that bureau of -- a small bureau at the time -- of UK liaison offices.

Q And then I understand in -- following that position, you moved on to the UK's National Criminal Intelligence Service. Can you tell us a little bit about that agency and what you did in that role.

A Yes. I returned then to the UK policing structure, so as the director of the International Division of the National Criminal Intelligence Service. And here I was responsible for police cooperation between the United Kingdom and its European partners, including Europol but also the bilateral relationships that we had with countries around -- around Europe.

 Q And then moving on from there, I understand you then went to the Serious Organized Crime Agency from 2006 to 2009. What can you tell us about that agency and your responsibilities there?

A By 2006, UK government decided to merge three of the constituent agencies at the national level involved in fighting organized crime, and for the first time we created a single agency, which was called Serious Organized Crime Agency. And the National Criminal Intelligence Service was one of the three agencies that was folded into this new one.

And I followed that route myself and was appointed to a similar role as I had been in the National Criminal Intelligence Service, so director of the International Department but now responsible for global operations of international police cooperation between the United Kingdom and the rest of the world. So that included Europol but also Interpol, for example, the global police organization and our bilateral liaison officers not only in Europe but around the world in -- at areas like South Asia and South America.

- Q Thank you. You mentioned briefly the connection between your first position with the British security service and the issue of money laundering. I wonder if you might tell us a little bit about the extent to which you dealt with issues related to money laundering in your roles with the National Criminal Intelligence
- Service and the Serious Organized Crime Agency.

 So we understood through these national agencies, especially when we formed this new more powerful agency in 2006, the importance of financial investigation, the importance of putting at the heart of our strategy to prevent organized crime but also to bring to justice those criminals that were causing the most harm to the United Kingdom, the importance of conducting investigations into financial affairs, and for the purposes ultimately of preventing them from benefiting from their criminal activities and whilst also identifying opportunities maybe to lawfully take their assets away from them.

We also saw the benefits of the intelligence available by investigating their financial affairs in that it would often lead to the identification of their network of associates, for example. All of those things I just said, Kyle, apply to our international approach to

 Α

combating organized crime, because we recognized that by 2006 and certainly since then, the problems of large scale organized crime -- be it drug trafficking, major frauds, increasingly cyber -- were becoming increasingly globalized in nature, and therefore our work in the United Kingdom had to have a very significant part of it that was complementary in terms of our ability to also connect with similar agencies in jurisdictions that are of relevance to us.

So heroin coming to the United Kingdom wasn't produced in the United Kingdom, it was trafficked from South Asia primarily through certain routes of -- through European countries to the United Kingdom. Our ability to combat the problem of heroin on the streets of the United Kingdom absolutely depended in large part also to our ability to collaborate with our European partners, and indeed further afield, in order to identify the full chain involved in the trafficking of those drugs.

- Q Thank you. I understand that after leaving the Serious Organized Crime agency in 2009, you became the executive director of Europol. You spoke very briefly about what Europol is and its -- I wonder if you might tell us a little bit more about its role in law enforcement within EU
 - more about its role in law enforcement within EU. Yes. It has something like a 25-year history and it's constituted to act as a facilitator and a supporter of international police cooperation in Its primary role is to act as an information hub, as a means by which to facilitate the exchange of information, principally between the member states of the European Union. As I said earlier, Kyle, it also carries within its mandate the ability to conclude international cooperation agreements with other countries. And so its scope of operations in facilitating the exchange of information extended beyond the EU. Today it's something like 40 different countries that are part of a coordinated information sharing network.

It also uses the extent to which it can share -- collect, share, analyze that data on a significant scale to identify opportunities for operations to engage directly against the

Robert Wainwright (for the Commission)
Examination by Mr. McCleery, Counsel for the
Commission

organized crime and terrorist networks that Europol is seeking to help identify. So there's a basis therefore for data-led operations against the most serious forms of crime and terrorism. Europol has progressively become a more and more important or key instrument of the way in which European Union fights these more globalized threats.

- Q You mentioned that Europol's relationships extend beyond the member states of the European Union. Can you tell us a little bit more about the role played by non-EU states in its operations.
- A Yes. There's some 20 or so cooperation agreements that were concluded during my tenure of nine years as the executive director of Europol, and the purpose of these binding legal agreements concluded between Europol and those other -- third states, as they were known -- was to facilitate in a lawful manner, therefore, the exchange of information and to allow the participating agencies from that third country to participate in the cross-border operations that Europol was seeking to support and, indeed, coordinate.

It also allowed, as I said earlier, for the posting of liaison officers at Europol. And indeed, by the time I left in 2008, the agency had something like in excess of 200 different liaison officers from EU member states and the third-party countries with which it was cooperating. So a very large hub -- operational hub that allowed for the very quick, safe, secure exchange of information across a landscape of some 40 countries.

For the purposes of Canada, maybe I can say that that was one of the earliest cooperation agreements that Europol concluded. I believe it was signed in 2002, and from that period, therefore, Europol has had continuous cooperation with Canada, and I think since 2002 or shortly thereafter, continuous presence of a Canadian liaison officer, one or more, at Europol.

Each third country would establish a national central point of contact for its relationships with Europol, and in the case of Canada, that was the RCMP.

Q Thank you. I wonder if you might tell us a

Robert Wainwright (for the Commission)
Examination by Mr. McCleery, Counsel for the
Commission

little bit more about the nature of your role as executive director over your nine years.

A Yes. Well, as the equivalent of a CEO of an organization, which is what it was, I was responsible for running the agency's operations on a day-to-day basis, responsible therefore for of course its people, its finances, and of course I was its legal representative.

In practical terms, apart from the duties of managing that agency and developing its strategy, it was essentially a very outward-facing role. There's a challenge when I arrived to develop Europol's reach, I think, into the wider law enforcement sector in order to better fulfil its potential it had to help member states fight organized crime and terrorism. So that meant very outward facing, trying to influence also political-legislative agenda and trying to develop better -- better strategic responses to organized crime and terrorism in Europe as a whole, and that certainly included the area of financial crime.

- Q And you've alluded to this, but your CV refers to the transformation of Europol during your tenure into a leading European security institution. Can you tell us a little bit about how the agency changed under your leadership.
- A Yes. I think when I arrived, I took the approach, supported of course by many colleagues, that Europol's key value that it could bring was in developing this concept of becoming a single information hub.

I made the assessment that the -- 10 years ago, by then, organized crime and terrorism was rapidly becoming defined by its globalized nature and the fact that the offenders involved were relying increasingly on globalized technology, for example, and other forms of globalization, such as greater freedom to travel. And they were operating more and more together as an integrated global community. And so we were seeing increasing dimensions in Europe, for example, of criminals moving across border and then moving their illicit commodities drugs, moneys, and others across border as well.

In order to -- in strategic terms, to better respond to that, we first needed to learn more

Robert Wainwright (for the Commission)
Examination by Mr. McCleery, Counsel for the
Commission

about it and identify it in a quicker and more complete way. And for that we needed data, but data not just held at the national level, because of its intrinsic cross-border nature, but data exchanged at a pan-European level.

And so I took the view that a single integrated, coordinated data platform would allow us therefore to drive a more effective response. So it became an example, I suppose, of what in the technology sector these days would be known as a data network economy driving more -- higher levels of insight into the problem that we were trying to solve, and from that insight, creating greater levels of opportunity to deal with the problem.

And so that was the key defining strategic vision that I had, and we worked with colleagues to build the necessary components to implement that, especially putting at its heart this single technology platform to share data in that way, and then, of course, influencing very much the agenda of those users that would share the data, essentially the police agencies, trying to attract more and more agencies to become part of the -- of the platform and to share more of its data.

- Q And I understand that one of the changes made during your tenure was the creation of a financial intelligence group in 2012.
- A The dog's barking. Kyle, let me just shut the window behind me. Excuse me. I can see the dog. He's one of the friendliest in the neighbourhood but he's not happy at the moment. Okay, excuse me.
- Q Thank you. I was saying, I understand one of the changes made during your tenure with Europol was the creation of a financial intelligence group in 2012. Can you maybe tell us a little bit about the reason why that group was created and what the need was.
- A Yes. It fitted the strategic agenda we had at the time, which was to collect data on a more pan-European basis in order that we could assimilate it, analyze it, and from that, as I said earlier, learn more about the nature of the criminal threat that we were trying to deal with. And so it involved collecting a range of data

 types and sources from a range of actors, of course, a range of police agencies around Europe, on a range of related dimensions of organized crime. That of course included financial crime.

And so the ability to collect data about the financial affairs of suspected criminals became a core element, one of many, and that would allow us, therefore, to serve that strategy.

And so in order to do that and in order to do it in the most efficient way and to raise the right kind of profile of the importance of that work, we set about creating a structural capability at Europol that would raise the profile of that work. And so we created a so-called financial intelligence group that could also become a centre of gravity, we'd hope, for the way in which national authorities were fighting financial intelligence. A single financial intelligence group in Europe that, with acting as the centre of gravity, could provide some kind of direction and support for the most important financial crime investigations that were being conducted in Europe at the time.

- Q Thank you. And I understand there were at least three component parts to that financial intelligence group entitled Analysis Project Sustrans, Analysis Project Asset Recovery, and FIU.net. I wonder if you might tell us a little bit about what those component parts are and what they did.
- The term "analysis project" was, as the name Α suggests, a project that concentrated the analysis of a certain type of data that was processed across the single platform in key targeted areas of our work, and there were some 20-plus different analysis projects. In this area of financial intelligence, two of the most important were, as you say, Sustrans and Asset Forfeiture. These analysis projects involved the exchange of data relating to the focus of that project, but also include experts from the participating agencies in the member states, and indeed of third countries, designed therefore also to work against agreed priorities and identify the key actors.

In regard to Sustrans, so-called suspicious transactions, this was an analysis project

 focused on cases and phenomena relating to organized crime involved in money laundering in broad terms. And it was one of the oldest that Europol has, one of the first that was opened, I think in 2001.

So it receives -- and it's still going today -- receives, analyzes, facilitates the exchange of information relating to money laundering from investigative cases that member states and other countries are involved in. It also receives in certain cases data relating to the suspicious transaction reporting from obliged entities.

It's an analysis project that also coordinates cross-border operations. And as part of that, Europol functions as the secretariat of the so-called Anti-Money Laundering Operational Informal Network, which was set up in 2012 and has practitioners from over 20 jurisdictions.

The second major analysis project, Asset Forfeiture, as the name suggests, concerns asset recovery, so supporting the tracing and identification of criminal proceeds linked to organized crime, including working group on, for example, virtual currencies as a money laundering instrument, which has become a more important matter. As part of that -- and again, consistent with Europol's coordinating role across Europe, it hosts an Asset Recovery Interagency Network that includes something like now 54 registered member jurisdictions, including all the EU member states, and indeed Canada.

So these are the two -- certainly during my time -- the two primary asset -- sorry, the primary analysis projects that drove the day-to-day work of the new financial intelligence group.

FIU.net, the third area you mentioned, Kyle. This is a decentralized and secure IT network supporting financial intelligence units of all EU member states. These units are independent of Europol. They're established within the national jurisdictions. Europol runs the network on behalf of that community and integrates its work into the broader Europol mandate. The FIUs, as you might know, are set out in national regulations and each country has a single financial intelligence unit as a national centre for the receipt and analysis of suspicious

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12 13

14

15

16

17

18 19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

29

30

31

32

33

34

35

36

37

38

39

40

41

42

43

44

45

46 47 transaction reports from obliged entities in the banking and other sectors.

- Q Thank you. And over the course of your tenure, I gather these -- this financial intelligence group was created relatively early on during your time at Europol. Can you tell us what kind of results were achieved through these or whether they were seen as successful.
- I don't have to hand detailed statistical Α Yes. evidence of that, Kyle. But across Europol as a whole Europol expanded its ability to collect data across all mandates, something like an eightfold increase in the amount of data over a similar number of years, so had succeeded, I think, in mobilizing to a much greater extent, a much wider level of participation from the broader law enforcement community. And those figures, I think, would be broadly consistent with what we saw on financial intelligence. ability to convert those, I think, into much greater numbers of cross-border operations, something like a five- or six-fold increase over that period in new investigative opportunities in cases that Europol supported against organized crime in Europe over that period.

I should say that the trend -- its -- I'm pleased to see, although of course it doesn't -no longer concerned me, that just in the last few weeks, Europol has moved to develop the financial intelligence group into something more substantial still. On the 5th of June, it launched the so-called European Financial and Economic Crime Centre, which reflects, I think, a trend towards recognizing this horizontal integration of a range of financial crime and economic crime offences, such as fraud and cybercrime. So the idea that a further concentration, I think, at the European level, of the approach to financial crime by establishing it as a new centre with additional resources supported by the European Union institutions in a way which also allows it to tackle economic crime in the wider sense.

So I think it's a trend that's continuing and underlines certainly the continuing interest in increasing Europe's ability to deal with financial crime.

Robert Wainwright (for the Commission) Examination by Mr. McCleery, Counsel for the Commission

- Q Thank you. I'd like to now turn to the first of three reports I'm hoping we can discuss during your evidence.
 - MR. MCCLEERY: Madam Registrar, I wonder if you might display document number 45 on your list, which is a report titled "Why Is Cash Still King?" Thank you.
 - Q Sir Rob, do you see that report on your screen?
 - A Yes, I do, Kyle.
- 10 Q And you recognize that report?
- 11 A I do, yes.
 - Q And this was produced by Europol during your tenure as executive director; is that correct?
 - A Yes. It was produced in 2015, I believe.
- 15 Q Thank you.
 - MR. MCCLEERY: Mr. Commissioner, I ask this be marked as the next exhibit.
 - THE COMMISSIONER: Yes, very well. That will be Exhibit 64.
 - THE REGISTRAR: Exhibit 64.

EXHIBIT 64: Europol - Why Is Cash Still King?: A Strategic Report on the Use of Cash by Criminal Groups as a Facilitator for Money Laundering

- MR. MCCLEERY: And Madam Registrar, we can take that document down now. Thank you.
- Q Sir Rob, I wonder if you might tell us a little bit about the purpose of this report and why it might have been created.
- A Yes. We wanted to inform our law enforcement partners, and beyond that also policymakers, for example, and even legislators, about the trends we were seeing at that time in financial crime, and in particular how cash, as we -- as the title suggests, we were seeing cash was still overwhelmingly the prevalent form of financial instrument for criminals. So as we were moving in our social lives in the legitimate economy to a more and more cashless society, the point we were making is this absolutely wasn't the case -- and, I believe, still today is largely not the case -- in the crime world.

And the purpose of the report was to investigate some of the reasons for that and to provide certain evidence about the aspects of how cash is important. And we wanted to shine a

light, in particular, in the role of high denomination notes, in the case of the Eurozone in particular, the 500-euro note and the way in which that became the instrument of choice for very many criminals for a number of reasons.

And we wanted to highlight what were our concerns about the fact that whereas there were fewer points of evidence towards the legitimate use of this very, very high denomination note, we could see more and more evidence of criminals using it, and that raised for us big, important policy issues that should be addressed.

- Q Thank you. And you mentioned that the audience for this report was in part national legislatures. Broadly speaking, who -- were there other, sort of, individuals or bodies that this was targeted at or would have -- you would have included in the intended audience?
- A Yes. we worked also with central banks of certain member states, and in particular the European Central Bank, which has certain -- centralized authority for the Eurozone.

We worked with officials also in the European Commission, which is the EU's executive, and also certain member states, to highlight these issues. And this was important because in the end, the report became -- had quite a significant impact actually in informing this policy debate around the role of very high denomination notes in society. And in fact, it led ultimately to a policy shift, a decision by the European Central Bank to stop the production -- the future production of 500-euro notes.

- Q And I understand the report was, in addition to being provided obviously to the legislatures and the European Central Bank, was released publicly as well; is that correct?
- A Yes.

- Q Can you speak a little bit about the value of making a report like this one available to the public.
- A Yes. I think these type of reports typically -certainly during my time were always produced
 publicly. Of course, plenty of information that
 Europol deals with on a day-to-day basis
 certainly isn't, relating to tactical operation.
 But in this case we wanted to inform the widest

possible audience. This included, by the way, law enforcement officers who weren't yet integrated on a day-to-day basis in the Europol community. It included certainly a wider set of policymakers similarly that weren't working closely with us on a regular basis.

I think it was important also for us to raise awareness amongst the public more generally in order that -- we served, I think, our mission -- part of our missions, which was to fight organized crime and terrorism in the most effective way. Part of that involves helping to inform the wider public so they become sensitized to the way in which crime operates, for example. And that in a way, therefore, acts as a preventative instrument.

For all those reasons, that was -- that's why we produced it publicly.

- Thank you. I mentioned over the course of your evidence -- we'll look at a couple of different reports that are somewhat similar to this one. Can you comment maybe on the process by which Europol would produce a report like this one in general and, sort of, how it would identify the need for such a report.
- A Yes. As an information hub, which was a, you know, a primary part of the agency's business, as I explained earlier, we employed a large cadre of analysts whose job, as the name suggests, was to interpret the data that was received and to convert the data into, in this case, meaningful intelligence.

Most of the analysts were operational analysts. They were looking for connections, non-obvious connections maybe, in big data samples between an investigation in one country and another. And those connections and the work of our analysts in interpreting this large amount of data very often became a highly significant lead essentially for the national agencies therefore to investigate.

But a good many of our analysts were also strategic analysts, and their job was to interpret as much of that operational data as possible and to draw some strategic sense from it. These strategic analysts were responsible for producing reports like this. And they had a

Robert Wainwright (for the Commission)
Examination by Mr. McCleery, Counsel for the
Commission

highly informed view, for example in this case, of financial crime because of the extent to which Europol was collecting so much information from so many participating agencies across so many countries.

I'd argue that perhaps they became the most knowledgeable analysts perhaps in Europe, certainly within the European law enforcement community, because of the wealth of information they had access to through this mechanism that we created. Now in addition to that, they would work with the experts of the national authorities in publishing a report -- in producing a report like this and very often with members of academia, for example, who were important members of our wider community.

So reports like this one and the one or two others we'll see today, Kyle, are the product of a significant amount of very well informed research.

- Q Thank you. I'd like to delve into this report now to some degree and ask you about some of the, at least, at the beginning, some of the general concepts that are raised in the report. Maybe at the most fundamental level for our purposes, page 9 of the report poses the question of: What is money laundering? The Commission so far has heard a few different definitions of what money laundering is. I wonder if you might explain to us what money laundering is.
- It's the process of, I think, Α concealing -- disquising the identity and ownership of illegally obtained proceeds in a way that makes the origin appear legitimate while leaving no link to the real source of the funds. In the end, I think that's how I would understand money laundering. And of course, at the heart of that is this understanding, recognition that almost all criminal activities are carried out to generate profits. And so, you know, the logic clearly is that in order for criminals to make use of those profits in an unhindered way, the process of money laundering plays this critical enabling instrument -- critical enabling way which crime can function, and from that, criminals can benefit.
- Q Thank you. As it's perhaps somewhat evident from

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12 13

14

15 16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27 28

29

30

31

32

33

34

35

36

37

38

39

40

41

42

43

44

45

46 47 the nature of that definition, but you spoke earlier about the extent to which this has been an issue that you've addressed in your career. Can you tell us about why in your view money laundering is a problem for society and the harms that it causes that motivate the action to confront it.

Α Yes. In Europol -- and this may be something [indiscernible] in later reports -- you know, we described it as an engine of organized crime because it was at the heart of -- of -- is at the heart of the criminal economy, because it's about, of course, as I said earlier, for criminals finding ways to make crime pay essentially. And that in itself, if they can do that in an effective way is of course a huge incentive to engage in crime in the first place, a stimulus for exponential increase, and it also acts, importantly, as a funding source for further illicit activities, and not only for drug traffickers, not only in drugs but in other very important offences that impact society, such as terrorism and modern slavery.

I think its intrinsic role as a key enabler of organized crime is important. Why is it a problem? Also because of the scale and the way in which the amount of -- the way in which the globalized criminal economy has grown. Our conservative estimates while I was at Europol was that around 120 billion euros were produced in annual revenue relating to the criminal economy in Europe. Actually global estimates -- the one most reliably quoted, most often quoted from the UN points to something like two trillion U.S. dollars, which is over three percent of global GDP. And of course, when it's at that scale, it has a serious polluting effect on the integrity of our financial markets, on our economies. of course, it has this very adverse societal impact because not only does it fuel the crime itself, it fuels corruption around that to enable the crime. It drives illicit labour markets. And we've seen all of that -- a microcosm of all of that in the last three months with the COVID impact, for example. We've seen certain sectors that have declined as a result of the economic downturn associated with COVID. Some of those

O

 Robert Wainwright (for the Commission) Examination by Mr. McCleery, Counsel for the Commission

sectors have become more vulnerable to criminal exploitation and even takeover.

And where we see, for example, difficulty in accessing capital because of that, they turn unknowingly maybe to loan sharks involved in processing criminal profits. And of course, a rise in investment scams.

So I think money laundering, the scale of it, the impact of it, has in driving this global criminal economy is a serious problem actually on many levels to our interests in society. Thank you. The Commission has heard some evidence already that countries like Canada and the UK are in some cases destinations for illicit funds generated through crimes committed elsewhere. Some may perhaps, in Canada, take some comfort in that, knowing that perhaps the

money is ending up here but the immediate effects of those predicate offences are somewhat distanced from us. Is that, in your view, misguided thinking, or how would you respond to that issue?

A It's a symptom, of course, of the fact that financial criminals will tend to operate in and target the most affluent countries in the world. That's what makes the European Union -- so not just the United Kingdom but many other parts of the EU such a lucrative path for money laundering. And similarly North America, the countries of North America, I would say the same as well.

Of course, that's a problem, therefore, in our societies and perhaps places a high degree of responsibility on those countries to ensure that the optimum measures are put in place at the national level to fight organized crime, including of course financial crime and money laundering.

- Q Thank you. Page 35 of this report refers to the emerging threat of international money laundering syndicates. I wonder if you might tell us in your own words what an international money laundering syndicate is.
- A Yes. So we -- I've seen over the last 10 years the rise of professional enablers of crime, and it's really an important strategic development that as crime became more and more of a global

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11 12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23 24

25

26

27 28

29

30

31

32 33

34

35

36

37

38

39

40

41

42

43

44

45

46

47

Q

Α

concern involving essentially the syndication of crime with multiple different criminal groups operating together, supported by modern technologies, for example. Then to serve this new, more integrated, criminal economy, we had a concept that we labelled as "crime as a service" that developed over this period. And as part of this new criminal economy, professional enablers of certain crime would offer their services, for fees of course, to the largest crime gangs. was in many areas. A notable feature of today's problem with cybercrime, for example, is the way in which professional hackers, for example, are offering cybercrime tools and services to organized crime groups. But it also includes this area that we're talking about today, and that we saw at Europol over the last 10 years the emergence of professional money launderers. These are typically, or they were at least during my time, networks of professionals who understood very well how to game the financial system and had developed highly efficient, sophisticated ways to do so, and would offer their services to drug trafficking organizations and others to take the cash from their proceeds and indeed to find the right way in which to launder those proceeds and deliver at the end of that, in a safe way, back to the cash -- the proceeds of crime back to the original owners of it.

So it became a very important new feature. And as of 2008, by the time I left, I think we'd identified around 400 top professional money launderers that were operating in Europe, typically taking a commission of between five and eight percent for their work.

Thank you. You mentioned that these groups seem to have emerged in the last 10 years. Can we generate any insight into what led to their emergence or why we're seeing them on the scene now, whereas we weren't maybe 15 years ago?

I think it just became this you know one

I think it just became this, you know, one notable feature of the way in which this globalized criminal economy had developed over that period. And you know, crime just has become — at the top end at least, at the most serious end, crime has become a much more professional business, taking advantage also of these modern

Commission

1

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16 17

18

19

20

21 22

23

24

25

26

27

28 29

30

31 32

33

34 35

36

37

38

39

40

41

42

43

44

45

46 47 technologies, so huge trading platforms set up on the dark web to allow them to trade in these tools and services, for example.

And generally, a marked change from the typical image we have of so-called mafia groups of days gone by where they would very much engage in turf war battles between each other to -- and that sort of violent competition to what is today and over the last 10 years, much more about collaboration, and in a way that has some features that we would recognize as the same in the legitimate economy in terms of the way in which globalized businesses are running and how they run themselves today.

- Q Thank you. As these groups have emerged and, kind of, the face of criminal organizations has changed in the way that you've described, has the risk landscape changed in the sense that are these groups targeting or making use of different industries or economic sectors in ways that that wasn't the case before, or has there been a shift in that sense?
- Α To a certain extent, yes. I say to a certain extent because still, I think, the regulated financial sector is the primary sector affected by this. So obviously the banking sector, cash deposits in accounts and very often, you know, split into a larger number of smaller accounts, which are known in the trade as so-called money mule accounts. Shell companies, of course, that -- established with no significant assets or business operations, for example, often embedded in complex corporate structures, registered maybe in offshore jurisdictions. So I think the regulated financial sector remains the primary means by which criminal funds are laundered. Alongside that you have the so-called informal value transfer systems, underground banking essentially, outside the regulated sector. money services most certainly. Trade-based money laundering, which is -- which are legal entities for investment and so [indiscernible] concealing criminal funds in that case by manipulating purchase of sales or using false invoicing, for example, around certain companies. Virtual currencies, real estate, have been sort of part of the problem, a smaller part, but still...

 Robert Wainwright (for the Commission)
Examination by Mr. McCleery, Counsel for the
Commission

Here, you know partial payment by cash, over- or under-valuing the real estate, for example. Using non-transparent companies and trusts. So the real estate sector has been affected. And, you know, most specifically for the interests of this inquiry, of course, the gaming sector as well.

Other parts of the hospitality sector generally, which -- especially because these are cash intensive businesses and allow therefore for the transfer of large amounts of cash, and they will always be likely to be vulnerable therefore to money laundering.

- Q Thank you. I wonder if you might comment on -you've indicated that the financial sector is
 still the primary sector at risk of engaging in
 money laundering and has been even prior to the
 development -- or the emergence of these money
 laundering syndicates. Can you comment on why
 it's the case that there's the financial sector
 is so either vulnerable or so heavily targeted or
 used in this type of activity.
- A Yeah. Well, I think the financial sector, of course, in itself offers many means -- many easy means by which it can transfer money, by far, most of time of course, for lawful business. But because of that, there are -- criminals will always be drawn to the ease with which monies can be maybe moved from accounts across borders very easily.

Where criminals have -- professional money launderers have developed their capabilities to effectively dodge the anti-money laundering regulations that we've developed, then they will do so. And I'll give some examples maybe later around what we've seen in terms of how effective those professional money launderers are.

So a number of interesting, you know, cases of how the professional money launderers worked during my time at Europol which shine a light, or shone a light at the time, on how these -- how these operate. I can take you through two or three of those if you're interested, Kyle.

- Q Yeah, I think that would be interesting if you wouldn't mind giving us an example or two of how these work and take us[indiscernible].
- A So in 2016, we -- Europol collaborated with very

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16 17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

29

30

31

32 33

34

35

36

37

38

39 40

41

42

43

44

45

46 47

many European authorities and those from the United States, focusing on a South American cocaine cartel that was serving a very large amount of drugs, cocaine, on the streets of -- of -- throughout Europe. The cartel employed a professional network of money launderers to collect the cash and essentially launder it. was interesting. I think in that case -- a significant case, a large scale -- 85 percent, we think, of the cash was laundered through the regulated financial sector. So a typical case. You'll see 85 percent that went through -- and the rest through, you know, a combination of those other sectors and industries that I talked about earlier, Kyle.

They -- similar period, a case again, focused this time on the Chinese network involved in laundering criminal proceeds from a range of offences -- modern slavery, counterfeit goods, excise tax fraud. Again, they relied on professional enablers to set up this time complex corporate structures to transfer money to China and -- in fact, they offered that service to other criminal groups as well.

The final one -- again, a similar period -was work focused on 'Ndrangheta, which is one of the key -- one of the three leading organized crime groups in Italy. It's traditionally one of the mafia groups. In fact, 'Ndrangheta probably is the largest organized crime group in the world, I'd say. And this is an interesting case in 2015, and a success for the Italian authorities in taking down a network of companies involved in online betting. It's headquartered in Malta and controlled by this organized crime group. And companies were set up to launder large sums of illicit cash, and the case raised significant concerns around online gambling market generally and the potential for criminal abuse and shone a light on that at the time.

And in Malta especially the gaming authority there came under a lot of scrutiny, and it's been an ongoing challenge, I think, for that jurisdiction in Europe, and so much so it led to the Anti-Money Laundering Directive in the European Union including a modification of it, I think, by 2017 to try and deal with some aspects

 Robert Wainwright (for the Commission)
Examination by Mr. McCleery, Counsel for the
Commission

of that.

So these are some examples, Kyle, of the way in which professional money launderers were operating at the time at least.

- Q Thank you. That's helpful. I wonder if we might now turn to the focus of this report and speak a little bit about the role of cash in money laundering. You've explained that you feel the, sort of, central point of this report that despite the decline of the use of cash in legitimate society, it remains an important part of the criminal economy, and you indicated that you still feel that that's the case. Can you talk a little bit about what accounts for this persistent important role of cash in money laundering.
- I think this was a bearer instrument so Α Yes. it's extremely difficult -- so it's anonymous essentially of course. It's very difficult to trace the true owner of that asset. It's highly portable, particularly in regard to high denomination notes as well. You can move it quickly across borders. And very hard, I think, for the police to track that respondent speed. Connecting the cash to a so-called predicate offence, which is a legal requirement in many jurisdictions in Europe, again, it's very difficult to prove that this cash, for example, is the proceeds of drug trafficking, for example.

So I think, you know, it's because of the nature of cash as an instrument itself and its convenience and portability, then I think that's the primary reason why it's such -- plays such an important part in the criminal economy.

- Thank you. The report speaks as well about the need to convert cash to other assets and some of the different methods of doing that. Can you comment on, sort of, the importance of, even, despite the value of cash in the sense of its anonymity, the value to criminal organizations in converting that to other assets eventually.
- A Yes. It's also -- I mean, eventually of course, if we're dealing with millions if not billions of profits from a criminal enterprise, then having that in cash makes it, I guess, difficult to use without raising significant attention. If you were to buy a million dollar property with just

Robert Wainwright (for the Commission)
Examination by Mr. McCleery, Counsel for the
Commission

cash, then the anti-money laundering regulations would almost certainly highlight that as a suspicious activity. So at some point you have to convert the cash into other forms. And so I think that's why also we were seeing an increase towards virtual currencies, for example, and the way in which cash would be used maybe to buy smaller types of high value goods, such as expensive watches or something like that as well.

- Thank you. You -- maybe changing gears just a little bit. You mentioned previously that cybercrime is also an area of focus for your current work. I'd like to ask you some questions about the connections between cybercrime and money laundering. Maybe first, I'll just ask you to tell us in your own words what you mean when you refer to cybercrime.
- A It is simply the criminal exploitation of the digital world. And, you know, popularly it's sort of seeing into the ways of old crimes but new methods. So increasingly drugs, for example, are not sold on street corners any more but they are traded online, and cyber helps to facilitate that. Extortion -- we've seen a rise in socalled ransomware attacks hitting many companies. This is just a digital form of extortion, which is a criminal offence that's very, very old.

But it's also new forms of crime, so there are new means by which criminal groups can defraud people, steal their identity, steal their money.

- Q Thank you. I gather from that description that proceeds of cybercrime are often not generated in cash; is that fair to say?
- A Yes, that's right. And very often cybercrime involves defrauding accounts, for example, and then doing so maybe diverting certain funds from one account to another, either by stealing the password credentials of the user or indeed more directly targeting bank transfer payment systems, for example. So in that way, the money is not cash already. It's sitting in an account, moving from one account to another, so it's already in digital form, I suppose, and in some ways the proceeds of cybercrime very often are easier to facilitate as a money laundering proceed because they've already got beyond that first critical

Robert Wainwright (for the Commission) Examination by Mr. McCleery, Counsel for the Commission

stage, which is a very risky stage of criminals - for criminals of introducing cash for the first
time into, say, the banking sector.

But after that, you know, the criminals still face mostly the same challenge, and the same techniques are available then to convert that from -- into finally, you know, laundered goods. So I mentioned earlier the so-called money mule accounts, and that seemed to be -- that seems to be favoured by cybercriminals, so retail merchant accounts created under false identities as a means to transfer proceeds of crime and, again, to obfuscate the original source. Virtual currency is clearly an example. I could come on to describe that later if you like.

Interestingly also, I think, one particular money laundering method which is more specialized for cybercrime is, for example, via online gaming platforms, so criminals using proceeds, for example, from stolen credit card details to acquire currencies within gaming platforms -- of course, these are not cash -- and then sell them at a reduced price through online marketplaces. So those are the examples.

In the end, though, at some point in that chain, that asset, that criminal proceed, has to be cashed out somehow typically, so its -- in the end, cyber is -- those involved in laundering proceeds of cybercrime are mostly faced with the same dilemma.

- Q And, you know, in light of the, sort of, different nature of cybercrime, does law enforcement require, sort of, different strategies or capabilities to try to disrupt laundering of the proceeds of this type of crime than might be the case for, say, cash proceeds of drug crimes?
- A Some of the fundamentals are the same, Kyle, but I think there are additional challenges here for law enforcement. I mean, as part -- laundering the proceeds of cybercrime as part of the problem of combating cybercrime generally, law enforcement are faced with significant obstacles around even identifying the beneficial owner. So the ability through modern encryption technologies to protect the identity therefore of

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11 12

13 14

15

16 17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

29

30

31 32

33

34

35

36

37

38

39

40

41

42

43

44

45

46 47 Α

the persons engaging in cybercrime online, that's a significant hurdle for law enforcement, and indeed the ability of law enforcement to have the right kind of jurisdictional access to the offenders, because of course cyber and indeed the laundering of it is such a global enterprise, then very often the offender is not within the jurisdiction of the authority that is investigating that offence, of course.

The speed cybercrime -- the way in which cyber-enabled technologies allow criminals to move rapidly, and indeed generally the technology skill levels of offenders involved in cybercrime might be higher than they would be in other offences like drug trafficking. So for all those reasons, these are additional challenges faced, I think, by the police.

Q Just one other topic I'd like to touch on before we move into the next report, which would be the role of professionals and gatekeepers, at least as it's framed in this report. I think it refers specifically to lawyers and accountants but suggests there may be others as well.

Can you comment on the role professionals and gatekeepers play in money laundering and in the challenges they may pose for law enforcement. Again, a part of this evolving nature of this concept of crime as a service where organized criminals, in professionalizing their business, including by making it harder for law enforcement to detect, will increasingly rely on, as I said earlier, the professional enablers of crime, and that would include, as I said earlier, money launderers abut also those involved in a range of professional areas that are -- that are helpful. So IT professionals, certainly, lawyers, accountants, many others, those maybe working in the banking sector. These people, professionals who have been corrupted by criminal gangs to provide, I guess, an inside -- an insight but also inside service from their professions to assist organized crime in this syndicated way. So typically a large organized crime group would rely on a full range of different types of professionals as part of its, sort of, rather complex global criminal enterprise.

 Robert Wainwright (for the Commission)
Examination by Mr. McCleery, Counsel for the
Commission

MR. MCCLEERY: Mr. Commissioner, as I mentioned, I'm planning to move to a new report, and I wonder if it might be a convenient time for a break.

THE COMMISSIONER: Very well. We'll take 15 minutes. Thank you.

(WITNESS STOOD DOWN)

THE REGISTRAR: The hearing is adjourned for a 15-minute recess until 11:02 a.m.

(PROCEEDINGS ADJOURNED)
(PROCEEDINGS RECONVENED)

THE REGISTRAR: Thank you for waiting. The hearing is now resumed.

ROBERT WAINWRIGHT, a witness, recalled.

THE COMMISSIONER: Yes, Mr. McCleery. Thank you.
MR. MCCLEERY: Thank you, Mr. Commissioner.
I'd like to now move on to a second report. And
Madam Registrar, I wonder if you might display, I
believe it's document number 43 on your list,
which is a report titled "From Suspicion to
Action."

EXAMINATION BY MR. MCCLEERY, continuing:

- Q Sir Rob, you can see that report on your screen? A Yes, I can.
- Q And do you recognize that report as one produced by Europol during your tenure as executive director?
- A Yes, I do.
- MR. MCCLEERY: Mr. Commissioner, I wonder if we might mark this as the next exhibit.
- THE COMMISSIONER: Yes, very well. That will be Exhibit 65.

THE REGISTRAR: Exhibit 65.

EXHIBIT 65: Europol - From Suspicion to Action

MR. MCCLEERY: Thank you. And Madam Registrar, we

 Robert Wainwright (for the Commission)
Examination by Mr. McCleery, Counsel for the
Commission

- can take that report down now. I don't need it any further.
 Sir Rob, can you comment on the purpose of this
 - Q Sir Rob, can you comment on the purpose of this report and why it was produced.
 - Α It examined the nature -- the evolving nature of organized crime into this more globalized form that I've been describing, and also examined the efficacy of the principal instruments, or some of them at least, that form part of the anti-money laundering regime. In this case, especially focusing on the role that suspicious transaction reporting has in helping to inform and drive effective financial investigations. So our research that were focused on a lot of data that we obtained from the national bodies responsible for processing these reports as well as, as I described earlier, the process of interpreting the results of certain investigations. And it led to some findings which pointed to some failings perhaps in the way in which past antimoney laundering systems were working.
 - Q Thank you. And we'll certainly get into those in some detail. I wonder if you might tell us who the intended audience for this report was at the time.
 - A Certainly again, the law enforcement community, the regulatory community in this case. That includes of course the financial intelligence units. Once again, as per the previous report we discussed, policymakers, legislators. In this case the banking sector and other sectors were also certainly interested relevant to the findings that we saw. And once again, for the same reason as I mentioned last time, Kyle, it was made public.
 - Q Thank you. You wrote the foreword to this report, and one of the comments you made early on was that in recent years the task of combating money laundering had become more difficult. Can you comment on why it was your view at that time that this issue -- the issue of money laundering [indiscernible] was more difficult to deal with.
 - A Yeah. For all the reasons I think I mentioned earlier, Kyle, so I might not repeat all of them. But the scale of the problem, the way in which it was becoming more globalized, the way in which we could see financial crime and the international

 Robert Wainwright (for the Commission)
Examination by Mr. McCleery, Counsel for the
Commission

flows of illicit money becoming this instrument -- sorry, this engine of organized crime, the rise of professional enablers which were becoming more and more adept at gaming the system essentially, avoiding anti-money laundering measures. For all these reasons, therefore, the scale and the sophistication of the threat was growing. And at the same time, whereas we'd noticed some evolution of our anti-money laundering framework, sometimes in significant ways, nonetheless the overall extent of that we judged to be slower and less significant than the pace and scale of the threat.

And indeed, we were finding -- my view is that we drifted away from the core purpose of the anti-money laundering system in a way that had made the system as a whole much less effective than it should be essentially. And so the threat had increased and our response hadn't -- hadn't been good enough in response to that changing nature.

Q Thank you. And I certainly have some questions about the way in which the response had failed to keep up to the pace of crime. But I wonder if we could take a step back. In the foreword you indicate that yes, this widespread acknowledgement of the importance of tackling criminal finances has led to the development of this global anti-money laundering framework.

I wonder if you might start that conversation by telling us what you're referring to when you refer to this global anti-money laundering framework and sort of how it was supposed to work.

A Yes. I think it has its origins in -- through the '80s and certainly in the '90s -- the first significant piece of legislation in the European Union that governed this framework of anti-money laundering appeared in 1991, for example, embedding in law and resulting regulation the important principles that were accepted in large parts of the world by that time and promoted by the Financial -- the so-called Financial Action Task Force. So this is a regime that has therefore been in the works for some decades, and it has some notable features, including the role

 Commission

of, as I described earlier, financial intelligence units and the purpose of suspicious transaction reporting.

So FIUs, to give the acronym, are national coordination points of interface essentially between investigative judicial authorities on the one side, and the private sector on the other. And the legislation designated certain entities as obliged entities, therefore obliged to report suspicions of financial crime to the FIU as the main gateway towards the broader policing and other sectors involved in investigating and prosecuting financial crime. In regard to suspicious transaction reporting, as I said, the legislation placed -- and this was a key defining -- still is a key defining part of the way in which the regime works. It places this legal obligation on certain entities to report in a timely manner to the FIU, suspicions of financial transactions across their platforms for example?

STRs, to give their acronym, run in [indiscernible]. For example, there are identified algorithms that are running across all transactions -- that's the nature of the legislation, a demand, and they're configured via the work of algorithms to report alerts of suspicious activity for manual review by compliance officers that are employed by that entity.

The 2017 report that we're discussing, for example, recognized the use of cash was one of the primary reasons for triggering these suspicious transaction reports. And to give some figures around that count by way of context, as of 2014, I think, the EU FIUs as a whole were receiving around a million reports in total from their obliged entities in each of the national jurisdictions. It's certainly higher now. The published figure for the United Kingdom in 2018, for example, is around 460 -- four-six-zero thousand suspicious transaction reports. So this is a big enterprise of suspicious transactions that are reported.

What our report also found was that there were variable standards in terms of the diligence of certain entities and even in certain countries reporting these, and across certain sectors

 Robert Wainwright (for the Commission) Examination by Mr. McCleery, Counsel for the Commission

importantly. Lower levels of reporting from some sectors such as money services bureau at the time. Interestingly, we found that the gambling sector appeared simultaneously as among the highest but also the lowest of those reporting entities, and that depended really on the jurisdiction. So a real challenge there of uniform compliance perhaps.

- Q And the report goes on to make some conclusions about the effectiveness and efficiency of this global anti-money laundering framework, at least as it operated in Europe. Can you tell us a little bit about the conclusions reached by the report in that regard.
- A Very important findings, I thought, and certainly they were received as such by the broad audience that we were reporting to and have become also -- findings of this report have become a mainstay of a lot of the discussion, particularly in Europe around how the system could be improved.

So among the conclusions, the most notable, we found that only 10 percent of suspicious transaction reports that were received by the FIUs led to further investigation. So essentially 90 percent of what was being reported was of no value to police and judicial authorities. And we found that that was a figure — an average figure across the EU, more or less stable for the 10 years or so before that, and of course explains a lot of why and how the regime now is performing, I think, at quite a low standard.

Now, to put, again, a more current context around that, I looked at the figures in the United Kingdom for 2018. So 20 million automated alerts were produced by the sector in the United Kingdom, obliged entities. As I said earlier, the regulation obliges those entities to manually review all of those alerts by compliance officers. So algorithms in this case reported 20 million alerts. From that in 2018, 460,000, as I said, suspicious transaction reports are That's a figure of around, I think, 2.3 filed. percent. So of all the alerts, to give an example of one large country in the -- Europe for one whole year, of all of the alerts manually reviewed by compliance officers, only two percent

Robert Wainwright (for the Commission)
Examination by Mr. McCleery, Counsel for the
Commission

-- some two percent of them reached the threshold for reporting as a suspicious transaction.

Now, in terms therefore of the productivity yield of this whole system, which is a cornerstone of the way in which the anti-money laundering system works, productivity yield is 2.3 percent of 10 percent essentially, because only 10 percent of those that were received by the FIUs then lead to further investigation. So it's a very, very low productivity yield of investing a significant amount of time and resources in running this key part of the antimoney laundering system.

Indeed, in the example I'm citing from the United Kingdom in that year, it led only to 28 investigations, I understand, and something like 50 million pounds seized only, which is a tiny, tiny proportion of what most observers would judge to be the amount of criminal revenue produced in the United Kingdom.

Now, what is interesting is also reported from that year in the United Kingdom, the banks, for example, are spending a total of about 5 billion pounds in running that system and employing all of these compliance officers, for example, and in other means. So quite an expensive system. A lot of resources thrown at it and a productivity yield of 10 percent of 2.3 percent.

Now, right in conjunction with other Europol reports produced around the same period, which identified, for example, that we are seizing only one percent of criminal proceeds through the system. Then all of this tells us quite a lot about the inefficiency in the system and tells us a lot about the very low level -- low return on investment that we've had. We've been developing and implementing legislation since 1991 in Europe. We got to the point where one European country and the banks started now spending billions of pounds to run the system. before one considers staffing the FIU and judicial authorities. And the net effect of this whole system is that we're seizing barely one percent of criminal proceeds. And as a return on investment, I don't think that's good enough. Thank you. The report also refers to some

Α

 Robert Wainwright (for the Commission) Examination by Mr. McCleery, Counsel for the Commission

possible secondary benefits to a reporting regime, being the deterrence that may arise from the knowledge that a particular entity or institution is required to report. Can you comment on the value of those secondary benefits. Yes. They're not insignificant. Of course, effective anti-money laundering arrangements will act as a disincentive. And it's notable, we think, that criminal activity generally is highly risk sensitive and criminals will likely go to a jurisdiction where they think that risk is lower. So there is an important point about disincentives here.

The problem I have, of course, is that when these sort of headline figures, which of course ae perfectly well known by criminals, are that one percent of the proceeds are being seized only, then that doesn't act -- in practical terms doesn't act as much of a disincentive to many of these criminals.

Q Thank you. I'd like to turn now to in more detail some of the challenges that are identified for the system in this report. I'll refer to the report in my questions, but it is appreciated that it's a few years old now. I'll certainly not ask you to limit your comments to what was known at the time or the situation as it existed then, as you've been doing. I'll certainly be -- welcome comments more up to date than that.

The first shortcoming I'm interested in exploring is the notion that this is perhaps a national level solution aimed at a global problem. In the foreword to the report, you wrote that:

The anti-money laundering regime still operates at a domestic level, and has not yet fully adjusted to the reality of a problem that is defined by its international nature.

You commented on this a little bit already, but I wonder if you might explain why you describe money laundering as a problem that's defined by its international nature.

Yes. Because of the way that the flows -- the predicate offences, for example, might take place

Α

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15 16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

29

30

31

32

33

34

35 36

37

38

39

40

41

42

43

44

45

46 47

in several jurisdictions, the criminals themselves are operating across jurisdictions. And in order to effectively launder the proceeds, more often than not it involves the transfer of funds across borders. So by its very nature, financial crime or money laundering, certainly in its gravest form, is a global enterprise. And yet -- and it's becoming more so. Against that, our regime to control it operates primarily through national arrangements that are enforced in law. So although there are important legislative instruments in the EU, they are transposed into national law in the European Union, and the enforcement of them is not a matter for the European Union at an institutional level, but for the national authorities.

Now, there's good reason for that, of course, absolutely. But I mean, it's an issue replicated around the world that in the end this is about national enforcement of a problem defined by its global nature. And there's a reality gap there which has grown substantially since the first legislation in 1991. And some of the legislation and some of the regulations that come from revisions of that core legislation have attempted to deal with that, but it's only been partially successful at best. And all of this is compounded, bringing it more up to date, by development of virtual environments, which of course are by their nature borderless, which absolutely challenges this efficacy of supervising on the international level.

And current regulations in some cases actually even directly prevent effective international cooperation, for example, in terms of the exchange of information in the name of data privacy or banking secrecy arrangements, for example.

- Q Are you able to give us any concrete examples of these types of regulations that prohibit or inhibit the sharing of information or the integration systems across borders?
- A Yes. I think most anti-money laundering regulations, directives [indiscernible] in the EU, as transposed in law, of course, embed certain principles of data privacy especially, again for very good reason. In doing so, and in

Α

Robert Wainwright (for the Commission) Examination by Mr. McCleery, Counsel for the Commission

> the name of data privacy, have therefore limited the extent to which the obliged entity may share that data with other obliged entities, certainly limits the extent to which that data can be shared across borders. And in some cases it even limits the extent to which it can be shared with law enforcement. There are different variations of this.

> Now, you reach a point where essentially data privacy, which is an essential interest, absolutely, has been codified in legislation to reflect that, but at the same time, the challenge of fighting money laundering, a financial crime, has become increasingly dependent on the ability of us to work also cross-borders, not least by sharing information that can drive that more effective response. And so you have a conflict of interest essentially. And I'm not always convinced that the regulations and legislation has adequately dealt with that conflict of interest.

Q A second challenge identified in the report is the speed at which the system operates. And again, I'll turn back to the foreword for some comments that you wrote. You wrote that:

The time taken to cooperate between the private sector, FIUs and law enforcement means that the speed of response is simply too slow to stem the flow of funds which move globally almost instantly.

I wonder if you might elaborate on the pace at which the global anti-money laundering system moves and how that compares to the pace of, sort of, modern financial crime.

Yes. So modern financial crime seeks to exploit the very efficient global digital ecosystem that we all inhabit ourselves, and so has made use of what has become a much more convenient system, of course, to transfer money very quickly and securely.

And ranged against that are the significant problems of international coordination between the authorities, even where the regulations or legislation might allowed -- might allow, so even where data privacy paths might not be an issue,

the ability to connect authorities and indeed entities across jurisdictions is difficult because, of course, this is a system, as I said earlier, primarily designed around national configurations. So you have, again, this reality gap of a problem which is becoming more global and more and more facilitated by modern technology, and the speed with which that operates, and the fact that the international community hasn't really adapted well enough to deal with that.

For reasons that are extremely recognizable and even unsurmountable. It's not that I have any magic solutions here today, but it's become a notable feature of the problem.

- Q I wonder if you can comment on the speed at which the system operates even domestically. You mentioned earlier that suspicious transaction reporting system [indiscernible] deadlines by which reporting entities are required to submit reports. I mean, does -- even within a nation, is it -- are these systems moving at the speed necessary to keep track of or keep up with, as you mentioned in the foreword, this sort of instantaneous flow of money?
- A I think my -- my concern is that the system is configured around this business of suspicious transaction monitoring and reporting, which by its very nature is reactive essentially, which is trying to find evident suspicions of criminal activity, very often when it's too late. And the reporting of it therefore arrives with the FIU and with police teams in a way that in some cases 10 percent, from my report, is useful for further investigation. Very often it's not, partly because it's yesterday's news perhaps.

And so the system, in my view, you know, has to move much more to being a more proactive instrument for dealing with financial crime, and that involves making better use of information and intelligence, in the way that I can describe if you like. But I think there are essential — there are intrinsic difficulties with operating essentially a reactive system to deal with something that is extremely dynamic in form and scale.

Q Thank you. We can certainly get into some of

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

29

30

31

32

33

34

35

36

37

38

39

40

41

42 43

44

45

46

47

Robert Wainwright (for the Commission) Examination by Mr. McCleery, Counsel for the Commission

those ideas about how to reform the system shortly.

But maybe the next challenge we can talk about, and we've certainly touched on this already to some degree, is the notion of technology-enabled crime. The role of technology is certainly a central theme to this report. sort of presents it as both a blessing and a curse. Maybe before we get into the opportunities presented by technological enhancements, I wonder if you might comment a little more on the dark side of technology for the global AML framework. And maybe I'll ask you about a couple of the technologies that you've mentioned if we don't get to them, but maybe I'll invite you to just comment generally about the manner in which technology has changed crime in a way that sort of inhibits efforts to combat money laundering.

So we have -- I mentioned earlier the dark web, Α which is really a core trading and communication infrastructure for these increasingly global criminal markets. Huge trading platforms and hundreds of thousands of different types of illicit commodities. And they have to provide this underpinning crime-as-a-service infrastructure to the criminal economy, and that includes money laundering and financial crime. They connect professional enablers with criminals. They work in the entrepreneurial, innovative way even to develop new solutions, for example, for money laundering offences, cybercrime for example, within this sort of very vibrant entrepreneurial criminal community operating at this substrata -- anonymized, encrypted substrata of the internet infrastructure.

Cryptocurrencies, virtual currencies, is clearly - are clearly an important way in which criminals are making use of modern technology, and here we have a problem because, at least in the past they have been less well regulated. And there is a key problem with virtual currencies in that there is no centralized authority generally. And they also operate in a way that are anonymous or, in some cases, pseudo-anonymous, so the owner of the criminal asset, in this case virtual

 Q

Robert Wainwright (for the Commission)
Examination by Mr. McCleery, Counsel for the
Commission

currency, is much harder to identify.

And I think not until 2017 were virtual currency exchanges, for example, made obliged entities in the EU. I think the U.S. were slightly quicker off the mark.

I think when considering money laundering, for example, through online gambling, again the introduction of a possibility to pay and play, I think cash-out using virtual currencies has added a new level of anonymity, and indeed a new generation of online casinos has emerged specifically for virtual currencies, some of which promote themselves indeed on the level of anonymity that they provide. So you have a real challenge from the fact in that case there were reported 95 percent of all virtual currency transactions move across unregulated jurisdictions. So not only are 95 percent of all transactions moving across borders, they're also moving across certain borders that are unregulated. So it makes it extremely difficult therefore for law enforcement to deal with that.

It's interesting also -- and I make a point about how the regulation has since, at least in Europe, been modified to apply to virtual currency exchanges. And that's because still in today's world virtual currency has rather limited spending possibilities. It's still not possible in the main to buy a house or a car, for example. So you have to cash it out at some point into a fiat currency, and that's the role that the virtual currency exchanges have, and that's why they've been regulated as obliged entities.

I think in the future the threat will become a real problem once indeed we get to the stage where you can indeed buy cars and houses with virtual currencies, and then -- and then we have a real problem on our hands, I think.

So these are some of the ways in which technology, I think, [indiscernible] have been helping here and are relevant.

Thank you. And you -- in describing the global anti-money laundering framework, you described a system in which financial institutions, other reporting agencies, are sort of -- have the responsibility of identifying what is and is not suspicious. When we're talking about rapidly

11

12 13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21 22

23

24

25

26

27

28

29

30

31

32

33

34

35

36

37

38

39

40

41

42

43

44

45

46 47 Α

feasible thing to ask them to do, to identify sort of what is and is not suspicious with the new payment mechanisms and other enhancements? No, it's a significant challenge and a notable part of this new age, I guess, of trying to combat money laundering in a much more technology Indeed, it's much more difficult to do setting. so, describe the way in which anonymization capabilities help to protect the identity of the [indiscernible]. It's more difficult to enforce

changing emerging technologies, is that a

money laundering regulations. All the more reason, I think, why we need to sort of change the system in a way that can drive a more proactive response.

The next challenge I'd like to Q Thank you. discuss, we've spoken at some length about the impact on reporting entities in terms of resources and the money it requires to run those systems and certainly, I imagine, the labour hours that it commands. I wonder if maybe, aside from this resourcing impact, are there other impacts on reporting entities that you can identify that might sort of give us an indication of how this reporting burden affects the priorities of those organizations or affects how they might think about their role in combating money laundering that maybe is not as productive as it could be?

Α Well, the regulations create a rather clear yardstick by which all obliged entities, they know they have to measure up to, and that's driven indeed the injection of significant levels of resources in the way that I was describing earlier, into monitoring suspicious transactions and indeed reporting them, and indeed regulators have been quite diligent in many jurisdictions in fining obliged entities for serious failings in living up to those regulations. So that's driven a certain perspective that's always kept this matter a fairly high priority, I think, in most obliged entities.

The challenge they face, I suppose, is in resourcing that in an effective way. But also, it's not just about managing to resource it out of their budget. It's also really -- it's a challenge that comes with recognizing that it is

 such an unproductive system producing two percent of value or less. And of course, the banks know that, and other obliged entities, and indeed as do the compliance officers that have that. So, there is a serious problem of motivation and morale levels in energizing the men and women that are involved in this industry, and I think that's an important point.

There is, on the other side, an even greater challenge, I think, in terms of the generally low levels of resourcing of the financial intelligence units who are receiving these suspicious transaction reports. That's a significant part of the challenge that we face in most jurisdictions.

- Q Thank you. I'll suggest now we sort of move on to the sunnier side of the story and talk about some opportunities for improvement or solutions to these challenges. But before we do, are there any other shortcomings or challenges that you can identify with this global anti-money laundering framework that we haven't had a chance to discuss?
- Α I think one that sort of encapsulates all of it, Kyle, which is the concern that I had at Europol and I continue to have now in the work I do is that since 1991 in Europe, use that as the example still, we've effectively created a compliance-led culture at the heart of our antimoney laundering response. The focus has been on the regulatory effort, including the fining of obliged entities in that case, is to measure compliance with a rule book essentially, rather than the effect of compliance. And it's a subtle but very, very important point. And my view is that although creating incentives to comply is clearly important, it's not good enough to only do that because what's the point of being a hundred percent compliant if the system is still only seizing one percent of criminal assets?

So, we have to remind ourselves what the original focus of our efforts in designing the system in the first place were. It is not to comply for the sake of complying with any rule book, but for the purpose of preventing dirty money from entering the legitimate economy and polluting our way of life. So, I do think

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27 28

29

30

31

32

33

34

35

36

37

38

39 40

41

42

43

44

45

46 47 Α

Robert Wainwright (for the Commission)
Examination by Mr. McCleery, Counsel for the
Commission

therefore that there's a cultural norm that needs to be reset and indeed a strategic narrative and objective at the highest level that has to underpin that.

Q Thank you. As I said, we've discussed a number of the different challenges and shortcomings with this system. Let's move now to talking about some possible solutions. Specifically on the issue of resource allocation, you've alluded to some ideas that you have about how to better organize the system to better apply those resources.

What can you tell us about how we can ensure the resources dedicated to anti-money laundering efforts are better and more efficiently deployed? Yeah. In outline terms, it's -- my strong experience from Europol is that we needed to get better at collaborating within the sector, between the sector and law enforcement, and across borders, and collaborating in a way that's driven by better information sharing. becoming more intelligence-led, to use that phrase, and more collaborative. And I'm encouraged, Kyle, by the fact that since leaving Europol and joining Deloitte, at the end of last year in October 2019, Deloitte published the paper of the joint research they did with the Institute of International Finance, that surveyed the sector in some depth actually and concluded the same essentially, that we needed to get better in those two principal ways.

Now, what do I mean by intelligence-led approach? I think that the key point is that these anti-money laundering controls, including transaction monitoring, actually are very powerful in their construct, but they're made weak in their impact by being generally left undirected. It's a blanket-wide, rather blunt instrument, trying to monitor absolutely anything to try and hopefully find the odd needle in the haystack. And instead, you know, I think we need a much more laser-like approach that is capable of identifying the very small subset of transactions, the very small subset of, for example, the banking customer community that are engaged in nefarious activities and should attract the highest attention. So rather than

Robert Wainwright (for the Commission) Examination by Mr. McCleery, Counsel for the Commission

spreading ourselves extremely thinly in trying to cover everything, we need to focus on identifying at the start of the process where the most likely criminal offenders are and the methods that they're operating.

So, gathering and analyzing intelligence from multiple sources, all of the hallmarks of -- that I've been involved in my career to improve our knowledge of the problem set, down to very practical things. Who are the financial criminals? Where are they? In which sectors are they operating? What methods are they using? And so on.

So, it's -- it's an experience I have also in other areas of combating criminal problems, particularly in also terrorism, and one which is largely missing, at least up until now, from the way in which anti-money laundering systems are operating.

- Q I understand that since 2012, the Financial Action Task Force has emphasized the importance of a risk-based approach and that there is some take-up of that within the industry. Is a risk-based approach synonymous with what you refer to as an intelligence-led approach? And if not, how would they differ?
- Essentially, I think it is Kyle -- for Α Yeah. purposes of this inquiry I think it is. It's the premise of directing your control efforts, of course, to the best effect, you know, both to bring maximum impact on identifying and reducing the problem of money laundering, but also, which is an important point, minimizing the collateral damage caused by the way in which the regulations work. The regulations are such that they operate in a way that they lead to significant levels of financial exclusion of innocent people essentially who cannot enter the banking system, for example, maybe cannot buy property because of the onerous nature of those regulations.

And being more risk approach implies, of course, that you are indeed being a big more laser-like about where you should really focus your attention on rather than trying to cover everything with everyone.

Q And the intelligence-led approach you've described would seem to obviously require a

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21 22

23

2425

26

27 28

29

30

31

32

33

34

35

36

37

38

39 40

41

42 43

44

45

46

47

Robert Wainwright (for the Commission) Examination by Mr. McCleery, Counsel for the Commission

> higher degree of centralized coordination than is currently in place. Can you speak a little bit about the resources and infrastructure that would need to be in place to make that type of a system function?

Of course, it -- it requires a legislative Α Yes. and regulatory environment that would allow, of course, for effective information sharing between In the models that I found to be most entities. effective in my career, what I and others helped to build at Europol, which is this information hub I was describing at the start of my evidence. Earlier in my career, and indeed at different points along my career, the way in which many national authorities have led the fight against terrorism, for example, very much govern by similar principles. But if you think about how our jurisdiction tries to manage terrorism, it doesn't try to monitor the transaction of the activities of every citizen in a blanket way in the hope that some alerts from some of them can be identified. Absolutely not. It works in a way that starts by harnessing the right kind of data in a way, in a centralized coordinated way, from multiple sources to gather intelligence on the likeliest offenders, and then to throw a very strong control regime at that very small subset of the population. That's essentially how counterterrorism works and it's been largely effective right across Europe, I would say. And it's a hallmark of the way in which Europol has led the response to all forms of crime and try to encourage the same on financial crime.

Now, for that to work, as I said, you need legislation or regulation to allow it to happen. You need a technology. You need a platform. And in a different -- in the modern digital community we live in, there are different forms of doing this. It doesn't have to be a centralized database. It can be one that is linked in a federated way. But essentially it has to have the technology -- the technological ability to connect data, in a big data environment, to identify this idea of non-obvious connections.

And then, of course, analytical technology but also analytical horsepower in terms of people who can drive a more coordinated response.

 Robert Wainwright (for the Commission)
Examination by Mr. McCleery, Counsel for the
Commission

So, it's a different kind of response that is operating in parts, certainly of the law enforcement community. There are some examples, smaller examples of how this partnership between, for example, the banking sector and law enforcement is operating in some countries in ways that are beginning to look a bit like this. But largely these examples are not commonplace and not yet fully developed.

- Can you maybe help us identify where we might look to find those examples of [indiscernible] at least starting to do this in a way that makes more sense?
- The United Kingdom initiative from 2015 Α called the Joint Money Laundering Intelligence Task Force, innovative at the time and held up today as the best practice model, certainly that concerning the banking sector, around the world. Not without its deficiencies, but still, it had a strategic design that I think was the right one and has been effective. So this is a so-called public-private partnership, so it brings together the leading police authorities in the United Kingdom with, in this case, up to, I think, 40 financial institutions, the regulator as well, and -- for the purposes of exchanging information, analyzing, working on essentially live cases that the national police authorities are working on, the most -- highest priorities that they have.

And this sort of illustrates, I think, in a more practical way what I've been describing. This is a more proactive way of running a system. The police are operating a way to try and identify major organized criminals operating in the United Kingdom. They identify a one. They need to acquire more information about the network path that this criminal is involved in. They recognize that the banking sector, for example, has access to significant quantities of information that can help to identify, for example, the financial accomplices, contacts, the networks of that individual.

So, with the name of an individual or a suspect, they seek the banks' support in interrogating the banking records. So instead of throwing a blanket over all of the suspicious

Robert Wainwright (for the Commission)
Examination by Mr. McCleery, Counsel for the
Commission

financial transactions, you start with a single name or a single group of names, or a typology of crime, for example, or a suspected region of the jurisdiction, and then, in this more laser-like way, you try and interrogate the database of financial transactions that you have, and when you find something very specific, you report that back through the financial authorities in the usual regulated way through financial intelligence units. And it's led in this case, the example I gave you, since 2015, they've developed over 500 new investigations in this way, identified 5,000 suspect accounts and criminals.

But the statistical evidence I think I saw which most interested me was that within the first two years of running this system, there was an 80 times increase in the productivity of suspicious transaction reports that go to the So those suspicious transaction reports that were the result of these leads coming through this initiative from the police were flagged, in amongst the many, many thousands of others. I think I said earlier there were over 400,000 a year in the UK. Only a proportion, a small proportion of those came from this initiative. But those were the only part of the set that were proactively driven in this intelligence-led way. On the set of the Financial Intelligence Unit, where the average is 10 percent only led to further investigation, those that came through this initiative were 80 times more likely to be accepted for further investigation, which kind of makes sense because of the way in which the system works.

But that, albeit non-scientific, experiment, isolated example, tells you a lot, I think, about how the system indeed could run. And as a model -- and various forms of that is something that is being copied to a certain extent, replicated -- in other parts of the world there are variations of that, maybe in Hong Kong, Singapore, to a certain extent Australia. I've worked on models with the community in the Nordic region, also in Canada actually. I'm still working on that at the national level.

Thank you. I'm interested in going into a little

 bit more detail on this issue of information sharing with private sector organizations. The traditional system that you've described does rely on the private sector to an extent to provide information in the form of suspicious transaction reporting, but as you say, it's not in any way in sort of a targeted way. Can you speak a little bit more about what the -- how the role of a private sector organization like a financial institution would shift under this kind of an intelligence-led approach, and what the nature of their involvement in, not necessarily the joint money laundering investigation team, but in the initiative.

A Yes. I think the suspicious transaction controls, the monitoring controls, need not change very much. As I said, as a sort of -- the latent power of the instrument is very high. The value depends on how well you use that, of course. And then in the system that I described, if it was much better directed around the idea of having pre-analysis that helps to identify with more granularity the suspected offenders in your system, suspected accounts in your system.

Even with less granularity, which is something that we developed at Europol on a pan-European scale, a more highly informed view on the typologies of financial crime. This modus operandi of how professional money launderers work is emerging as a mock on this is what it looks like. This is how it works. These are the techniques that they use, and maybe even coming from certain jurisdictions. Anything that would lead to an increase in the knowledge and the understanding of the reporting entity, a much richer insight into what is likely to be occurring across their transactions, can therefore be used by those entities to essentially modulate their controls to focus specifically in certain areas or specific accounts.

And so, it's driven from the top, I guess, in a better way. A lot of that coming out of law enforcement for obvious reasons, but not all of it. Some of it could come through more effective sharing of information and typologies within the banking sector, between different banks or

Robert Wainwright (for the Commission)
Examination by Mr. McCleery, Counsel for the
Commission

between different obliged entities, for example.

Within a single enterprise, I've been
arguing for some time the case for sharing data
within, for example a bank, in order to connect
better our understanding of cybercrime, fraud and
money laundering, because they too are becoming

much more part of an integrated criminal economy, the controls against which should not be compartmentalized any more. And yet they are,

for example, in the banking sector.

So, you know, a vision of a more integrated, coordinated response which faces up to the reality of how crime is changing. One that is using data to drive a richer understanding and a more, again, laser-like response to the problem. You spoke earlier about the challenges that arise from the creation of a compliance culture within some of these entities. Do you see a more targeted approach, a more intelligence-led type of a system resolving those challenges as well to any extent?

A Yes. But I think the issue that we have, though, Kyle, is that at the moment the obliged entities are essentially forced to do what the regulations expect and how the regulators measure them, of course, under the threat of fines and you know, public opprobrium.

For the culture to change, the regulations have to change. The yardstick has to change. The way of measuring it has to change. And for that to change, one needs a tweaking of the legislation, but perhaps more importantly, a different kind of mindset within the community that helps to govern and fashion a more productive response. And you know, the system as a whole is kind of working on that. You mentioned that the Financial Action Taskforce is moving more and more to promoting a risk-based agenda. That's good. We're seeing regulators, national authorities, governments in certain countries in Europe beginning to move [indiscernible] a bit slowly but they at least move to a system based on that. But that's what we need. We need a mindset shift amongst those that are responsible for running the system. And you've alluded to this earlier today that whenever we begin to speak about changing how

Α

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13 14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27 28

29

30

31 32

33

34

35

36

37

38

39

40

41

42

43

44

45

46 47 Robert Wainwright (for the Commission) Examination by Mr. McCleery, Counsel for the Commission

> information is shared and the nature of information-sharing arrangements, the issue of the barriers imposed by privacy legislation, I think, invariably comes up. In your experience -- I appreciate the European legislative environment is a little bit different from Canada's, but I think both have fairly robust privacy protections -- has that been a challenge or a significant barrier to the creation of these kinds of intelligence-led initiatives that we're speaking about? Yes, it is, because we have sort of unwittingly walked into a trade-off, you know, a trade-off in the end between you know, privacy and the ability to fight financial crime, which is a trade-off that doesn't make sense in my view. I've never thought it was a binary choice that we had to make in any event, not least because, you know, privacy is also about preventing data abuse by criminals. To prevent that, it relies on more effective ways to investigate financial crime, which relies on a need to exchange information better. So, there's a sort of deficit of logic in the way in which we've constructed this because we've again done it in piecemeal fashion essentially.

And I think there's a better way of doing this. And my experience with Europol was one of seeing absolutely the virtues of a privacy-by-design approach that could also be enabling of our ability to fight financial crime.

Maybe I could explain. Because I arrived at Europol and found the most robust data privacy regime that was -- that I still know today. It was probably the most robust of any law enforcement agency that I know. My default reaction was that that would prevent the transformation of Europol into an effective operational centre essentially.

Actually within 18 months, two years, I'd flipped my view and came to realize that it is not the binary choice, and indeed privacy can even help you to run a more efficient data-led digital operation. And what I mean by that is data privacy legislation forced the police in that case to limit the extent to which -- limit the data that we could collect. We weren't

 Robert Wainwright (for the Commission)
Examination by Mr. McCleery, Counsel for the
Commission

allowed to collect data for which we had no purpose to process and share. We weren't allowed to store data for longer than we actually needed it. So, the result of that, of course, was that our databases became cleaner. We had much less junk. We no longer had data that we never needed anyway. And also, our analysts, the minds of our analysts became much more precise, so we became sharper and leaner in our digital operations. And that in itself, of course, gave tremendous operational benefits. And that operational benefit was the result -- unintended but happy result of implementing privacy legislation.

So, I do believe that privacy even is an opportunity to shape up your digital operations in a way that can also lead to significant benefits, for example, in fighting financial crime.

The key comes down to making sure that in doing that, you take a privacy-by-design approach that follows very, very closely, three important principles for privacy legislation. And the first, and perhaps most important, is this principle of proportionality. You construct a data system, a data-sharing mechanism, on the principle of proportionality, which is that you limit your data collection operations, as I said earlier, to those types of data that you need strictly only for the purpose of why you need it. Provided you stick to that, those guardrails, in my experience privacy legislation actually enables you to fight financial crime, and it even enables you to do other things.

The other two principles are ones of accountability and transparency, transparency before the data owner, data user. In our case at Europol that was actually the police teams and the national authorities. They still owned the data. They could see what we were doing with the data. That helped to embed trust in the system and indeed encourage others to add their data.

And accountability in the sense that you have to be governed by clear legislation, but also an independent oversight body that in our case, had full independent access to all our datasets. So that helped, again, to build trust in a wider community, though we were operating in

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11 12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

29

30

31 32

33

34

35

36 37

38

39

40

41 42

43

44

45

46 47 a way in which there was no dark secrets about what data we were using and so on.

So that's a long answer. Excuse me, Kyle. But I do think that there is a different way of seeing the role of privacy in a way that doesn't have to make it this binary choice between the two things we're talking about.

- Very helpful. I wonder if we might now move on to sort of another of the challenges we discussed earlier, which was the nationally or domestically oriented nature of the system. And I think you've spoken at some length about the importance of an internationally coordinated approach. I wonder if you might comment on, having spoken about the value of that approach, what a regional or international intelligence structure might look like and whether there are examples sort of, we might draw on to better understand how to more appropriately focus the geographic scope of these systems.
- Α Yeah. The only examples really that I know that are functioning are not actually in the private sector generally. In the law enforcement sector, Europol itself being -- I guess I'm biased, but perhaps being the best example, not least because today I think Europol's intelligence-sharing platform connects over 1,200 different law enforcement entities across 40 countries. it's an enormous enterprise. So, we did it at scale, and in a way that I could immediately see the fruits of the work that we did and the approach of the work. It was absolutely a core instrument in Europe's response to the terrorism attacks over the last five or six years. Absolutely it works, and becomes very quickly a primary instrument to control the problem that you have. So that's why I'm so convinced by the principles.

In the private sector, there have been significant attempts to connect law enforcement with the private sector. I gave you some examples in the UK. At Europol also we had this initiative across many industries in Europe as well. I think in the private sector essentially its -- there are very few examples because the nature of the regulation in most countries effectively limit those opportunities, if indeed,

in some cases, even exclude the potential for those opportunities.

So internationally this is challenging. think at a national level it is less challenging but still -- still there are not very many strong examples of these initiatives. And there, I think the opportunities are greater for this more collegiate response connecting different sectors and industries, and different entities within certain sectors and industries. There I think there are very many possibilities actually. wouldn't say limitless, but very many opportunities to do this within the banking sector or within the real estate sector or within indeed the gambling sector, each time with or without cross-industry cooperation with law enforcement. Always better if you can. without, it's still a good start. And so, there are different -- different modes of operating here that are possible.

- Q Thank you. And sort of on this same subject of international or regional integration, this report that we're [indiscernible]seems to endorse the idea of the creation of a pan-European financial intelligence unit. I gather there's been some movement in that direction recently. Can you comment on why the creation of a pan-European financial intelligence unit might be of particular value in the European context?
- A Yes. To use the European Union as an example, as I said earlier, each country has a single dedicated financial intelligence unit. That's governed by national regulation, and in each case created a legal gateway by which information could be shared between the obliged entities and the financial intelligence unit. But that legal gateway very often did not extend to anything outside of the national jurisdiction.

Meanwhile, in the way that I've been describing, Europol as a pan-European body was monitoring this growth of a more globalized form of crime, international flows of illicit money, movements of criminals, and finding pan-European typologies or indeed leads of criminal syndicates that were operating across multiple jurisdictions. And yet there was no gateway for us to share at Europol those leads, for example,

Robert Wainwright (for the Commission) Examination by Mr. McCleery, Counsel for the Commission

with multiple banks in different jurisdictions, which would have been the most effective way to deal at the pace, with the fact that these are high-level, high-harming, global syndicates of financial crime.

So once again, the reality gap that I described earlier had exposed this deficit of understanding -- deficit of capability. correct that, this idea of an EU-wide financial intelligence unit alongside the national ones -not instead of them, became a proposal. In fact, it was a proposal under the so-called Fifth Anti-Money Laundering Directive, which was going through the works in my last year or two at Europol. In the end it was not supported by the EU institutions. But encouraging for different reasons - that are perhaps not so relevant here, -- encouragingly, in the last couple of months, the European Commission has published a new socalled EU action plan on money laundering, on financial crime, and this avenue seems to be open for debate again, so [indiscernible] encourage that.

- Q And then the last topic I'd like to cover, subject to anything further you would have to add, on the subject of solutions is -- turning back to the question of technology, we've spoken at some length about the challenges that technology poses for efforts to combat money laundering. I gather there are also significant opportunities in that regard, and I wonder if you might comment on what you're seeing in terms of new tools that technology might be providing to help us in these efforts to combat money laundering.
- A Yes. I won't labour the point too much more. But of course in the field of big data and data analytics, which is the central premise of my argument, the technology available today is very powerful -- machine learning, artificial intelligence -- the business therefore of interrogating large, disparate datasets in a quick, reliable form to, again, find these hidden connections in the system, has been made more possible, more powerful by the advent of machine learning and now artificial intelligence as well.

I think the world of -- in the area of

compliance solutions, technology-enabled ones, I think is worth mentioning around digital identity, which is -- which offers the ability to enhance identity verification essentially, for online [indiscernible] and transactions, through the use of biometrics, other authentication methods essentially for sensitive transactions. So this is making the system of what we call onboarding essentially into obliged entities like banks, proving the identity, identity transaction, a digital identity form is likely to provide a more accurate result, less prone to criminal exploitation, certainly more portable and efficient, and in digital form therefore capable of being processed and shared across other networks. So digital identity has become an important new development in this area and has a lot of potential, so implementing it is quite important.

But any business environment that has a vulnerability of money laundering essentially will always have a core challenge and a core task of proving the identity of the beneficial owner of the asset, and that could be somebody seeking to buy a house, somebody seeking to buy -- open a new bank account, somebody of course seeking to register as a customer at a casino. In any of those cases where you can apply modern technology, for example digital identity, it is likely to add a level of robustness to the system that's not there at the moment.

- Q Thank you. Before moving on to the third report I hope to discuss, while we're still on the subject of solutions and opportunities, are there other potential enhancements to our global antimoney laundering framework that we haven't had a chance to discuss that you think it's important to speak about?
- A I think in the area of FIUs, I think I've talked before about resourcing being important [indiscernible] low levels. Certainly, if you were to compare the size of the compliance community, and budget underpins that in finance sector to the size of the FIU in any jurisdiction, it's extremely lopsided. That gives rise to significant problems of resourcing those leads, of course. And it might be one of

Robert Wainwright (for the Commission)
Examination by Mr. McCleery, Counsel for the
Commission

the reasons why only 10 percent are taken forward, I guess. But it also gives rise to a consistent criticism in the sector, which is very poor feedback from financial intelligence units to the obliged entity. So that in itself slows down the process of -- or makes less efficient, of course, this system.

I think consistent application of regulatory controls across jurisdictions, even between different sectors, is important. And above all that, this idea of what the UK calls in its new response to this, a whole-of-government response, which is, I think, going back to a point I was making earlier, that the problem of dealing with economic crime in its widest sense is best challenged if multiple relevant parts of government and indeed the private sector are working hand in glove. That's the point. And so, the challenge really is about creating a strategic framework of coherence that's not there at the moment.

O Thank you.

MR. MCCLEERY: Mr. Commissioner, as I just indicated, I'm going to turn to a new report, and I thought this might be a convenient time for a break.

THE COMMISSIONER: All right. Thank you, Mr. McCleery. We'll take 15 minutes.

THE REGISTRAR: The hearing is adjourned for a 15-minute recess until 12:23 p.m.

(WITNESS STOOD DOWN)

(PROCEEDINGS ADJOURNED)
(PROCEEDINGS RECONVENED)

THE REGISTRAR: Thank you for waiting. The hearing is now resumed.

ROBERT WAINWRIGHT, a witness, recalled.

THE COMMISSIONER: Yes. Thank you, Mr. McCleery.
MR. MCCLEERY: I see that I was muted there. Thank you,
Mr. Commissioner.

EXAMINATION BY MR. MCCLEERY, continuing:

Robert Wainwright (for the Commission) Examination by Mr. McCleery, Counsel for the Commission

- 1 Q As indicated before the break, I'd like to turn now to a third report.
 - MR. MCCLEERY: And Madam Registrar, I wonder if might display document number 44, which is a report titled "Does crime still pay?" Thank you.
 - Q Sir Rob, you can see that report?
 - A Yes, I can.
 - Q And do you recognize that report as one produced by Europol during your tenure as executive director?
 - A Yes, it is.
 - MR. MCCLEERY: Mr. Commissioner, I ask that be marked as the next exhibit.
 - THE COMMISSIONER: Very well. That will be Exhibit 66.

THE REGISTRAR: Exhibit 66.

EXHIBIT 66: Europol - Does crime still pay?

- MR. MCCLEERY: Thank you. And Madam Registrar, you can take that down now. We don't need it any further.
- Q Sir Rob, I wonder if you might comment on the purpose of this report and the audience for which it was produced.
- A Similar to the other two reports that we've been discussing, Kyle, it was to raise awareness amongst a broader community, again the law enforcement community, policymakers, regulators and indeed the wider public, on the way in which financial crime is impacting on society.

So, the three reports that you've chosen to highlight during my evidence, you know come as a set, a complementary set that describe the nature of financial crime and the response to it. In this case, "Does crime still pay?" analyzing the size of the criminal economy in Europe in so far as we were able to assess that with any degree of reliability, and in particular focusing on how much of -- how many of those -- how much of that revenue, how many criminal assets are seized and frozen and finally confiscated. And I alluded earlier to the figure of one percent, which comes from this report.

Q Maybe before we speak in more detail about the contents of this report, aside from the production of a report aside from the production

Robert Wainwright (for the Commission)
Examination by Mr. McCleery, Counsel for the
Commission

of a report like this one, can you tell us a little bit about the role that Europol plays in asset recovery and confiscation within Europe. A Yes. I think I probably covered this at the

- Yes. I think I probably covered this at the introduction in terms of the analysis project in this area around asset recovery. It is the socalled European Criminal Assets Bureau, and its role is to support this network of asset recovery These are also like the FIUs. offices. They are national coordinating points, as the name suggests, for the business of recovering assets from proceeds of crime. And similarly, with the FIU network, Europol has a role in helping to support -- facilitate the work of these national offices. They're on a pan-European basis, including in the areas I mentioned earlier about managing a network concerning anti-money laundering.
- Q Thank you. And you've mentioned now the headline conclusion of this report, which is that it seems that there's a success rate of confiscating one percent of the criminal assets believed to be generated in Europe. I wonder if you might tell us in a little bit more detail about some of the key conclusions of this report around the effectiveness of asset forfeiture in Europe.
- A We tried to estimate the size of the criminal economy in Europe. As I said earlier, it's extremely difficult to do that with a high degree of competence, and that's -- that's something that is the case facing, I think, any jurisdiction.

Conservatively, we took a piece of work -- an estimated piece of work. The academic community had done a significant amount of work. This is an academic institute based out of Italy called Transcrime Institute. And they measured that EU illicit markets generate around 110 billion euros each year. Now, that is a figure that is much smaller than the UN figure for the globe that -- for the world, rather, that a lot of experts rely on, which is why I think it's a conservative figure. We went with that to -- we preferred to err on the side of caution so that we wouldn't be in risk of generating any undue alarm.

But even against that figure of 110 billion,

Robert Wainwright (for the Commission)
Examination by Mr. McCleery, Counsel for the
Commission

which I do think is an underestimate certainly by today's standards, we then compared that against, as I said, the volume of assets that were seized, frozen, and eventually confiscated. Now, in doing that we had more confidence indeed in that statistical evidence because of our work in supporting the network of asset recovery offices around Europe, so we were getting first-hand data from the responsible authorities in the European Union.

Now, that showed that in a given year, some 2.4 billion euros' worth of criminal assets were seized and/or frozen, and that represented 2.2 percent of this headline figure of the size of the criminal economy of 110 billion. And now, seized and frozen doesn't necessarily mean finally confiscated because of the way this process worked and how only 1.1 percent finally of those though were finally confiscated. So that's my figure that I use of one percent.

As the report's title suggests, you know, we think that the way in which financial crime works indeed sort of gives rise to the notion that indeed crime does pay, still pays. And we're left with this you know, extremely unsavory finding that 99 percent of -- almost 99 percent of criminal assets, you know, continue to be enjoyed essentially by the offenders. And that's a figure therefore that we focused on in this report and wanted to bring to the attention of authorities and the wider community.

- Q Thank you. The introduction to this report describes confiscation of assets as one of the most important measures for fighting organized crime. And I wonder if you might tell us if you agree with that assertion, and if so, why in your view it's such an important part of the fight against organized crime.
- A Yeah. As I've been talking, making money, of course, is the primary motivation for most criminals. There are some exceptions [indiscernible] involved in child sexual abuse, for example. But overwhelmingly, for criminals the primary motivation is to make money.

So, if the authorities are able to run an effective forfeiture regime that therefore removes or denies those assets to the criminals,

then that is obviously going to reduce the incentive for criminals to engage in the first place, and indeed reduce the reward for engaging in crime. And then to a certain extent there is a moral purpose here behind this idea of asset forfeiture that we will have to make sure, to the best of our ability in the public space, that criminals do not profit from their illicit activities. That's the fundamental principle that I think is important.

There's another secondary benefit of asset forfeiture. It becomes an important source of intelligence to understand the broader network in the sense that you can identify the assets that are owned by the criminal for the purposes of finally trying to forfeit them, then it also is a means by which it's giving you more information about the lifestyle perhaps of a criminal and who he or she might be associated with, for example.

- And we'll speak a little bit later about the importance of financial investigative capacity. I wonder, the secondary benefit of asset forfeiture as a source of intelligence, is that -- I presume that's dependent on the asset forfeiture regime having some level of capable investigative resources.
- A Yes, indeed. But in that asset forfeiture has become an instrument -- a common instrument in financial crime, it -- although there are, once again, in this area, resource limitations faced by the authorities. Nonetheless, in constituting this as an important principle, it does therefore direct a certain amount of investigative capacity in this direction, and therefore makes -- makes possible therefore, these secondary benefits of intelligence.

Now it's not -- sometimes those secondary benefits are not fully utilized, very often because some asset forfeiture regimes, some asset recovery offices are not connected closely enough to the broader ecosystem of authorities that are fighting financial crime. They're operating in siloes perhaps to a certain extent, and therefore this opportunity to make the best use of the information that they are identifying is lost. And that's, again, a notable feature actually of the way in which law enforcement authorities in

 Robert Wainwright (for the Commission) Examination by Mr. McCleery, Counsel for the Commission

- the wider community operate in trying to prosecute to the limit financial crime.
- Thank you. The -- this report doesn't refer to this directly, but the two we looked at previously both offer some endorsement of one particular form of asset recovery, that being unexplained wealth legislation. Before I ask you your views on the merits of that type of legislation, can you tell us what your understanding of unexplained wealth provisions is.
- Α Yes. It's not a primary area of my expertise, but maybe I know enough to answer your question. It's -- these orders are also now a key investigative instrument to act on criminal assets, relatively more recent in their construct and evolution. Again, to use the UK as an example, the area perhaps I know best, in 2017, for example, the Criminal Finances Act introduced this power of an unexplained wealth order. an order from, for example, a law enforcement agency can go to a high court judge, and if that judge accepts it on the basis of certain key criteria that is met, then that order is served on a suspect.

Now, those criteria are quite important. They include, for example, some evidence that the suspect's known income is insufficient to obtain the asset in question. And when that order is therefore served on the suspect, he or she is -- has to positively evidence before the court the source of income for that order. So, it is an important principle of -- which is, reverse burden of proof, that the burden of proof is therefore imposed on the defendant, not in this case the prosecutor. You have to prove that the house or the expensive yacht or the car that you have has come from a source of income that is legitimate.

That concept of reversing the burden of proof isn't new to unexplained wealth orders. It was part of a kind of civil-based forfeiture procedures that have been the hallmark of some financial crime -- so financial crime strategies in some European countries for some time, 2002 in the United Kingdom's case, Proceeds of Crime Act, that in itself following a similar innovative

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16 17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

29

30

31

32

33

34

35

36

37

38

39

40

41

42 43

44

45

46

47

approach taken by Ireland in the years before that.

- 0 Thank you. As I mentioned, this mechanism is mentioned in the [indiscernible] too, the first two reports that we looked at. And the "Suspicion to Action" report suggests that unexplained wealth provisions with a reverse burden of proof would mean a strategic and substantial quick win for all law enforcement agencies and anti-money laundering supporters. take your comment that this isn't a primary area of expertise for you, but to the extent you're able to comment, was that an assertion you would agree with, and if so, can you tell us why in your view this is such an important tool for combating money laundering in particular.
- Yeah, I think applying it will have the usual Α round of teething problems, and we've seen the first few notable cases, celebrated cases in the UK which - so, I think it remains to be seen how effective they are at implementation, but certainly the -- that aside, the purpose of these orders certainly has a large potential to bring significant benefits to the world of fighting financial crime, because in the end, of course, it helps to deny criminals indeed the assets that are the proceeds of their activities. So again, going back to my more general remarks earlier, the more effective we can be denying these assets, then the more of the incentive to engage in the first place will be reduced and the more we'll win this fight to prevent criminals from benefitting, being rewarded by their criminal lifestyle.
- Q Thank you. This report that we're speaking of now makes a number of recommendations, as they all do. But I'd ask you for your thoughts on one in particular. The report recommends that financial investigative capacity in particular be strengthened. I wonder if you might comment on what -- you've spoken a little bit about the value of that as a potential source of intelligence. But can you comment on why financial investigative capacity in particular is critical to the confiscation regime.
- A Yeah. I think it's axiomatic that if we make the case, persuasive case, I think, that illicit

Robert Wainwright (for the Commission)
Examination by Mr. McCleery, Counsel for the
Commission

proceeds are at the heart of money laundering, is an engine of organized crime at the heart of the criminal problem we're trying to deal with and that which drives us therefore to the need to seize as much -- take -- deny as much of those assets to the criminal as possible for all the reasons we've been talking about. To get to that point, as I've been describing earlier, you need better intelligence to identify, of course, the criminals, the lifestyles and the ownership of certain assets.

Then all of that needs to be found through investigative work. So, the idea of financial investigative work, therefore, becomes one of not just -- not only one important part of how to deal with organized crime, but it becomes in itself an enabling instrument to fight it more effectively.

And so for some years, you know, a few of us have been saying that we need to mainstream financial investigation in every significant organized crime case, and that we need to move from the traditional space that it's had in the law enforcement community of being a rather niche area of police work into one that is a centrepiece of every major investigation. And this process of so-called mainstreaming has been, you know, a challenge for the last 10, 20 years. This got a lot better in some countries. It's just been successful. Now, to make that work, in addition to that you need the resources to back it up. We talked about that earlier. You need, importantly, the technical competence within your teams because it's a highly technical area, so the same way as criminals are making use of corrupt accountants, for example, then police increasingly rely on that kind of technical proficiency within their teams, for example.

And again, you know, going back to a point I've said many times before, it needs to be embedded also as part of an interagency framework of coordination.

- Q Thank you. Are there particular agencies in other jurisdictions that you can identify that are maybe good models for what a robust financial investigative capacity might look like?
- A I think the challenge has been found by every

 Robert Wainwright (for the Commission) Examination by Mr. McCleery, Counsel for the Commission

European country, and those that I know, like Canada and the United States and further afield in Australia. I think some like Australia, maybe the UK, maybe the Netherlands have been slightly ahead of the curve in recognizing this and in sharpening up their act. I think that in itself is still work in progress, but the UK launched — is in the process of launching it's new economic crimes strategy I mentioned already, and that definitely places, I think, this [indiscernible] financial investigation at the highest strategic level priority. And so, work in progress, I think, is the best I can say, Kyle.

- One other question on this report. The recommendations also make specific reference to the need for financial investigative capacity at the national level as well as at the regional level. I wonder if you might comment on why this -- maybe this was particular to Europe, but why it might be necessary to have this capacity at both levels.
- Yes, in the same way if you were to build a most Α effective financial investigative capability, then it needs to have the capacity to follow the flows of illicit money across the borders in the way that the threat therefore is operating as I explained earlier. And therefore, you know, the investigation doesn't stop within the national borders, and therefore relies on gateways of cooperation with other jurisdictions, of course. And that's why effective pan-European arrangements in the EU and in broader afield than that are so important. The threat, as I keep saying, is absolutely moved in that direction, and if we are to properly investigate it, then we need to have the ability to do the same.

So that's why at Europol, you know, as an EU coordinating mechanism, we focused so much on facilitating the exchange of financial investigative work across the different dimensions we've been talking about.

I mentioned earlier that in the last few months, the EU Commission has published its so-called action plan on money laundering. That includes some further steps -- proposals at least -- to take further steps to facilitate more effective pan-European cooperation, including the

Q

1 2

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11 12

13

14

15

16 17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

29

30

31

32

33

34

35

36

37

38

39

40

41

42

43

44

45

46

47

Α

Robert Wainwright (for the Commission) Examination by Mr. McCleery, Counsel for the Commission

establishment of a dedicated -- an agency dedicated to anti-money laundering, a dedicated EU agency, that is. As well as the point we discussed earlier, which is more effective EU coordination mechanisms for FIUs.

Thank you. Just changing gears then and moving on from this report, I'd like to ask you a few questions now about some work that you've done recently for the Province of British Columbia in your role with Deloitte. And -- mostly for the benefit of the participants, there's been some discussion, and I understand that while your work is subject to a non-disclosure agreement, the Province has advised that they don't object to your speaking about your work in this regard, with two exceptions, the first being that you're not permitted to disclose information subject to solicitor-client privilege, and the second being that you're not permitted to disclose information that originated with federal entities such as information obtained from the Royal Canadian Mounted Police. So, in answering these questions, I'll simply ask you to remain within those limits.

But I wonder if you might tell us in a general nature -- general sense what the nature of your engagement with the Province was. Yes. They've occurred within the last year and a I'll explain shortly what they are. yes, you're correct in that all of it during a period in which I have been a partner of Deloitte. That said, the nature of my engagement in so far as I shared any advice, you know, is heavily -- has heavily drawn on my former career, not least at Europol. So, I wanted to make that distinction. Yes, on behalf of Deloitte, and as part of a wider Deloitte enterprise to support the Province in fighting financial crime, but a lot of it was based on my former career.

So, reading from my notes, Kyle, on the 7th of February 2019, I took a visit to British Columbia. I met a range of officials in the Attorney General's office, the AML Secretariat, to have a discussion very similar to some of the points I've been raising today during my evidence.

I had a follow-up call in the next month,

Robert Wainwright (for the Commission)
Examination by Mr. McCleery, Counsel for the
Commission

13th of March, with the Anti-Money Laundering Secretariat to discuss the proposals that they were then shaping in response to the Peter German report and the follow-on developments around the establishment of possible police units.

Some advice and support, more indirectly via my Deloitte colleagues, in the time in between. And most recently, on the 23rd of April this year, a telephone call with the Attorney General Eby, again to give him the benefit of my wider experience as he seeks to marshal his thoughts on the strategy in this space. I should say there are follow-up visits being planned and might have occurred already, possibly also by physically meeting the Attorney General if it wasn't for coronavirus.

- Q Thank you. And you've indicated that [indiscernible] you obviously drew on your expertise from your time with Europol and prior to that in giving this advice. Is it safe to say that the advice you gave to the Province would have been generally consistent with the evidence that you've given here today?
- A Yes, that's correct.
- Q You might be aware -- I'd like to ask you about one of the recommendations that was made to the Province and your thoughts on that. One of the recommendations related to this issue of financial investigative capacity that we've been speaking about, and in particular it proposed the creation of a designated policing unit focused specifically on casinos. And I wonder if you might have comments on the wisdom of creating a policing unit with a mandate focused in particular on -- whether casinos specifically or even generally -- on one specific economic sector.
- A I think there are two important issues here in answering that question. The need to ensure optimum anti-money laundering arrangements within the gaming industry, casinos -- that's an absolute requirement, as it is indeed in all industries that are affected by money laundering. So, you clearly need to ensure as best as possible that there are optimum arrangements for countering financial crime.

A second related issue here is to -- need to

Robert Wainwright (for the Commission)
Examination by Mr. McCleery, Counsel for the
Commission

ensure that those arrangements in a particular sector like casinos are part of an integrated and coordinated approach to financial crime that reflects the reality of the threats that I've been describing today, and therefore is geared to achieve the biggest impact. And those two points are important, and maybe I'll just sort of talk through a bit more and unpack that.

So, for the first point, money laundering through casinos, in my experience, is a relatively small part of the overall problem. It's still important enough certainly to fully address in a way that's consistent with standards in other sectors, of course. In the EU it's a regulated sector, although there are variable standards of enforcement. I mentioned Malta's [indiscernible] earlier for example.

Going back to the UK, I think the UK is perhaps a more positive example. The UK Gambling Commission seems rather proactive in my experience, quite diligent in inspecting levels of compliance. They have some -- amongst their board of directors -- board of commissioners rather, they have people like Trevor Pearce, who is a former -- occupied a very senior position in UK policing, fighting organized crime. And it helps, I think, the Gambling Commission to be very well informed in this area.

Further afield, Hong Kong police and the problems of money laundering through casino networks in the Macau Province, for example. We've seen -- although I'm much less of an expert there. We've seen how that was addressed rather -- rather successfully.

Second point is to make sure -- to ensure it's part of a more coordinated response.

Well, again, to reiterate, financial crime has been described as global in nature, operating relatively freely across borders and between different sectors and I think to -- a simple premise here -- to even understand it properly as a basis for giving you the best shot to counter it, a similarly, I think, coordinated approach is needed -- as much as possible across borders and as far as regulation allow, as much as possible integrated across multiple relevant sectors.

Not least because -- financial crime is not

2

3

4

5

6

7

8 9

10

11

12 13

14

15

16

17 18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

29

30

31

32

33

34

35

36 37

38

39

40

41

42

43

44

45

46

47

Robert Wainwright (for the Commission) Examination by Mr. McCleery, Counsel for the Commission

> only global in nature -- I want to stress this point -- it operates in a way where it is in multiple sectors and industries simultaneously or they're a part of the network with this sort of footprint around different sectors of the community, and you have to start with the premise of acquiring the information that will give you the best hope of understanding where the full extent of that financial crime operation runs to.

> And the way to do that is, in my experience, this data-led approach, public-private partnership if possible.

> And I think this joined-up approach is all the more important given the scale and complexity of money laundering methods and the professionalization of the actors that I've been describing because, you know, that threat, I think, I'm finding, is often outstripping our capability at micro-levels in the system. where we're compartmentalizing our resources and therefore generally making them weaker and smaller in individual components, it doesn't measure up to the threat. You know, as I said, we have outstripped in terms of our know-how, our knowledge, our resources of AML teams in different bodies, and so we really need to leverage the effects on our side as well of a network economy, of a data-powered network economy. We are stronger together, if we can work together, are part of a coherent, broad That's my view. strategy.

- 0 Thank you. I wonder if you might comment as well on the idea that there's a need to, within this need for coordination, in terms of how we organize police resources, with the need to have myriad resources or expand the scope of an agency beyond even this question of money laundering to financial crime more broadly. Is there a sensibility in focusing my unit specifically on money laundering or is that an artificial distinction and is there a need to ensure that there's a broader integration with financial crime more broadly?
- No, I think the sort of highly technical nature Α of parts of financial crime require clearly a degree of specialization. That in itself will be -- will call for a depth of horizontal

Robert Wainwright (for the Commission)
Examination by Mr. McCleery, Counsel for the
Commission

specialization that is very important. But at the same time there must be some sort of vertical integration to leverage the capability of our specialist knowledge as part of a holistic strategy to fight it.

So you know, to go back to the analogy of Europol, you know, we had different analysis projects that we were describing, an analysis project on asset forfeiture, an analysis project, by the way, on heroin trafficking, on cybercrime, on people trafficking -- around 20 to 25 at any one time, and all requiring degrees of specialized knowledge, bringing specialized experts together each time, indeed even sharing specialized pools of data. But all 20 or 25 of them were connected as well on an integrated single platform.

So you bring the best of your vertical and your horizontal integration, and that for us was -- the importance of having both was very, very central to our ability to drive some kind of progress against organized crime because the depth of expertise allows you therefore to really understand the problem, but the vertical connectivity allows you to then define those golden, non-obvious connections, that what you're working on, this important asset forfeiture case, is actually connected to a modern slavery case in a different part of the forest. And knowing that is a very important lead in most investigations. Thank you. I thought, to conclude my examination at least, I want to take a bit of a step back and ask a couple of bigger picture questions around priorities and the most important areas we need to get right in this province if we want to really address this problem.

Let's assume the Province has established this Commission because it's genuinely serious about trying to meaningfully address the issue of money laundering. As someone who advises governments and private sector organizations on doing just that, what would you identify as the most critical areas that British Columbia needs to get right if it wants to make real progress in this regard?

A Well, of course in answering that question, there's nothing that I'm going to say now that

Q

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11 12

13

14

15 16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

29

30

31

32

33

34

35

36

37

38

39

40

41

42

43

44

45

46

47

Robert Wainwright (for the Commission)
Examination by Mr. McCleery, Counsel for the
Commission

you haven't heard me sort of explain during the last two or three hours. I'd be surprised if there was. So, if I think off that, you know, it's sticking with that last theme that I talked about, this idea of strategic coherence. strategy that is clear about the objectives and clear about its construct of joining up the system as much as possible and enabling regulatory environment and helps to implement that in practical form. Drawing the right kind of balance of interests and objectives across different privacy and other things. Clearly the resources in technology to support that. what the Province does -- so I'm describing that the Province should deal with the problem of money laundering in the province by seeing it as something that affects multiple sectors and industries. And it needs to design an approach that accommodates that, and doing so within the province, to do it in a way that is consistent and, as much as possible of course, also integrated with a national response, for obvious reasons and not least because the financial sector, which is still a primary part of problem money laundering, is operating essentially in the east coast of Canada, of course, so there has to be a national integration, as much as possible, international as well.

My last important element that I would mention, and I think I've hinted at before, is this idea of effective leadership, that in the end there have to be champions of change in relevant sectors and it has to be supported at the political level. So, the need, the appetite for reform, has to be clearly signalled at the level where the most influence can be brought, and its implementation must be carried by those who carry those legislations.

- Q Thank you. And then just as a final question, I wonder if you're able to identify other jurisdictions that have made real progress, either overall or in particular sectors or areas that British Columbia might want to look to as models of reforming.
- A Yeah. I think Australia was quick off the mark in a way back 20 years ago, and it's quite an interesting model to look at now. I know much

 Robert Wainwright (for the Commission)
Examination by Ms. George, Counsel for the Law Society
of British Columbia

less about how Australia governs its casino industry, so I'm not sure about that. But in overall terms, pretty good.

The UK is the -- I mean, if you look at the -- its strategy recently, going through the process of being published and implemented, important principles that they're getting right -- I mentioned earlier the whole-of-government, so again, the strategic coherence. Interesting that they are modelling a strategy -- it's not even financial crime. It's beyond that. It's the terminology of economic crime, recognizing, therefore, that in this much more globalized, integrated criminal community, cyber and fraud and money laundering and other dimensions are much more closely integrated [indiscernible] before. So again, this idea of a holistic approach.

The SARs reform process has been put up in the United Kingdom and in these other countries as a significant part, a flagship part of developing a more effective response, along with the points we've been talking about today. And there's also a nod in the direction of public-private partnerships in the UK, in the Netherlands, and indeed in other jurisdictions.

Q Thank you very much.

MR. MCCLEERY: Mr. Commissioner, I believe that concludes my examination of this witness.

THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you, Mr. McCleery, and either you or Mr. Martland will correct me if my list of participants asking questions of Sir Robert is wrong or in the wrong order, but I first have Ms. George on behalf of the Law Society of British Columbia, who's been allotted 15 minutes.

EXAMINATION BY MS. GEORGE:

Q Good afternoon, Sir Robert. My name is Catherine George and, as you've just heard, I represent the Law Society of British Columbia. My questions for you today are focused on clarifying a few things for the record with respect to the work that you and Deloitte have done for the Province of British Columbia. And the reason that I'm asking you about this is simply that when the panel from the Province and the AML Secretariat

 Robert Wainwright (for the Commission)
Examination by Ms. George, Counsel for the Law Society
of British Columbia

- testified last week, Megan Harris indicated that
 there were some points that someone from Deloitte
 might be better placed to clarify.

 MS. GEORGE: If I could ask Madam Registrar to just
 - MS. GEORGE: If I could ask Madam Registrar to just briefly bring up Exhibit 49 -- that's the Jurisdictional Scan -- up on the screen, please.
 - Q Sir Robert, do you recognize this as the jurisdictional scan that Deloitte prepared for the Government of British Columbia in September 2019?
 - A Yes, I do recognize it, although I wasn't a principal architect of it.
 - Q Well, I'm hoping you'll be able to help me with a very small detail about it.
 - A Sure.
 - Q You'll notice at the bottom of the first page here that it says "draft." Do you see that?
 A Yes.
 - MS. GEORGE: And Madam Registrar, if you could just turn to the second page, please.
 - Q This also features a large watermark that says "draft." Do you see that?
 - A Yes.
 - Q So Ms. Harris testified that this was the form of the jurisdictional scan that was accepted by the B.C. AML Secretariat. And so, I'm not at all suggesting that there's anything wrong with this. I'm just wondering if you can clarify why Deloitte put this jurisdictional scan in in this draft format.
 - A I'm afraid I can't answer that question. I don't know the answer to that. I'm sorry. So, as you can see on that page, it's signed by one of my colleagues, Peter Dent.
 - Q Mm-hmm.
 - A So Peter would know. I understand Peter is scheduled to give evidence to the inquiry later, at a later date. But I'm afraid that I don't have that information to hand.
 - Q All right. Well, thank you. The other thing I wanted to ask you about -- and again, this is a question Ms. Harris indicated that was better put to someone from Deloitte. And perhaps it's not you, and we will return to this in the fall. But if you know, if you could describe the mandate Deloitte received more broadly from the Province of British Columbia. My understanding is that

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

29

30

31

32 33

34 35

36

37

38

39

40

41

42

43

44

45

46 47 Robert Wainwright (for the Commission)
Examination by Ms. George, Counsel for the Law Society
of British Columbia

- Deloitte did work that was outside of the creation of this jurisdictional scan.
- Apart from the elements that have directly Α included me, which was giving a general impression of my understanding of financial crime and some advice that I gave the Province in regard to its proposals for a policing unit in regard to the casino sector, these are the areas specifically that I advised the Province on. I think this report in question is much broader than that and it refers to other work that Deloitte has given -- has provided to the Province on the subject of money laundering, and I'm not in the best position, I'm afraid, to comment on that. I wouldn't want to give you false or misleading information, and certainly it would be incomplete according to my knowledge.
- MS. GEORGE: All right. Well, thank you, then, Sir Robert. Those are my questions.
- A Thank you.
- THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you, Ms. George. The next on my list is Mr. Usher on behalf of the Society of Notaries Public. He has been allotted 10 minutes.
- MR. USHER: Thank you, Commissioner. I have no questions today.
- THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you, Mr. Usher. Next then is Mr. Smart on behalf of the British Columbia Lottery Corporation, who's been allotted 20 minutes.
- MR. SMART: Thank you.

EXAMINATION BY MR. SMART:

- Q Sir Robert, we've been provided some notes prepared by someone of your meeting with the Anti-Money Laundering Secretariat in February of last year, and in those notes I have -- I don't know if you have those before you.
- A I can find them, I hope. Please continue while I search for them.
- Q I don't have very much. I just want to -- one of the notes I have is "Casino money laundering is very small compared to what is actually happening in the banking system." Does that accord with what -- what you advised the Province when you met?

- A Yes. I mean, of course they sound like -- as they would be, of course, notes -- so shorthand notes of the broader discussion that we had. And so, I cannot recall if those were the specific words that I used. But of course, it would be the general sense of what I told the Province, in keeping with what I said, I think, as part of this evidence which indeed, it's a relatively small part, certainly compared to the banking sector.
- MR. SMART: Now let me just see. I've been told I need to adjust my camera. I hope that's better.
- A I can see you fine. Thank you.

- Q Okay, thank you. And is that -- that's consistent with what you've said about casinos in relation to money laundering. Does that come from looking particularly at the regulation of casinos in this province or just your knowledge generally about money laundering in casinos?
- A No. Thank you for asking that, Mr. Smart.
 That's an important distinction. It's from my
 broader global, and specifically more European,
 experience. I'm not sufficiently well versed in
 the specificities of the problem in the province
 for me to make that judgment.
- Q All right. I wanted to ask you about what's Exhibit 66, "Does crime still pay?" and your key findings. And if you need to find that document, please go ahead and do that. But I'll just read to you paragraph 1:

The results of this survey show that the amount of money currently being recovered in the EU is only a small (portion or) proportion of estimated criminal proceeds: 98.9% of estimated criminal profits are not confiscated and remain at the disposal of criminals.

And you've told us about the Italian study that you've referenced in terms of the amount of -the volume -- the dollar amount of criminal proceeds. Can you assist in terms of the different areas that proceeds originate from? By that I mean, certainly drug trafficking cartels get lots of publicity, certainly in Canada and in the United States. But you've talked about

 Robert Wainwright (for the Commission)
Examination by Mr. Smart, Counsel for the British
Columbia Lottery Corporation

financial crimes. What -- do you have a sense of what -- I'd like you to explain what you consider financial crimes and what role that plays in money laundering -- generating proceeds of crime, I guess.

Yes. I still think the drugs -- the illicit drug Α sector is still the largest part of the criminal economy, and therefore the largest producer of illicit proceeds. That said, there are other substantial parts of the criminal economy also producing substantial illicit -- you mentioned financial crime. In the wider sense that includes fraud, for example, and fraud, in Europe for example, is also a multi-billion euro problem. Fraud in different ways -- fraud on -defrauding banking customers of their money, sophisticated tax frauds, also relating for example to carousel fraud, which is a major problem. So, I think fraud is a major part of the criminal economy. Trafficking of people to work in illicit labour markets or for sexual exploitation is a growing part of the problem. Cybercrime I described earlier. So still important elements of it.

I think the point I was trying to make earlier, Mr. Smart, was that increasingly this range of different serious criminal offences are part of an integrated criminal infrastructure that is operating across borders and they're served by more and more a common criminal marketplace and infrastructure that supports that.

So certain professional money launderers, for example, financial criminals, are likely to be serving a range of criminal syndicates, not just those in any particular sector such as drugs trafficking.

- Q What's the impact from -- your opinion of the impact of these professional money laundering networks on money laundering? Just that we have much more sophisticated specialists undertaking those tasks for criminals?
- A Yeah. I think that's largely it. That we have -- the impact has been to professionalize the business of money laundering much more, and what that means is that generally those involved in that have become more adept at laundering

 Robert Wainwright (for the Commission)
Examination by Mr. Smart, Counsel for the British
Columbia Lottery Corporation

money through different means and more adept at identifying and exploiting any loopholes that exist in the anti-money laundering framework, more adept at concealing the identity of themselves and maybe their criminal associates that they're serving. And so yes, it's just a more professional criminal operation which has made it a fair degree harder, actually challenging, even in the best of worlds for law enforcement to combat.

- Q Do you -- but my sense from your evidence today is it's important that the reporting entities and the public are aware of evolving methods of money laundering so they can be more able to recognize it when it occurs and report it.
- I think -- I think any regime, any Α Yes. Yes. response to a sophisticated criminal problem like this, or terrorism, relies first -- you know, the basics are that you have to understand the nature of the threat. Know thy enemy is something Confucius wrote millennia ago. And so, this idea of improving your knowledge set is fundamental to any hope of designing the right strategy in the set of interdiction measures, because otherwise you might not know in which direction you should be pointing and prioritizing your resources. so that relies therefore on -- knowledge comes Data will come from -- the best data, from data. the best knowledge will come from the collection of the best data sources in some sort of intelligence-led way.
- Q And I gather you would encourage, to the extent reasonable, law enforcement and financial investigation units to share information with reporting entities so they're more knowledgeable in identifying transactions that are suspicious or put -- well, transactions that are suspicious and individuals who are suspicious.
- A Yes indeed. And it is indeed a regulatory requirement on obliged entities to do so. And absolutely that remains a cornerstone of the regime and should continue, but alongside some of the other response measures of improvement that I've been talking about today.
- Q Mm-hmm. This is a provincial inquiry, as you appreciate, and I think a clear theme of your helpful evidence today has been how global crime

Robert Wainwright (for the Commission) Examination by Mr. Smart, Counsel for the British Columbia Lottery Corporation

and money laundering has become. And so provincial efforts are necessarily going to be handicapped and really need to coordinate with national and international efforts. Am I -- do I capture that accurately?

- A Yes. I think where the impact of anti-money laundering takes effect in practical form will always be, of course, at the end point, at the local level and regional level. So --
- O Yes.
- A -- you have to have structures that are implementing, enacting these principles with practical effect every day. That's clear. But you're right in the sense my evidence today is pointing to that those actions that should be the product of a systemic approach that is across government and indeed across provincial boundaries.
- Q Mm-hmm. I note from the notes that we've been provided of the telephone meeting with Deloitte in March of last year that somebody has noted that:

British Columbia is lightyears ahead of any other province or the feds --

Being the federal government.

-- by considering and coordinating competing mandates and the other efforts that B.C.'s taken.

I don't know if that was you that offered that or --

- A No, it wasn't.
- Yeah. So you -- If I -- we've heard some evidence about this and this may have been your experience, that law enforcement tends to prioritize certain crimes over others, and obviously terrorism is one that in recent years has priority, and there are others, but that financial crimes and money laundering, at least until recently, has not been given that priority. Is that consistent with your experience?
- A Yes, it is, broadly. Yeah.
- 46 O Yeah.
 - A In many countries in Europe and to a certain

Robert Wainwright (for the Commission) Examination by Mr. Smart, Counsel for the British Columbia Lottery Corporation

extent I would say, to the best of my knowledge, in Canada and the United States as well.

- Q Yes. So, one of the efforts this province can make, from your experience, would be to encourage the federal government to coordinate a national and international response to money laundering and put sufficient resources and give a sufficient priority to financial crimes in general and money laundering in particular.
- A Yeah. I think as a principle, Mr. Smart, that that is right and I believe that. I know also from my -- my experience of running an operational agency how difficult it is to assign competing priorities against one another. So, I know how difficult and how hard these choices are. But yes, as an absolute principle, that yes, we have to make sure that we have the right resources to tackle financial crime, of course that's true.
- Q Yes. The last thing is, this inquiry is focused on money laundering. But money laundering is just part of a larger effort to reduce crime, isn't it?
- A Yes. Yeah, absolutely.
- Yeah. You've talked about the benefit of seizing assets, the proceeds of crime, because it takes the incentive out of committing crimes and, I guess, recycling those assets back into crime. But really in a sense money laundering is just another component of an effort to try to deter criminals generally, and it's really the predicate crimes that need to be the focus of law enforcement rather than just money laundering. Do you agree? That's a long statement from me, but do you agree with that?
- A Well, and in the sense that there are -- I believe that the most effective investigation and prosecution of organized crime, yes, depends on a range of complementary, simultaneous actions, including of course the investigation of predicate offences.

But I'm not sure I agree with the sentiment of your question in the sense that it's more important to do so. I think -- my concern for some time has been the way in which money laundering has become one of these great engines of organized crime, as I said, and must clearly

Robert Wainwright (for the Commission) Examination by Mr. Smart, Counsel for the British Columbia Lottery Corporation

be tackled with some degree of focus and efficiency because it is instrumental actually. It's not the only key instrument but it is an instrumental component of how the criminal economy works, and it has this capacity, if we get the actions right, of hitting the criminals where it hurts most, taking their assets away, stopping them from benefitting from [indiscernible]. And it's a major part of why anti-money laundering strategies are so important.

- Q Isn't what hits the criminals most is the sound of the cell of a jail closing on them? They've been effectively investigated and prosecuted, and there's those consequences, penal consequences.
- A Actually in my experience, no. It might surprise many of us, but I think some of the -- you know, to use a sort of slightly more everyday parlance, criminal godfathers that I've had the deepest pleasure of investigating over my years have feared nothing more than losing their assets.

And there is another important point here, which is those same criminal kingpins are very adept at removing themselves from any important chain of evidence, so it's relatively more difficult, I think, for authorities to get to the point where they can actually lock up, prosecute the kingpins themselves. So, if that's not possible, then through the different means that we've been talking about today, if you can take away their assets meantime, then that's the other avenue that's clearly worth exploring.

- Q But if you're only taking 1.2 percent of the money generated, we need to do better than that to have a significant deterrent effect.
- A Absolutely. And that's why we need to inform -reform the anti-money laundering system in all its respects. We all need to do better, frankly, as part of a more effective overall strategy.
- MR. SMART: All right. Thank you, Sir Robert. Those are my questions.
- A Thank you.
- THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you, Mr. Smart. And now, on behalf of the Great Canadian Gaming Corporation, Ms. Harmer, who has been allotted 10 minutes.
- MS. HARMER: Thank you, Mr. Commissioner. Great Canadian does not have any questions at this

44

45

46 47

time. 1 2 THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you, Ms. Harmer. Next -- and 3 Ms. Mainville, I leave it up to you. We've got 4 about tenish minutes left. You've been allotted 5 30 minutes. Do you wish to start today or would 6 you prefer to start tomorrow morning? 7 MS. MAINVILLE: My preference would be tomorrow I may well not be 30 minutes. 8 morning. 9 I don't think I would be, but it would still be 10 my preference to start in the morning if I could. 11 THE COMMISSIONER: All right. That's fine. We will 12 then adjourn until tomorrow morning at 9:30. 13 MR. MCCLEERY: Mr. Commissioner, sorry to interrupt. 14 I wonder if I might offer one point of 15 clarification on evidence that was offered 16 earlier. 17 THE COMMISSIONER: Yes. 18 MR. MCCLEERY: There was a comment about Mr. Dent 19 giving evidence later in the Commission's 20 proceedings. That's certainly a possibility, but 21 I didn't want to leave the participants with the 22 impression that we've finalized our witness list. So that is something that may well happen, but we 23 24 can't say so with certainty. However, we're 25 happy to look into this question of the watermark 26 on that jurisdictional scan and confirm why it 27 said that. Thank you for that, Mr. McCleery. 28 THE COMMISSIONER: 29 And Ms. Mainville, as far as you're concerned and 30 the rest of the Commission, we'll adjourn now 31 until tomorrow morning at 9:30. 32 MS. MAINVILLE: Thank you. 33 THE REGISTRAR: The hearing is adjourned for the day 34 and will recommence at 9:30 a.m. on June 16, 35 2020. MR. MARTLAND: 36 Mr. Commissioner, I'm sorry to 37 interrupt. It just occurred to me, though, that 38 in order for us to be consistent with our past 39 practice with the witness still there, I think 40 we've been in general terms having a direction 41 not to discuss evidence once we've moved under examination by participants. I would simply ask 42

whether we might do that again here.

Yes. Thank you, Mr. Martland, for

that timely reminder. Sir Robert, it has been my

that while they're under cross-examination, they

practice [indiscernible - break in recording]

THE COMMISSIONER:

may not discuss their evidence with anybody. Thank you. I understand, Commissioner. Thank you. THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you. We'll adjourn then. (WITNESS STOOD DOWN) THE REGISTRAR: The hearing is adjourned for the day and will recommence at 9:30 a.m. on June 16, 2020. Thank you. (PROCEEDINGS ADJOURNED TO JUNE 16, 2020, AT 9:30 A.M.)