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

Thursday, May 28, 2020

APPEARANCES

Brock Martland, QC Patrick McGowan

Cullen Commission

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

and Enforcement Branch)

B.J. Wray

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

Carly Peddle

Robert Kroeker

Robin McFee, QC

Maya Ollek

James Lightbody

Chris Weafer Patrick Weafer B.C. Real Estate Association

Morgan Camley Carina Chiu

BMW

Latoya Farrell

B.C. Civil Liberties Association

Jo-Anne Stark Kevin Westell

Canadian Bar Association, B.C. Branch

TABLE OF CONTENTS

		PAGE
Wit	nesses called for the Commission:	
	SIMON LORD Examination by Mr. McGowan	1
EXI	HIBITS	
11	Curriculum vitae of Simon Lord IVTS Network Map Report entitled "Ethnic Chinese Money Laundering in the UK"	2 76 81
	Report entitled "Chinese Underground Banking and 'Daigou'"	81

 Simon Lord (for the Commission)
Examination by Mr. McGowan, Counsel for the Commission

Vancouver, B.C.
May 28, 2020
THE REGISTRAR: Good morning, everyone.

THE REGISTRAR: Good morning, everyone. Thank you for waiting. The hearing is now resumed.

- THE COMMISSIONER: Mr. McGowan, I believe you have conduct of today's proceedings on behalf of the Commission.
- MR. MCGOWAN: Yes. Good morning, Mr. Commissioner.

 The first -- the witness for today will be Mr.

 Simon Lord, a senior officer with the National

 Crime Agency out of the United Kingdom. He is

 scheduled to testify today and tomorrow, and I

 think we have good time to complete his evidence.

 We should be in a position at the end of today to

 let you know whether we anticipate using the full
 day tomorrow.

THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you.

- MR. MCGOWAN: The witness will affirm.
- MR. LORD: Yes, good morning.

THE REGISTRAR: Sorry, Mr. Lord. Can I read you the oath first? Thank you.

SIMON LORD, a witness called for the Commission, affirmed.

THE REGISTRAR: Please state your full name and spell your first name and last name for the record.

A Yeah. My name is Simon Peter Lord. Simon, Sierra India Mike Oscar November, S-i-m-o-n, and Lord, Lima Oscar Romeo Delta, L-o-r-d.

THE REGISTRAR: Thank you.

EXAMINATIONA BY MR. MCGOWAN:

- Q Good morning, Mr. Lord.
- A Good morning.
- Q You can hear me okay?
- A Yeah, no problem at all.
- Q Good. You're coming through loud and clear as well. Just a housekeeping matter as we start, I understand that while we might normally think to address you as Officer Lord, you've asked today to be addressed as Mr. Lord, primarily because you're here, while with the blessing of your employer, not in your official capacity of representing them.

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

Simon Lord (for the Commission)

Examination by Mr. McGowan, Counsel for the Commission

- Α So although I'm appearing essentially as an expert witness who also happens to be a law enforcement officer.
 - And you haven't produced any written work 0 product specifically for the Commission, but you'll be relying and giving your evidence today on your many years of experience and work you've previously written; is that right?
 - Α That's correct, yes.
 - Okay. And speaking of your experience, you provided us with a copy of your CV setting out some of that experience?
 - Α Yes.
 - MR. MCGOWAN: Madam Registrar, I wonder if we might pull up Mr. Lord's CV just momentarily on the screen. Perhaps scroll down to the first page.
 - This is the first page of your CV that you O provided us?
 - Α Yes, it is.
 - Mr. Commissioner, I wonder if that might MR. MCGOWAN: be the next exhibit.
 - THE COMMISSIONER: Very well. I think we're at Exhibit 10, are we, Madam Registrar?
 - THE REGISTRAR: Yes, Exhibit 10.
 - THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you.

Curriculum vitae of Simon Lord EXHIBIT 10:

MR. MCGOWAN:

- Mr. Lord, I thought we might just start by walking you through, for the benefit of the Commissioner and the participants, some of the experience you've had. You're currently a senior officer with the National Crime Agency, and within the National Crime Agency you work primarily within the National Assessment Centre?
- Α That's correct, yes.
- And you bring to that position 30 years of experience investigating serious and organized crime with the last 15 years primarily dedicated to investigating, understanding and addressing money laundering?
- Yeah, that's right. Α
- 44 And I gather through those years of experience, 0 45 you've gained some particular expertise in some 46 specific areas of money laundering, correct? 47
 - Α Yes, that's correct.

Simon Lord (for the Commission)

Examination by Mr. McGowan, Counsel for the Commission

- 1 Q And some of those include informal value transfer systems and the criminal abuse of those systems?
- 3 A Yes.
- 4 Q The use of cash in the criminal economy and its transport internationally?
- 6 A Yes.
- 7 Q The criminal exploitation of money services businesses?
- 9 A Yes.
- 10 Q The use of international jurisdictions for money laundering purposes?
- 12 A Mm-hmm.
- 13 Q And trade-based money laundering?
- 14 A Yes

25

26

27

28 29

30

31

44

- I gather you started your law enforcement career with Her Majesty's Customs and Excise Criminal Intelligence Section; is that correct?
- 18 A Criminal Investigation, yes.
- 19 Q Yes. And that was -- pardon me. That was April 1990?
- 21 A That's right, yes.
- Q Okay. And you spent some time there up until 23 2004, when you moved to the Financial Crime Team 24 within that unit?
 - A Yes. Prior to that I'd been working on various different types of criminality, including things like tax fraud, drug trafficking, cigarette smuggling, things like that. But in 2004 I moved to a dedicated financial crime team where everything that we did was looking at primarily money laundering.
- 32 Q And in that capacity did you receive some formal 33 training and experience specific to money 34 laundering?
- 35 A Yes. Yes, I did.
- 36 Q Yes, carry on
- 37 A So I did -- there was training in money 38 laundering, in enhanced financial investigation 39 skills, in confiscation, in cash seizure 40 investigations and various other things like 41 that.
- 42 Q And you subsequently carried that experience into 43 the Serious Organized Crime Agency in 2013?
 - A That's right, yes.
- 45 Q And what was your role there?
- 46 A Essentially when I started in SOCA, I was part of 47 a team that was addressing various aspects of

Simon Lord (for the Commission)
Examination by Mr. McGowan, Counsel for the Commission

money laundering. Essentially, although I moved from one agency to another, the type of work I was engaged with was pretty much the same. So I was involved in the investigation and prosecution of serious money laundering offences and all the -- and the whole gamut of that, including arrests, searches, interviews of witnesses and suspects, all of those sort of routine things that you would expect to do in a routine investigation.

- Q And ultimately you moved to the National Crime Agency when it was formed, correct?
- A Yes. Everybody who was in the Serious Organized Crime Agency was automatically absorbed into the National Crime Agency when it was formed.
- Q Okay. Now I'm going to ask you in a little more detail about the National Crime Agency in a few minutes, but I wonder if you just might tell the Commissioner in a sentence or two what that agency is.
- It's essentially the UK's federal policing Α Yeah. Most of the policing in the UK is done by one of about 43 regional police forces. are groups within the police where those forces come together to pool their resources and look at serious and organized crime. But the National Crime Agency effectively sits above all of that. It covers the whole of the UK, including Scotland and Northern Ireland. And we have the responsibility essentially to lead the UK's response to serious and organized crime, and that is across the whole range of organized crime. as well as the more obvious stuff like drug trafficking and money laundering and things like that, we also deal with organized immigration crime, modern slavery, human trafficking, child sexual exploitation and abuse, counterfeit currency -- a whole range of things essentially, and that's all the NCA's responsibility.

And as I say, as well as having an operational response itself, it also has the ability to task other law enforcement agencies, depending on what it is perceived as the operational priorities of the UK at that particular time.

Q Okay. And you're working within the National Assessment Centre, and that is situated within

the NCA's intelligence hub; is that right? 1 2

Α That's correct, yeah.

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

- Okay. And what are your duties there currently? Q Α So I work on the economic crime team within the NAC, the National Assessment Centre, and in specifically on the money laundering desk. my role essentially is to ensure that I have a thorough and complete understanding of the money laundering threats that are faced by the UK at any point in time. And my role is to sort of explain those threats to colleagues in the National Crime Agency, other law enforcement agencies, and also in the private sector in terms of orally but also in terms of writing intelligence assessments and so forth.
- 0 And those intelligence assessments sometimes are reduced to reports which are, I gather, distributed not just within law enforcement but elsewhere as well?
- So across law enforcement in the UK but Α also to the private sector, so to banks and various other bodies such as MSVs, money laundering professionals, things like that, also overseas partners and people like that. So across the whole range of people who would have an interest in understanding and tackling money laundering within the UK.
- Q And speaking of international partners and distribution, you're currently involved in a project, a collaboration between the Gulf States and the United Kingdom to improve a joint response to money laundering; is that right?
- Α Yes. So the -- obviously the Gulf States, most people will recognize, is of importance when trying to tackle financial crime, in particular money laundering. And what we're doing is we're -- we have a project where we're liaising closely with the authorities in the Gulf States, particularly the UAE, to assist them in developing their response to the money laundering threat.
- Q Okay. On page 3 of your CV, you talk about some engagement you have with international partners in your official capacity. I wonder if you might tell the Commissioner a little bit about that role.
- I've been lucky enough to spend a fair Α Yeah.

 Simon Lord (for the Commission)
Examination by Mr. McGowan, Counsel for the Commission

amount of the last 15 years liaising with international partners on money laundering issues. And I'd also, prior to that when I worked in HM Revenue and Customs. So I've worked with agencies in USA, in the United Arab Emirates, in Australia, Canada, and New Zealand; places like Turkey, India, Israel, Sweden -- a whole range of countries -- in terms of addressing and dealing with organized crime in general but money laundering in particular.

- Q And has that experience given you a lens not only into the UK's experience but also the experience of other jurisdictions with respect to organized crime and money laundering?
- Yeah, absolutely. I mean, the main thing that --Α one of the things that you have to do when you're trying to address money laundering in the UK is understand the extent to which what you are seeing is specific to the UK or whether it's a problem that's faced internationally, because if it is, then you can -- there's a number of things You can reach out international you can do. partners, agree to joint working, agree to leverage off each other's capabilities, but also learn from them in the ways in which partners tackle a particular issue and, you know, assess whether that is actually a good process that you could put in place in the UK.
- Q Okay. You've also done some work with the Financial Action Task Force?
- A Yeah. So between around about 2012 and mid-2015, mid/late 2015, I worked on two FATF typology reports, one looking at hawala and other similar service providers and the other looking at money laundering through the physical transportation of cash. Essentially as an extension of my role doing the intelligence work within the -- first of all the SOCA and then the National Crime Agency, essentially to ensure that the understanding that the UK has in respect of these issues is other people from other jurisdictions can make use of it as well, and also to check that their understanding accords with ours.
- Q Okay. You also contribute to the Five Eyes Law Enforcement Group, specifically on the topic of money laundering?
- A Yeah. So I spent a couple of years around about

 sort of 2016-2017 on the Five Eyes Law Enforcement Group. There's a subgroup called the Money Laundering Working Group, and I did quite a lot of work in that space for around about 18 months, two years. And then on top of that, I'm — there's currently a group called the International Money Controllers Practitioners Group, which is a Five Eyes group, and that's looking at the specific topic of international money laundering controllers and informal value transfer systems and the way in which they're abused by criminals.

- Q Maybe I should have started by asking you who the Five Eyes are and what the Five Eyes Law Enforcement Group is.
- A Yeah. The Five Eyes Law Enforcement Group essentially comprises the main law enforcement bodies from what is known as the Five Eyes countries. So we're talking about the UK, the USA, Australia, Canada, and New Zealand. And essentially it's a forum whereby the practitioners from those groups can come together, share information about financial crime, talk about ways to tackle it, and also, as I mentioned before, leverage each other's capabilities in tackling transnational problems.
- Q And why are those countries called the Five Eyes?
- A That's a good question. I don't know.
- Q Okay. You're also involved extensively in training both to law enforcement and the private sector; is that right?
- Yeah. So one of the many things that I do as Α part of my role looking to understand and address money laundering is to pass on my experience to other people to ensure that they sort of have -can learn from the experience that I've gathered as part of my law enforcement career, but not just me but from my colleagues as well. So I do the -- we run an Expert Laundering Evidence course. I know we're going to talk about that a little bit. But the Expert Laundering Evidence course, I've been delivering that with a colleague for the last four years. delivered training, in 2018 in the UAE I spent two weeks delivering money laundering training to the Emirati Police. And I've delivered forums on various different topics to do with money

 Simon Lord (for the Commission)
Examination by Mr. McGowan, Counsel for the Commission

laundering across law enforcement in the UK but also to the private sector, to banks, to the Law Society, to various bodies like the Institute of Money Laundering Prevention Officers and people like that. So I do quite a lot of talking in terms of, you know, helping other people to understand and address the issues.

- Q Right. And you've presented or done training internationally with other law enforcement groups such as the FBI or the New Zealand Financial Intelligence Unit?
- A Yeah. So for three years in a row, I was a speaker at the FBI's Advanced Money Laundering Conference in the USA. I've also -- I was invited -- also in 2016 I was invited by the New Zealand Financial Intelligence Unit to be the keynote speaker at the conference they run with ACAMS every year, and that was at the National Museum of New Zealand in Wellington. And I've spoken in places like Australia and other jurisdictions as well.
- Q Okay. You've testified in a number of cases in the United Kingdom?
- A Yeah. I mean I -- so I do intelligence work now. But up until relatively recently, I was a law enforcement officer. I still have all of my law enforcement officer powers. And in the course of undertaking work against organized crime, you know, having my own case work and all the rest of it, I testified extensively in courts. And I'm also now a member -- in fact I'm the Deputy Coordinator of the NCA's Expert Laundering Evidence cadre. And I give evidence quite frequently in courts of law in respect of money laundering typologies and what have you in respect of the cases that I'm allocated.
- Q Okay. We'll come back because I'm going to ask you some more about that expert evidence cadre in a little bit. You've been retained as an expert not just in the United Kingdom but internationally as well?
- A Yeah. I've given evidence -- I've provided expert evidence to a case in Canada which I know has been talked about quite a lot. That was the project E-Pirate. I've also provided evidence to a case in Switzerland and I've also provided evidence -- well, it was actually investigative

 Simon Lord (for the Commission)
Examination by Mr. McGowan, Counsel for the Commission

- advice to a case in New Zealand as well.
 - Q Okay. With respect to the E-Pirate investigation, you were retained and provided some advice, but ultimately didn't testify in that case; is that right?
 - A That's right. I provided an expert statement but I -- I didn't actually end up giving evidence in court.
 - Q Okay. And I should maybe just pause to flag at this point that you have some constraints in your ability to discuss the E-Pirate case. As I understand it, the details of that case are not something you're at liberty to discuss, things like the names of individuals or organizations other than a couple that are widely disseminated in the public domain, and investigative techniques are things that you've not been given authority to speak of, correct?
 - A That's right, yeah. I mean, I think it's important for everyone to appreciate that in this particular case, my role as an expert witness is to look at the evidence that's presented to me and to sort of put it into context essentially. So to use my experience to describe money laundering techniques and then to give an opinion as to the extent to which the evidence I'm presented with is consistent with the techniques I've seen previously.
 - Q Right. And you have been authorized in your evidence today to discuss at a general level the money laundering typologies that were identified in that investigation and how those may be similar or different to typologies or methods observed elsewhere or in other jurisdictions; is that right?
 - A Yeah, that's right. So that's the extent of my involvement in the case. I'm not actually privy to the way the case was investigated or to anything behind it. All I've seen is the evidence, and I can only comment on the evidence.
 - Q Okay. We'll come back to that a little bit later. I expect in your evidence you're going to address some fairly detailed and nuanced approaches to money laundering. But I thought I might just start by asking you a very basic question, and that is, in a general sense, what is money laundering and what is the aim of the

criminals and organizations that engage in money laundering?

- A Yeah. Essentially money laundering at its most basic is the act of making the origin of criminally derived funds appear legitimate. In a short sentence, that's essentially what it is. It's extremely difficult nowadays for criminals involved in all manner of types of criminality to use their ill-gotten gains, and the art of money laundering is to make it appear that the funds that they've made have a legitimate source so they can, you know, do what they will with them.
- Q We sometimes see money laundering explained as having various stages, several stages, and I think the most common ones refer to placement, layering and integration. I wonder if you might explain to the Commissioner your understanding of what those terms mean and whether you agree that that is the typical structure of a money laundering operation.
- A Yeah. Well, in a nutshell, I don't agree that that is the typical money laundering structure. That's one of those things that in my view has become truth by repetition.

Now, if you Google "money laundering," at some point you will bump up against this theory that all money laundering systems consist of three stages, and that's placement, layering and integration. And briefly, what that means is placement is supposedly the introduction of criminal funds into the legitimate financial system. Layering is supposed to involve moving the funds through different bank accounts very quickly and breaking it up into smaller transactions so as to hide where the money came from. And integration is said to be the act of getting it to the point where it's cleaned, if you like, and so that it can be used effectively. The problem being that in most money laundering cases I've looked at, most of those stages or any of them don't exist.

And it's probably worth exploring that a little bit more. So in the UK, the definition of money laundering is essentially -- first of all, it relies on the definition of criminal property. So property is any type of property whatsoever that has been derived from criminal conduct,

represents any person's benefit from criminal conduct. And the act of money laundering in the UK law is defined as converting, concealing, disguising, transferring, or removing criminal property from the jurisdiction. And there are also subsidiary elements to that which include acquisition, retention, use, and control of criminal property and various other things like that, and conspiracy.

Canadian law, as I understand it, is very similar. And I've had a look at s. 462.31 of the Criminal Code in Canada, and as I understand it, money laundering in that piece of legislation is described as using, transferring, sending, delivering, transporting, transmitting with intent to conceal or concert property, knowing or believing that it has a criminal origin.

Now, when you break that down, essentially, in the UK and in Canada, something as basic as selling a kilo of cocaine, hiding the money in the boot of your car, and either driving it through the Channel Tunnel to France or maybe from Vancouver to Toronto, is actually a money laundering offence because you are transporting or transmitting or removing criminal property from a jurisdiction.

Now, that being the case, I struggle to see where placement, layering, and integration comes into it.

So although I would say it can happen like that, you know, and there are examples I've seen where -- and there's a case I'm currently looking at where that is what has happened, where money has been introduced into the financial system and then it's been shuttled quickly to lots of bank accounts. It certainly by no means is the standard that you would see everywhere.

So yeah, it's talked about a lot, but like a lot of things in money laundering, it's not actually true.

- Q And what dictates, from your experience, whether the criminal or organization would go through the stages of placement, layering, or integration or take some other approach?
- A Well, essentially, one of the things that we tend not to do as law enforcement officers is to try and view things from the criminal's perspective.

 And I'm of the view that it's very important to try and do that because it helps you to understand why things have happened in a certain way and also how you might be able to stop it happening.

And the view I take -- and this is what I always say when I'm beginning a lecture on money laundering -- is essentially you have to look at the criminal decision-making process. So the first element of that would be the criminal makes money from organized crime in some way so he might sell a kilo of cocaine or heroin or sell some illicit cigarettes or commit a robbery or something like that. So once he's actually got the money, the second thing he's going to say to himself is: What do I want or what do I need to do with this money now I've made it? The third process is: Where do I need it to be in order to achieve that, and in what form? And the fourth How am I going to get it there? point is: that is actually what [indiscernible] how money laundering works. You have to consider the criminal has got the money and wants to do something with it. And that is how -- and that is how they're going to think. And the important thing that follows on from that is that different types of criminality are not always going to -you know, the funds arising from that are not always going to be laundered in the same way.

So as an example, you could be in the situation where a criminal sells a kilo of cocaine this week, and because he's bought it on credit he needs to pay his supplier. Now, in the UK, there's a good chance his supplier might be in somewhere like the Netherlands or overseas. In which case the criminal would probably want the money in euros, because that's the currency of the country where it needs to go, and so he might need -- and he might elect to do something like hide it in the car and drive it out of the UK to the Continent.

The following week, he might sell another kilo of cocaine. He's paid off his supplier, and so this time he decides he wants to buy a car with it. So somehow he's got to get that money into the financial system in such a way as to make the person who's selling him the car believe

that it's legitimate.

 And so the predicate offence is the same two weeks running but the money has been laundered in two totally different ways. And I think it's really important to understand that because I think there is a general perception amongst some areas of society that drug trafficking -- money laundering always happens in this particular way and things like that, whereas in fact it's entirely down to what the criminal wants to do with it.

- Q And I guess depending on the criminal's particular goals, there are various methods or typologies which can be employed?
- A Yeah. So there's a whole range of things. So you've got those four stages: making the money, using it, where do I need it, and how am I going to get it there. But impacting upon all of that will be certain external forces like, you know, I need to get it into a bank but I don't know the best way to do that so I might need to -- let's say, for example, I'll try and put it into the bank account of a company. Well, I might need an accountant to hide the money for me to make it look legitimate. So I need to find an accountant but I don't know an accountant. Or he might say, well, I did it like that last time and it worked, so I'll just try that again.

So there's a whole range of external forces that come into play which are going to affect the way in which the criminal thinks. And as I say, it's a lot more complex than placement, layering, and integration, is the short answer.

- Q Right. We're going to talk about some specific typologies today, like trade-based money laundering and the use of the informal value transfer system.
- A Mm-hmm.
- Q But let me ask you this general question. Do these typologies operate in silos or are they often integrated and used in conjunction with one another?
- A Very much. It's like a huge Venn diagram essentially with big areas of cross-over. So informal value transfer systems very frequently involve an element of trade-based money laundering in some way. That might be to the use

 of criminal funds to settle an otherwise -- you know, a transaction -- a trade transaction between two unrelated parties. You might be in a situation where in order to balance the cash pools in an IVTS mechanism, people might smuggle cash from one jurisdiction to another. You will have a situation where you might get a professional enabler involved. You know, there might be a movement of goods from one location to another in order to settle a transaction. So whole different ways, and they all overlap and intersect.

The key thing, as I say, is that all of these concepts that we talk about -- IVTS, trade-based money laundering, things like that -- are all essentially law enforcement concepts. Criminals don't think about -- you know, I have yet to find the criminal who says, I think I'll use trade-based money laundering this time. What he's actually going to do, he says, oh, my mate's got a company so I'll put the money in the company. He can buy some goods with it and export them to Colombia and I'll sell them there and that's my money realized. It's trade-based money laundering but the criminal doesn't think of it like that.

- Q Right. Has your work in the UK and internationally given you any insight into whether different jurisdictions see predominantly different methods of money laundering or whether there are similar methodologies employed across jurisdictions?
- A It depends where you go, and it also depends on the structures in place in the location which you're looking at. So for example, in somewhere like Hong Kong, which is a trade and finance hub for the whole of the Far East, you're going to get people taking advantage of the fact that the -- you know, its been opened up for investment so it's very easy to gain access to corporate structures. It's very easy to open a personal bank account; not so easy to open a business bank account.

So the way in which money will be laundered in Hong Kong will be different to how it's laundered in -- well, in somewhere like Africa, where it might just be just sticking a whole load

of cash in the boot of a car and moving it from one place to another.

That said, most what you might describe as western jurisdictions -- so I'm talking about the UK, USA, Canada, Australia, Western Europe, things like that -- in my experience, see pretty much the same thing. Certainly, we do a lot of work -- I mean, I've already mentioned I've done a lot of work with Five Eyes partners, but I've also done quite a lot of work in Europe as well. And in general terms, what we see in the UK is mirrored by what we see in the USA and Canada and Western Europe and places like that.

- Q Okay. And what you're seeing in those western countries you made reference to, are you seeing criminal organizations primarily laundering their own funds or are they making use of professional money launderers to do that for them?
- Α It depends -- to a large extent it depends on how much it is they're trying to launder. So if you've got an organization which is -- street dealing, if you like, dealing small amounts of drugs -- and in the UK we have what are known as county lines where there are people who are in relatively rural locations who are dealing small amounts of drugs to the local community, supplied by people from the larger conurbations, they tend to launder their own money because it's a question of, you know, I need to pay the supplier or I want to buy a new pair of trainers or a blingy watch or something like that. So they will tend to do it that way because the amounts of money that they're talking about might be in the few thousand pounds, maybe it's ten or fifteen thousand pounds, and you can do that relatively easily.

If you have successfully sold 20 kilos of cocaine and you're looking at something like 600,000 pounds, 650,000, maybe even 700,000 pounds in UK terms, that's a lot of money, and generally people turn to a specialist money laundering crime group in order to facilitate that for them.

- Q Do you have a sense of whether the use of professional money launderers or groups dedicated to laundering the funds of others is on the rise?
- A My feeling is it's largely static, I think,

 because it has been something that we've been seeing for a long time, generally, in the law enforcement perspective. I mean, certainly as long as I've been looking at this, in the last 15 years, all we've been bumping up against is professional money laundering organizations. And a lot of these groups that are operating have operated more or less untouched for long periods of time. You do get new ones emerging and some of them fall off the radar. But in general terms, I would say the picture is pretty static. I think it's something that's pretty much embedded in the way that money laundering works globally.

- Q Thank you. I wonder if you could address the Commissioner on whether there are features that make a jurisdiction more or less attractive to money launderers or more or less vulnerable to money laundering activity.
- A Yeah. I mean, there are a whole range of things. I mean, the first thing I would say is a lot of the things that make a jurisdiction a risk for money laundering are things that are shared by most western countries. So the UK and the USA, Canada, places like Germany and things like that, but also places like Hong Kong, the United Arab Emirates and places like that.

There are a variety of aspects of their economy that are shared which are there to attract inward investment and what have you, but attracts good money but also bad money. So the UK, for example, we're a trade and finance hub for western Europe, as is Germany, as are various other countries. We've got relatively simple access to corporate structures. We've got a highly developed banking system. You know, the rule of law is in place. So all of those things attract good money as well as bad. I mean, one of the issues that the UK faces is that we are host to an awful lot of money that has been generated by crime in other jurisdiction and ends up here.

So you know, we have people who are Eastern Europeans, for example, who might be involved in bribery and corruption and things like that, and they would like to come to the UK and live, thank you very much. They would like to buy a property

near Harrods or something like that. Because people just like it here.

Similarly, other jurisdictions, like the UAE for example -- it's probably worth touching on this actually. The UAE gets, in my view, a bit of an unfair depiction in some places. It's seen as like a hotbed of money laundering. But the truth is -- the first thing that's important to say is, in all of the work that I've done, I have never seen actually an Emirati citizen involved in money laundering. That's the first thing.

And the second thing is, is that the reason that the UAE is such a money laundering risk. Firstly, it's the fact that -- like the UK, like the USA, like Hong Kong -- it's the trade and finance hub for the Middle Eastern region. It's in close proximity to Iran and there's quite a bit -- there's quite a bit of shipping that goes backwards and forwards. In around about 1983, the then ruler of the UAE, Sheik Zayed Al Nahyan, decreed that the economy of the country should be opened up to foreign investment and what have you because he understood that basing your entire economy on expendable natural resources was not a good idea.

So the UAE went all out to try and attract foreign investment by opening up free zones and what have you and making it easy to live and open up a company and get bank accounts and various other things like that. It's got a very high expatriate population. Only about 12 percent of the population of the UAE are actually Emirati. Everybody else are sort of lower skilled migrant workers, and those are the type of people who tend to be unbanked, and so those are the type of people who tend to rely on the informal economy. So a big informal economy has emerged to suit the needs of those people, and it's that type of thing that gets abused.

And so generally, it's not really the UAE's fault it is where it is. It is just -- by opening up its economy to become a trade and finance hub and to make it a successful country that doesn't just rely on its natural resources, it attracts bad money as well as good. And essentially it's all of those things. If you were to look at any jurisdiction and tick off all

1 of those things: Have they got lots of MSBs, 2 migrant workers -- unbanked migrant workers? 3 it a trade and finance hub? Is access to 4 banking, corporate structures, easy? All of 5 those things. That's what, in my experience, 6 makes a country vulnerable to money laundering. 7 Q Having spent some time working in Canada, and 8

- Having spent some time working in Canada, and British Columbia specifically, I wonder if you can offer any comment on whether there are features of the Canadian or even British Columbia landscape that would make it more or less vulnerable to money laundering.
- Α I mean, generally Canada is pretty well run. know, you look back at -- I mean, Canada was inspected by FATF in 2016 and didn't come out of the MER too badly. There were some areas in which Canada was criticized in terms of legal arrangements and beneficial ownership and things like that. But, generally, Canada is pretty well So you've got a developed financial system. You've got a lot of trade links all round the You can get access to corporate structures quite easily. And you also have -certainly in British Columbia I know there's a large Chinese population, and unfortunately, you're going to be vulnerable to the abuse of the type of informal value transfer systems that are used by people in that sort of community.

Now, I'm not in any way suggesting that the Chinese community are all criminals or anything like that. It's just that within certain populations, you tend to find that there are different types of IVTS. In the UK, for example, we see it quite a lot with Iraqi Kurds. We've got a lot of people from places like Pakistan and India and things like that, who tend to rely on a particular type of IVTS to move money for entirely legitimate reasons a lot of the time. But those systems can tend to be abused.

So Canada -- but I wouldn't say Canada is any more or less vulnerable to money laundering than -- and certainly British Columbia -- than any other large western country really.

- Q Okay. You used the term IVTS. That's informal value transfer system?
- A Yes.

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

Q Okay. One of the things you said when you were

 talking about features that make a jurisdiction attractive to money launderers or vulnerable to money laundering was the rule of law. And that maybe seems a little counterintuitive. I wonder if you could address that.

When I said the rule of law, what I'm Α Yeah. talking about is the effectiveness of your regulatory regime. So one of the issues that some countries that have opened up their economy to investment face is that the -- you've got to be very careful if you're going to do that, that your desire to open up the country and to attract inward investment and everything that brings with it doesn't outstrip your ability to regulate it effectively. And one of the most important things is your ability to be able to understand how -- not just how the regulation -- you know, the normal banking system would work, but also how informal structures work as well. And you have to be able to understand and make, sort of, informed choices about the extent to which you're going to bring -- you're going to try and regulate that informal economy.

The informal economy generally is important to an awful lot of groups, and in places like Syria or in Afghanistan and Somalia, it's generally the only way in which you can get money into the country. And you're going to have people within your country that are going to want to use those mechanisms to move money for entirely legitimate purposes into those countries.

So what you need to be able to do is make an informed judgment as to whether you need to put extra measures in place to regulate those systems to ensure that they don't become abused. So when I talk about the rule of law, that's essentially what I mean.

Q Okay. Thank you. One of the things I expect we'll hear is that because money laundering operations are designed to be secret and the techniques employed are designed, by their nature, to go unseen and obscure the source of funds, it's a crime that is particularly difficult to investigate or has been challenging for some law enforcement bodies. I wonder if you can address the difficulties that are associated

with investigating it and the extent to which you think it is challenging.

A Yeah. I mean, it's difficult -- I mean, from my perspective, I don't think it's challenging at all, but that's because I've -- you know, I've been living this for the last 15 years. I think people think it's more complicated than it is. I mean, money laundering, like I've said, is essentially hiding the origin of criminal funds. So you don't -- it isn't that complicated to be able to do that.

A lot depends on the extent to which you actually understand what your legislation says. So as I've mentioned, in the UK, once you've got over the definition of criminal property, any type of property which represents any person's benefit from criminal conduct -- so that's absolutely anything which has come from crime -- pretty much anything that you do with it is money laundering. And part of the trick is to enable the people who have to investigate these things to understand what it is they're trying to investigate and what it is they're trying to prove.

I mean, the law in Canada is pretty similar to the law in the UK. And once you explain to someone -- well, number one, you've got to prove it's criminal property, and there are various ways in which you can do that. Number two, what's he done with it? Well, he's driven it across a border or hidden it under his bed or put it into a bank account. Well, that's money laundering.

And so you don't need to over-complicate things by making it difficult. I think there is generally a perception that money laundering is a difficult thing to grasp. I personally don't think it is. And one of my roles, both within the Expert Laundering Evidence Cadre but also in the National Assessment Centre is to demystify these things and to help people understand what money laundering actually is and what they have to go back and prove it.

And to a large extent, that's the reason that in the UK we've got the Expert Laundering Evidence Cadre, because we -- and certainly before around about 2010, there was a situation

8

13

18 19 20

21

22

23

24

36

37

31

42 43 44

46 47

45

where people would try and present a complex money laundering case in a court, but the prosecutors didn't understand it, the judge didn't understand it. To some extent the investigators didn't either. And so how was the jury going to understand it? And so we realized that there was a necessity for people to be able to explain things in nice, clear and simple terms to the jury so that they will be able to understand it and make the decisions that were appropriate to the evidence that was being presented.

- Q Okay. Thank you. I'm going to ask you a little bit about the United Kingdom's law enforcement approach to combating money laundering. And I'd like to start by having you describe for the Commissioner the National Crime Agency and the National Economic Crime Centre that's embedded within that.
- So the National Crime Agency, like I've Α Yeah. already said, is the UK's federal policing agency, and it's got a multiplicity of functions. And one of the things that was different about the National Crime Agency which, when it was formed out of what was the Serious Organized Crime Agency, was it had a greater focus on economic crime. So people realized that -economic crime was investigated in the Serious Organized Crime Agency but it didn't really have a home per se. But when the National Crime Agency was set up, there were various commands underneath the overall structure, and one of those was the Economic Crime Command. And that was set up, as the name suggests, to deal with all types of economic crime, so fraud against the private sector, money laundering, and also things like counterfeit currency and what have you.

And as that went forward, the decision was made sort of around about sort of 2017 or thereabouts, that there needed to be like a separate agency or a separate body within the National Crime Agency, whose role it would be to sort of drive the UK's response to economic crime and money laundering in a more, sort of, coherent And that was the reason why the National Economic Crime Centre was set up. So it's operationally independent, but it's housed within

This is the National Economic Crime Centre. And it consists of staff from seven different agencies. So as well as the NCA, you've got the Serious Fraud Office; the Financial Conduct Authority, the body that regulates banks and what have you for prudential purposes; City of London Police, which is one of the forces that has the primary responsibility for fraud in the UK; HM Revenue and Customs, who as well as having a sort of national law enforcement remit in terms of tax crime and the money laundering that comes out of it, is also the regulator for a large part of the financial sector, in particular money service businesses. There's the Crown Prosecution Service, who are the UK's prosecutor; and the Home Office, who essentially own the policy of what the NCA does.

And essentially -- so the NECC has got three main priorities, and that's serious money laundering, private sector fraud, and asset denial. It does other things as well but those are the three main priorities.

And essentially, what it has to do is -- the role of the NECC is to understand the threat initially, and to a large extent that's where I come in because the understanding that comes out of the National Assessment Centre helps the NECC to understand the threat. Then, once you understand the threat, then you can define the priorities that you have in terms of tackling the threat and also what partnerships you have available to you which might help you work on your priorities.

Then you can task and coordinate the response, so, you know, getting other agencies on board, working in partnership with different people in order to address the issue. And then you have to essentially drive the delivery and assess the impact of what it is you've done.

And there are various other -- so that's the overall aim, and there are various bodies that sit within the NECC, which include the Drug Money Laundering Intelligence Task Force, which is the UK's public-private partnership, so the body through which we share information with the financial sector.

There's the UK Financial Intelligence Unit.

So that's the UK's FIU as you would say, operationally independent but sits within the NECC. The Expert Laundering Evidence Cadre, which I'm a part of. That sits within it as well.

And there are various teams that deal with things like fraud, money laundering, bribery and corruption, asset denial, the Gulf strategy that we talked about, and coordination and planning. And essentially that's what it does. There are approximately -- it's difficult to say how many people work there because there are continually people being seconded in and seconded out from various bodies and what have you, but it's in three figures, the number of people that deal with it. So as I say, essentially it doesn't have any operational staff itself, so it doesn't actually have people that go out and arrest people. The operational response is coordinated by NECC, but the actual going out and arresting people bit is done by staff within the police and within the NCA and what have you, just general law enforcement officers.

- Q Okay. You said you're in three figures in the NECC. Do you have a sense of roughly the number of positions that are assigned to the NECC and also the NCA?
- A Well, the NCA in total has got about four and a half thousand staff. That's going up to 6,000 in the not too distant -- there's just been embarked on quite a serious recruitment campaign, and the aim is in the next 12 to 18 months to get the NCA up to, as I say, 6,000.

In terms of the NECC, as I say, I can't really put a figure on it. I have actually asked but I haven't got a response back yet from anyone telling me what the actual figure is. But as I say, it's in the hundreds.

- Q Okay.
- A But as I say, that includes things like the UK Financial Intelligence Unit, which has got lots of staff within it itself, and what have you.
- Q And within the NECC, is it primarily police officers or are there also other professionals such as accountants or analysts who are embedded in that organization?
- A So in terms of the -- so the analysis is done

 Q

Simon Lord (for the Commission)
Examination by Mr. McGowan, Counsel for the Commission

primarily by the National Assessment Centre. So as I say, that's where I sit, and that's the function of the NCA, whose job it is to understand and to sort of communicate the threat. And so that's where the analytical function for financial crime sits. So I'm one of the people who does that.

We don't have any accountants, but we do have specialists in fraud, and I mentioned the Serious Fraud Office is part of the response. So you have people within the Serious Fraud Office who are -- the SFO has their own accountants and people like that. So we do have specialists in various different types of things.

It's also worth, I think, touching on the capabilities of the JIMLIT, the Joint Money Laundering Intelligence Task Force, because -- I don't know whether you were going to come on and talk about that a little bit later on, but I can cover it now if you think it would be useful. No, I was, but now would be convenient.

Yeah, okay. So the Joint Money Laundering Intelligence Task Force was set up in response to government coming to the NCA and -- I think it was the Bank of England at the time -- saying it's about time you lot started talking to each other properly and sharing information about the threat. It was piloted for a 12-month period in 2015, and I think it's probably fair to say that it took a huge amount of good will on all sides to make the pilot work.

One of the key things that the JIMLIT does is it enables the sharing of operational intelligence between law enforcement and the private sector. Now, the piece of legislation that created the National Crime Agency, which is the Crime and Courts Act 2013, contains within it a very wide gateway, information-sharing gateway effectively, s. 7 of the Crime and Courts Act 2013, and that's available on the Internet if people want to look it up. It's on legislation.gov.uk.

So the Crime and Courts Act 2013, s. 7. That is a gateway that essentially says anybody is allowed to share information with the NCA if it would help in the execution of its functions. And what it also says is having received

information, the NCA can share it with whoever it thinks it is appropriate to share it with, also in the execution of its functions.

And when the JIMLIT was trialled, there was a lot of discussion about whether that gateway was sufficient to give law -- not just law enforcement, but also financial institutions, the legal basis on which they could share stuff with us and not get sued by their customers essentially. And a lot of the work that went into setting up the pilot of the JIMLIT in 2015 was around about that. But there had to be a -there had to be a willingness to share, if you like, almost like a dare-to-share attitude amongst everybody. And like I say, it took an awful lot of good will for that to happen. the pilot was successful, and in 2016 it became business as usual within law enforcement in the UK.

And I think it's fair to say that, from my perspective, it's probably one of the biggest shifts in law enforcement capability that I've seen in the last 30 years, bearing in mind that I've been a law enforcement officer all of this time. The ability to routinely share operational information on cases that have not yet come to court, that might still be in the covert operation phase with financial institutions, and for them to keep your information secure and to go off and then search their systems and come back and give you information about your subjects and give you information you might not already have known, is a real step change, is a real game changer as far as it's concerned.

And it works on both sides. Not only does it provide a much better response from law enforcement, but it also means that the financial sector is privy to an awful lot of information on current money laundering typologies that they wouldn't ordinarily have access to. And what that does is it works in everybody's favour because it means that they can, you know, build that into their risk management methods and also make decisions as to how they're going to tackle the threat.

And the third thing that it does, most significantly, is if you are looking at a

particular type of money laundering or a particular set of situations, it gives you more options on how you can tackle it. So you can now pursue, maybe, a hybrid approach with the financial institution concerned.

So essentially that's what it does. There are about 40 financial institutions that contribute to it, so most of the major banks in the UK but also people like Western Union, MoneyGram and the post office in the UK, and also law enforcement agencies, so the NCA, City of London Police, the Metropolitan Police, HMRC, Serious Fraud Office. So there's an operational response but there are also working groups underneath it as well. So there are expert working groups in order to build the understanding of different typologies, like trade-based money laundering, international bribery and corruption, organized immigration crime, terrorism finance and things like that.

And the most recent development is that we are now expanding it out into the insurance and accountancy sectors as well. So it's -- like I say, it's probably one of the most significant things that's happened in the law enforcement space, in my view, in the last 30 years.

- Q Okay. You talked about public-private partnerships and the ability to share information, and the examples you gave were financial institutions. Are there other private sectors that the JIMLIT shares information with or brings into its process?
- Well, like I say, there's -- it's being built into the insurance and accountancy sector now. I mean, the most -- one of the most significant things about it is now is that it is -- it's embedded into the law enforcement landscape, the concept of actually sharing information with the private sector much more. So the sort of things that I've been doing as a -- you know, in my role as an expert witness and things like that and talking about various different money laundering threats -- you probably would not have done 10 or 15 years ago. So you know, going out and giving a talk on the current money laundering typologies to the Institute of Money Laundering Prevention Officers, for example, or to the Law Society or

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

things like that, you know, to lawyers and people 2 like that, sharing that information routinely, 3 and essentially trusting each other that you're 4 not going to do anything inappropriate with the 5 information that you're being given. 6 embedded the whole idea of public-private 7 partnerships into the law enforcement space, 8 which is a hugely positive development. 9

- Q The agencies that are members of the NECC, do they have access to and can they search information gathered by the Financial Intelligence Unit?
- I mean, the FIU is part of the -- it's Α Yeah. part of the NECC anyway. If you're involved in financial crime, in the response to financial crime in some way, shape or form, generally you will be given access to the SARs database. So the FIU does lots of various different things, it's got an outreach team and what have you. But one of its principal roles is the receipt, analysis and dissemination of suspicious activity reports. As a matter of routine, all of those reports are entered onto a database called Money Web, and generally, if you're a financial investigator in the UK, whether you're in the NECC or whether you're in a police force or anything like that, if your role and responsibility involves financial crime, you have access to that database.

Now obviously, that's for intelligence purposes only. And if you want to get the information in a form in which it can be used in court, then you have to go through the process of obtaining a court order to be able to do that. But in general terms, yeah, most people have access who need it to the FIU's information. There's a whole project ongoing at the moment in terms of how we develop SARs and how we use them and all the rest of it. There's a whole -- there's a step change in process in terms of how we're dealing with that information at the moment.

- Q Okay. The National Crime Agency and the NECC, are they focused solely on criminal investigation and prosecution, or do they also delve into or coordinate with civil asset recovery?
- A No, we do -- we do -- essentially with the -- the

 NCA -- in the UK it's referred as the four-Ps approach. So what you're talking about -- and the four Ps are pursue, protect, prevent, and prepare.

So pursue is defined as the traditional going out and locking people up, so arresting people and put them in prison, what have you, like that. But also we're expected to go along the lines of protecting as well, so it's sharing information with businesses and private sector in order that they can build systems and what have you to protect themselves from the threat of criminality.

Prevention. There's preventing. We try and get involved in the way -- in stopping people being involved in criminality in the first place. And also there's a prepare function, which is essentially getting people in the situation where they know what to do if they are in some way affected by organized crime.

So it isn't just a sort of going out and knocking people's front doors off and arresting them and putting them in prison. The NCA has a much wider remit than that. And as part of that, we have a wide range of civil powers as well as criminal powers which we can call upon in order to execute our functions.

So for example, generally if you're in the process of trying to prosecute somebody for money laundering and you can't make it work, what you can do is refer that case to our Civil Recovery and Tax Branch. And what they can do is use their civil recovery powers to go after assets that are derived from the proceeds of crime but which you can't get at by traditional law enforcement techniques.

So they can actually sort of -- actually go after the asset itself. But in a situation where they can't actually get at the asset, they have tax raising power. So if you can prove that someone's got a lot of income that they can't account for, they can tax it and things like that. So yeah, there's a whole range of things. And civil powers are something that financial investigators use routinely.

So we use civil powers to conduct detain cash investigations where we essentially look at

the cash wads and then the individual. We use civil powers to go after the content of bank accounts. We have new power which enables us to forfeit money in bank accounts.

And the law was changed in the UK back in 2017 to bring in a raft of new powers, one of the most impactful of which at the moment -- and we're just using it for the first time now -- is something called unexplained wealth orders, where we say to someone, in effect, you've got a huge amount of money and you can't explain it, so tell us where you got it from. And if we don't believe you, we're going to take your money off you. That's a very simplistic way of looking at it, but it's compelling people -- it's putting the onus on the individual to explain that their money was from a legitimate source rather than us trying, having to prove it the other way round. And we've got --

- Q I wonder if you could just--
- A -- there's a high profile case going through the courts in the UK at the moment in respect of that.
- Q I wonder if you could just spend a minute talking about -- explaining to the Commissioner what unexplained wealth orders are and what the rationale for introducing them in the United Kingdom was.
- A Yeah. So it's essentially that. So the rationale was there was generally a recognition that there were an awful lot of people in the United Kingdom who had huge amounts of money that didn't seem to have any sort of explicable -- any sort of legitimate way of explaining where it had all come from. So one of the -- I mean, as an example of that, the case -- it's quite high profile and it's all over the Internet, so this isn't in any way sensitive.

There is a lady who is the wife of someone who is from an Eastern European country, who is currently in prison for an absolutely colossal bank fraud. And essentially his wife, who has got no means of -- or no serious form of wealth -- serious form of income in the UK has bought a golf course and has got a six million house -- probably even more than that. It might be more than 10 million -- house near Harrod's.

She spent half a million quid in Harrod's. She had access to a Learjet and all sorts of things like that. And she doesn't appear to be able to explain where she's got all this money and all these assets from.

And essentially the purpose of the unexplained wealth order is to say to those people, we need you, now -- the process is you have to explain to us where you've got those assets from, and if you can't, then we will go through the process of recovering them.

- Q And is there any need to identify or prove a predicate offence?
- I mean, because it's done to the simple Α standard of proof. You just have to do it so that there is a balance of probabilities that the money came from some type of -- you know, essentially, if the person can't prove where they got it from to our satisfaction, then the money is taken away. I'm not an expert in the actual application per se of the order, but as I say, the information on the first one that was used in the UK is all over the Internet at the moment. It was originally subject to reporting restrictions but those were lifted not that long ago. And the lady in question can be found on the Internet quite easily.
- Q I gather the formation of the NECC, one of the goals in creating that body was to increase coordination and information sharing?
- A Yeah, that's right. So like I said, the whole point is understanding the threat and then defining what the operational priorities are. And your operational priorities are going to include who your potential partners are in actually tackling the problem. So it's very much a collaborative approach in dealing with a particular issue.

So it might be that -- I mean, we'll talk about it later on, I'm sure. But there was a project called Project Princekin recently in the UK which was where Barclays Bank came to the NCA through the JIMLIT and said, we've identified an issue which is an abuse of one of the systems that we have in place, and we'd like to work with the NCA in order to tackle the issue. And we had an entirely collaborative response to that, not

just including the NCA but lots and lots of other law enforcement partners as well in terms of dealing with the threat. So very much a -- rather than trying one -- one agency trying to arrest its way out of a problem, it's understanding that there are lots of people who can have different impacts on a situation by bringing their -- by the entity leveraging their powers, bringing everyone together.

- And prior to the introduction of the NCA and the NECC, was there a perceived lack of coordination that was hampering law enforcement, or lack of information sharing?
- A I don't know that it was -- I don't know that there was a perceived lack. I think -- it wasn't like there was a situation where lots of people were sitting round saying, oh my god, we really can't do this. There was always a desire to make the most of what you had and make the most of what everybody else had. And as I say, it was the government and -- I mean, the former Prime Minister, Theresa May, when she was the Home Secretary and the head of the Home Office, that the order came down on high that people need -- the law enforcement and the financial sector needed to coordinate more in terms of tackling the threat, which is what led to the setting up of the JIMLIT.
- Q Okay. And that coordination, I gather, has led to some successes. And maybe you can just share with the Commissioner one of those successes, the one you just referred to --
- Yes, Project Princekin. And this comes into the issue of Chinese underground banking, which I know we're going to talk about a little later. Barclays Bank identified a situation whereby individuals -- it all centred around automated service devices in Barclays branches. And what these are is like ATM-plusses, if you like. So as well as taking -- as well as withdrawing money in cash, it also enabled you to pay money into a bank account using these devices. And what Barclays identified was that there were individuals who were going into Barclays branches, who were Barclays customers -- so they held accounts with Barclays -- and they were accessing the machine with their Barclays debit

 Simon Lord (for the Commission)
Examination by Mr. McGowan, Counsel for the Commission

card or whatever you -- and then they were paying cash into back accounts but not their own. They were paying an awful lot cash into bank accounts, sometimes hundreds and hundreds of different bank accounts, which were not theirs. And some of these individuals deposited cash up to the value of around about three million pounds a time.

And Barclays had identified -- I can't remember what the final figure was, but it was up in the hundreds of these high net worth depositors who would put cash into a total of around about 20,000 different bank accounts. All of this was linked to Chinese underground banking. And as I say, we in the NCA had no idea this was going on, and it was Barclays' internal analysis that was able to identify this, and Barclays came to the NCA through the JIMLIT and said, we would like to work with you to tackle this issue.

And one of the ways in which we dealt with this was that in June last year, Barclays Bank identified to us around about 95 bank accounts which had got huge amounts of cash in them that had been deposited by people who were not the account holder, and was just sitting there, and enabled law enforcement agencies all the way across the UK simultaneously to apply for account freezing orders -- that's essentially a cash seizure on a bank account -- in order to recover the funds from those bank accounts which we believe were the proceeds of crime.

And as I say, that was a joined-up approach that would not have worked had we not had the public-private partnership arrangements in the UK.

- Q Thank you. Throughout the Commission we're going to be hearing further evidence about the UK's approach to combatting money laundering. But I wonder if you might just address one theme that I expect we'll be hearing more about, and that is the significance of transparency, for example in property or corporate ownership, and the UK's approach to that.
- A Yeah. So a while ago now -- I mean it's -- essentially one of the main ways in which people launder money is through things like shell companies, through access to corporate

 structures. And I've already mentioned that easy access to corporate structures is one of the things that make a jurisdiction vulnerable to money laundering.

Now, it is a fact that in the UK you can buy a company for less than you can buy a cinema ticket essentially. Which is not ideal, but, you know, the idea is, is to make, you know, doing business easier in the UK.

There are lots and lots of company formation agents in the UK that buy lots of companies off the shelf and just store them for a while, and then someone will come along and say, I'd like to buy a company, and they'll say yeah, okay, 50 quid, here you go, and will give them a company off the shelf and they can go off and do what they like with that company.

Now, there are some companies that will, for an enhanced fee, provide you with a company and a bank account. Now, once you've got that, then the world's your oyster, essentially, where you're free to money launder. So it's really really important to be able to understand who it is who's behind a corporate structure like that. Bear in mind that we're talking about limited companies, which are legal entities in their own right.

So it's really important that we have -that there is a transparency of beneficial ownership within any jurisdiction, not just the UK but anywhere else. And a few years ago now -it was actually under the David Cameron government, I think -- there was a drive to open up public access to the company register so that you could see, at least on the first level, who beneficial owners were of companies. And that is now the Companies House Service and you can search the Companies House -- the UK Companies House online. And you type in the name of a company and it will tell you who the directors and the beneficial owners and the shareholders are and will give you access to all the papers that are filed and all the rest of it.

Now, if you're really savvy as a criminal, what you'll do is you'll have the directors of your shell company, will just be another shell company in another jurisdiction. So there's a

limit to how far you can dig down into that. One of the things that, in a bid to address that, is the UK is currently in arrangements with some of the Crown dependencies, some of the overseas jurisdictions, like the British Virgin Islands and Gibraltar and places like that, to get access to beneficial ownership information from them as well.

Now, that's an issue that's been -- that's come up against some problems. The point being that this is a really important thing for you to address. You know, ultimately you want to know who the person is who was in charge of the company when that 100,000 pounds went through that bank account. Because ultimately you can prosecute a company, but it's much easier to prosecute the person who actually was in control of a bank account at the time.

So that's essentially where you are with beneficial ownership. Any country really needs to -- and certainly if it wants to appease FATF, needs to be able to demonstrate that it has some sort of control over the beneficial ownership status of its corporate structures.

- Q You talk about this corporate registry being searchable. Is it searchable by law enforcement or by anyone?
- A By anyone. It's on the Internet. The company register in the UK, it's called companieshouse.gov.uk and it's searchable by anybody.
- Q Okay. Does United Kingdom take a similar approach to the beneficial ownership of property?
- A Less so the beneficial ownership of property. There is the -- all property in the UK is registered with a body called the Land Registry, and those documents are not open to the general public, but they are accessible by law enforcement. So you know, I can, for example, make an application to the Land Registry and get back, in intelligence form only initially, who owns what property and whether there are any encumbrances on it, so whether there's a mortgage or a loan or anything like that secured upon it.
- Q One of the things I expect we'll be hearing evidence about is the significance of the involvement of lawyers in money laundering

- transactions and some of the challenges that arise with investigating transactions when a lawyer or a lawyer's trust account had been used. I wonder if you could address that.
- Α So lawyers are an important part of the system because they give you access to all sorts of things like that. So if you want to buy a property in the UK, I think it is theoretically possible for you to do your own conveyancing. But 99.9 percent of the property in the UK generally has to go through a lawyer. And so if you are able to obtain the services of a corrupt lawyer or a lawyer who is prepared to look the other way or not do its proper due diligence in respect of that, then it gives you access to a whole range of things, not just property but also lawyers who are involved in the formation of trusts and other sort of complex corporate vehicles and things like that. If a lawyer is willing to facilitate criminal activity, it's a big boon if you're a criminal yourself.
- Yes. Now, lawyers in Canada presently don't report suspicious transactions to -- they are not required to.
- A Yeah. And I saw that was part of the criticisms that FATF had in 2016.
- Q Yes. Is that different in the United Kingdom?
- Yeah. Lawyers are part of the regulated sector. They have to report suspicious transactions. And there is a body called the Solicitors Regulation Authority, which is the anti-money laundering supervisor for lawyers. So yeah, they're part of the regulated sector. And just like a bank, just like an MSB, just like anybody else, they have to do all the due diligence, SARs, suspicious transaction reports and consent, all that sort of business.
- Q Okay. I'd like to move on and address some questions about the Expert Evidence Cadre. I wonder if you might just start by explaining to the Commissioner what that is.
- A Yeah. So the ELE Cadre -- I mentioned it a little bit earlier on. In around about, sort of, 2008, 2010, when we started dealing more with some of the more complicated types of money laundering, there was a situation arose where cases were failing because people didn't

understand them essentially. The people who were presenting the case in court, so the investigators and sometimes the prosecutors themselves, didn't understand it. The judge didn't necessarily have much experience in dealing with this type of activity. And when you're in that type of situation, the jury aren't going to get it either.

So the NCA already had at this point in time an expert cadre in respect of drug trafficking. So people who could go into court and to explain the sort of evidence that you typically got in a drug trafficking investigation -- so things like ledgers and drug prices and cutting agents and various different things like that. And so it was deemed -- it was thought a sensible idea to see whether we could end up with a bunch of individuals, a cadre of individuals who were subject matter experts in their own right, who could demystify money laundering to a jury to enable them to understand the evidence properly and to make the appropriate decisions based on the evidence in front of them. And that's what the ELE Cadre did.

So it was set up -- the first course that was run -- there's a two-week training course essentially, and the first course was run in March 2010, and there were about half a dozen people trained in respect of that. Not everybody ended up giving evidence, but a few people did.

It was realized by around about sort of late 2012 that the demand for the service of these individuals -- I've always said about being a money laundering expert witness, it's a little bit like being a good plumber. You know, once you've helped a court to understand the evidence in a particular case, you tend to get jobs by recommendation, so people will come up to you and say, well, you provided really good evidence in that case, can you assist me on this, and what have you.

And it got to the point where there weren't enough experts to go around, if you like. So in March 2013, there was a second Expert Laundering Evidence course which was run, and me and my colleague, Brian Ludlow, who is the coordinator of the ELE Cadre -- so he's the one who's in

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

charge of its day-to-day running -- we were both on that course. And so we started off just by being experts and giving expert -- and I'll come on to what an expert does in a bit. And essentially since then there have been a number of additional courses. My colleague, Brian, took over the running of the cadre in 2015. And between 2016 and 2019 -- we haven't run a course this year, but later in the year possibly --Brian and myself, we essentially redesigned the Expert Laundering Evidence course completely. And Brian and myself are now that people who actually train the individuals and we mentor them and we oversee the running of the cadre and what have you.

The cadre has got -- so Brian is full time in charge of the -- he's the coordinator and he's in full-time charge. I work essentially part time, so I've already said that my role is in the National Assessment Centre. But in addition to that I'm also the deputy coordinator of the ELE Cadre. And then we've got two support staff as well. And as a result of all the training we've done, we have now got 34, I think it is, expert witnesses, including myself and Brian, from 13 different law enforcement agencies, who are able to provide expert evidence on complex money laundering cases.

In addition to the experts we have from the 13 UK law enforcement agencies, we have also trained people from overseas. So we -- the people who have been on the course and have subsequently become accredited as experts are from the National Police in the Netherlands, RCMP -- every course that we've done since 2016 has had at least two RCMP officers on it, sometimes three -- the FBI, Homeland Security, the DEA, New Zealand Police, Australian Federal Police. Australian Federal Police have their own Expert Laundering Evidence Cadre, but all of their experts were trained by us, so they've all been on our course. And we've also trained two officers from An Garda Síochána, who are the police force of Northern -- of the Irish Republic.

So that's essentially what it is. It's made up of law enforcement individuals from across the

law enforcement spectrum. And we provide a range of different services to law enforcement. The first and the most important is that we act as independent and impartial experts on money laundering cases. And the independence and the impartiality is the most crucial thing about this.

And this would be the case on E-Pirate, for example. So to give you my perspective on that. So on E-Pirate, I had no prior knowledge of the investigation whatsoever. We were approached by the RCMP as to whether we could provide an expert to put some context around the money laundering typologies that were in place on that particular case.

Because I'd had no prior involvement in the investigation, I was totally sort of divorced from it and all the rest of it. My role was to look at the evidence and to assess the extent to which the evidence was consistent with my understanding of certain money laundering typologies. And that's what I did.

So I was provided with a report by RCMP which summarized the evidence essentially, and a hard drive with all of the evidence on it, so things like interviews of suspects, surveillance logs, interviews of witnesses, CCTV, witness statements, results of checks and what have you. And my role was to look at all of that and say, do I think there's money laundering going on here and what type of typologies do I think are in action? And essentially what I'm going is I'm giving an opinion. I'm in no way saying to a jury, this is definitely money laundering. This person, I think, is guilty and therefore you should convict him.

What I'm saying is, this is my understanding of how money laundering typologies work, and I know that because I've got an extensive CV and I've been looking at money laundering for the last 15 years, so I know what I'm talking about. So the typologies work like that. And in this case, in my opinion, the evidence is consistent with that typology.

The extent to which the jury place weight on my testimony is entirely up to them and down to the directions of the judge.

What I don't do at any stage is suggest to anyone that someone is guilty of money laundering. And what I don't do, and I have not done at any stage in my career, is direct an investigation in a particular way, because that would no longer render me impartial.

The important thing to say about the ELE Cadre is that it is our role to demystify money laundering to a court. And that means that we are more than willing, and have done in the past, to provide services to the defence as well as to the prosecution. I personally have never done that, but the ELE Cadre has done that.

It's also important for us to take -everybody who's in the cadre is a law enforcement
officer. And the reason that that is, is that if
you want to understand what money laundering and
what the evidence is supporting money laundering,
then -- you can be an academic, but it's
enormously helpful to actually know what it looks
like from the coalface, if you like.

When we are presenting our evidence in a case, we have to take the investigator's hat off and just look at things objectively from the point of view of, like I've explained, this is how the typology works and the extent to which that is consistent. And that means that there will be situations -- and I've personally been in a situation -- where someone will come to you with a case and say, I'd like you to be the expert witness in respect of this. Can you look at this case? And I look it and say, actually I don't think that is money laundering. I'm terribly sorry. And so I can't assist you.

And an example of that is Brian and I were approached by someone from one of the police forces in the UK and they came to us with a huge amount of analysis they'd done on bank accounts in respect of these particular individuals, and it was clear from the bank account that they were running an informal value transfer system. And it was their case that because it was an informal value transfer system, it was therefore money laundering. And we had to explain, I'm totally sorry, but it's an informal value transfer system all right, but that does in any way, shape or form necessarily mean it's money laundering. And

some of the things that we would look for to see whether there was abuse of the IVTS system for money laundering are not there in your particular case. So we can't help you. I'm sorry. Actually, I don't think you've got a case.

And that's the important thing, is that we have to be independent and impartial. Right.

Q A

That's in respect of giving evidence in a case. What we can also do is, if we are approached by a law enforcement body, and they might say to us, okay, well, we're doing a drug trafficking investigation and maybe a money laundering investigation, and there's a guy in this investigation who's one of our suspects and he runs an MSB, money service business. We haven't got a clue what we need to ask this guy because we don't understand how MSBs work.

And in a situation like that, what one of us might do is say, okay, we will provide advice to your investigation, and it might be the situation that we will help -- we will sit down with you and help to plan in interview strategy for the MSB owner when he's arrested and what have you.

In a situation like that, if I was to do that, I would not be the expert witness in the case because I've provided investigative advice and assistance, and in some way I've directed the case. If subsequently they decide they would like an expert witness to explain stuff to the court, I would then have to be kept separate from the guy who was actually brought in to do the evidence, because he would have to remain impartial and basically wouldn't be able to see the assistance I've provided.

So that's that. So there's the expert evidence. There's the case advice. And then generally there is the training side of things. Because we understand how money laundering works, as well as training new expert witnesses, we also do quite a lot of training of other people to help them to understand money laundering a little bit better. And we do a huge range of that. And we've done that in lots of different countries. I've trained in all sorts of places like Turkey and the UAE and various other places like that. And we engage with people like the UNODC and

 Europol and various bodies, providing that sort of support. So there's a huge range of stuff that we do.

- Q Right. You talk about demystifying the topic of money laundering and simplifying it so investigators and judges and juries can understand it. How do you train the members of the cadre to simplify the topic?
- A The selection process involves -- it's quite a rigorous selection process. So the number one thing in the selection process is, are you an experienced court witness. Because that's the ground state of an expert witness. At some point you're going to be called to stand in a witness box in front of a jury and explain this to them. So the first thing is, they have to be an experienced court witness and they have to be experienced in giving evidence in front of a jury. So that's the first thing.

The second thing is, when we select people, we ask them -- we give them a topic essentially and say, go away and rehearse this topic, and then when you come and apply, part of the selection process is you have to explain that topic to us. And if they get it all about their ears and they really don't know what they're talking about and they're stuttering and falling over, they don't get through the process. It's as simple as that.

Part of the training course is -- so the first week of the training course is, you know -- and what we don't -- there's a little bit of front-loading in respect of money laundering typologies and things like that, a little bit of that. A couple of days. But when they come to us, they're already expected to have the understanding and knowledge of money laundering on board. We don't take people who are fresh out of college because they wouldn't be able to -- they're not experts essentially. You have to have the CV to start off with.

So one of the things that we do -- the first week is all about the law surrounding the use of expert evidence, so what you can say and what you can't say, you know, what the legal basis of what you're saying is and all that sort of stuff. The second week is we give everybody a big pile of

evidence in respect to a fictitious case. All the evidence is real but it's been pulled from lots of different cases. We put a fictitious case together and we say, right, go away and write a witness statement. So that's the first test, is they have to be able to write down in the form of a witness statement what their analysis of the evidence is. So first of all, they have to explain the typologies, and then they have to say, this is what the evidence is and this is how it's consistent with that typology in that witness statement. So it's a test of their written ability to get that point across.

And then, lucky chaps, what we do is we turn the training room into a courtroom, and we get two QCs in there and we subject them to half an hour of hostile cross-examination by two QCs in order to see the extent to which they are capable of standing up to cross-examination in the box and also getting their point across in a clear and cogent manner.

The course is now accredited under Skills for Justice, which is a UK procedure whereby there's a set of standards that you have to go through in order to do this. And so at the end of it the course is pass or fail now. It never used to be. From the 2019 course onwards, it is. It's a pass or fail thing. And you have to prove that you are competent in order to be let go. And then once you've done that, they are not then released straight out into the open. We then go through a process of continual professional development and mentoring and what have you, in order to ensure that by the time they actually get to the point where they're doing it for real, they know what they're talking about and they know what they're doing.

- Q And I gather there's a peer review process embedded within this?
- A There is, yeah. So a statement is allocated to an expert witness. The expert witness goes away and does all of the stuff that you would expect them to do. They look at all the evidence. They write the witness statement. They analyze the evidence and, as I say, express an opinion as to how it's consistent and all that sort of

 Simon Lord (for the Commission)
Examination by Mr. McGowan, Counsel for the Commission

business.

What we then insist on is at least three peer reviews from other members of the cadre and we have a roto by which people rotate on to and off to. So when a statement comes in, it is sent out to the other experts and essentially they pick holes in each other's evidence. You know, they say yes, that's a really good statement. I agree with you. A couple of typos here or there. Or I'm not sure you've quite got that point across you're trying to make. Or in extreme cases, I don't think actually you're right in your analysis there.

And then that then goes back to the individual to make any changes that they see fit, and there is then a final sign-off of the statement by either Brian or myself in which we make sure that it complies with all of the legal requirements of an expert statement and just to make sure nobody's missed anything in terms of what's in the statement.

So it's an extremely rigorous process, and basically you don't get an expert statement on your case unless it's gone through that process. Nobody is allowed to self-task. All the tasking comes in to the centre and we then allocate it to people. So no one self-tasks. And statements have to be peer-reviewed by us and signed off by us before they're used in court.

- Q Okay. How many RCMP officers have you trained or have been through this program?
- A Well, there's been at least two on every course we've run since 2016, so I would say probably around about nine, ten, something like that. Those are the ones that I've personally trained.
- Q Okay. And do you know if any of those were from British Columbia?
- A Yeah, [indiscernible]. I mean, I could mention names. But yeah, some of the people who work in Vancouver have been on that course.
- Q Can you give me a sense of how many are from British Columbia?
- A At least two or three.
- O Thank you.
- MR. MCGOWAN: Mr. Commissioner, I'm about to move on to another topic. I wonder if this might be a convenient for a break.

 Simon Lord (for the Commission)
Examination by Mr. McGowan, Counsel for the Commission

THE COMMISSIONER: Yes. Thank you, Mr. McGowan. We will take 15 minutes. And once again, I remind people to turn off both their microphones and their cameras during the break. Thank you.

(WITNESS STOOD DOWN)

MR. MCGOWAN: Thank you.

(PROCEEDINGS RECESSED)
(PROCEEDINGS RECONVENED)

THE REGISTRAR: Thank you for waiting. The hearing is now resumed. Please ensure you're muted unless you are speaking.

THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you, Madam Registrar. Yes, Mr. McGowan.

MR. MCGOWAN: Thank you.

SIMON LORD, a witness, recalled.

EXAMINATION BY MR. MCGOWAN, continuing:

- Q Mr. Lord, I understand part of your role with the National Crime Agency is to assess and gain an understanding of the extent of the risk money laundering poses to the United Kingdom and beyond its borders, and I wonder if through that process you've come to gain an understanding of the damage that can be caused to communities if money laundering is committed in those communities.
- Yeah. I mean, it depends what you're referring to by communities really. I mean, the money laundering in general terms causes damage across the board in a jurisdiction. It can have quite far-reaching effects. If there is a general perception that your country is vulnerable to money laundering, it can make people less willing to do business there because they think they might, say unwittingly, become embroiled in it. In a situation like that, obviously then that acts as a block to inwards investments and to trade and things like that. It makes the borrowing of a country much more expensive. You know, they have to borrow at higher rates on the currency markets. That can have all sorts of

impacts in terms of the amount of money that's able to be spent on things like welfare and benefits and hospitals and public services within a country.

So money laundering in general terms is destructive to a country as a whole. And also then you can start looking at the impacts on individual communities, where some communities can get a really bad reputation and unjustifiably because there is a general perception that the activities of that individual community might be somehow generally involved in criminality.

So yeah, there's all sorts of ways in which money laundering is generally a bad thing to have happening where you live.

- I wonder if you can talk a little bit more about how a perception that a country is vulnerable to money laundering might impact on the ability of other nations or companies to do business there or its ability to borrow.
- A Yeah. So this is where the Financial Action Task Force comes into it. So one of FATF's roles -- and I know we'll talk about this a little bit later. But FATF was set up in 1989 with the purpose of ensuring a consistent approach to dealing with money laundering and terrorism finance across the globe. There are 39 member countries in FATF, but virtually all countries in the world comply with FATF's recommendations. Less so, Iran, and not so, North Korea.

So everybody expects more or less the same type of response because FATF sets out uniform standards for the way people should be dealing with it. And so if a country is somehow perceived as not complying with that approach and somehow making themselves vulnerable to money laundering, it can get a whole country a bad reputation and can put people off from doing legitimate business in that location.

And the UAE has suffered really unfortunately with this because there are all sorts of, you know, media reports out there which unfairly, in my opinion, tag the UAE as being a hotbed for money launderers. And there's no doubt that money laundering does take place there, but the -- you know, people can perceive that everybody who lives in a country is somehow

 Q

Α

Simon Lord (for the Commission)
Examination by Mr. McGowan, Counsel for the Commission

tied up in that criminality. And like I said, in the UAE, I've personally never seen a UAE citizen involved in money laundering. It's an abuse of the systems that they put in place to attract inwards investment.

So -- and like I say, as soon as you are seen as a bad place to do business, if your regulatory structures aren't in place, if there are lots of ways in which your country can be abused, then people simply don't want to put your money there. And then when that happens, you know, as I say, inwards investment is blocked, remittances go down, the cost of borrowing goes up, the amount of money available for public services goes down, taxation rises, and all sorts of things like that.

So it really is imperative that countries get on top of this type of thing because otherwise they can suffer ill effects from it. Thank you. That might be a useful or a convenient point to transition into a discussion of the Financial Action Task Force. We are going to have further evidence coming specific to this topic, but because I'm going to ask you about some of the reports you drafted for them, it might be useful to introduce the topic a bit through you.

I wonder if you could explain to the Commissioner what the Financial Action Task Force is.

Yes. So FATF, also known as the Groupe d'Action Financière (GAFI). It was formed in -- essentially the mandate for it was set out in the G7 Summit in Paris in 1989. It was given an initial mandate for 30 years, although in 2019 actually it's been given now that it's been reviewed and been given an open-ended mandate. And essentially its initial role was to examine money laundering and terrorism financing techniques and trends.

In 1990, the FATF did some work and came up with a list of 40 recommendations which it said all countries should pay attention to in order to make their financial systems more resilient to the threat of money laundering and terrorism financing. So those are the 40 recommendations, the famous FATF 40 recommendations, and they

cover all manner of things like -- I think recommendation 1 is the risk-based approach. It's sort of things like the extent to which businesses are brought into the regulated sector. It covers stuff like cross-border transportation of cash by natural persons, what your money laundering offence should look like, the scope of your money laundering offence -- a whole range of things.

Then in 2001, added to the 40 recommendations were eight special recommendations which were mainly designed to deal with terrorism finance. There were initially eight and there was a ninth one added in 2004. So there were 40 recommendations and nine special recommendations at that point.

And then in 2012, FATF revised the whole of the 40 and the nine together and just amalgamated everything into the 40 FATF recommendations.

So that's the first thing. That's the standard setting that FATF does. And the idea, as I say, is to make sure that everyone has a more or less coordinated approach to the way in which money laundering and terrorism financing is addressed in terms of legislation, operational response and all the other ways.

What FATF does in addition to that is it conducts a mutual evaluation review process. So on a rolling basis, FATF will go round to all of the member countries and will conduct a detailed investigation into the way a particular country is compliant with the 40 recommendations. And initially this was a technical compliance approach, so it was making sure that your money laundering offence covered all the right bases and things like that.

But with the second round of the mutual evaluations, which started happening around -- a few years ago now. I can't remember the exact dates -- FATF started looking at the effectiveness of your approach. So you're talking about not only the extent to which your money laundering law, for example, complies with the recommendations, but the extent to which you actually apply it in practice, so whether you are actually prosecuting people for that type of thing.

So that's FATF -- FATF, I should say, there are 39 members of FATF, and they include all of the large countries like the UK, USA, Canada, China, Russia, people like that, people in Western Europe. But there are a number of what are called FATF-style regional bodies, FSRBs, and lots of countries that are not full members of FATF are members of FATF-style regional bodies that apply the same standards and do the same mutual evaluation process, to the point where, as I've mentioned, that there are only -- there's only one country which doesn't engage with FATF at all. That's the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, so North Korea. And Iran has drifted into and out of compliance in respect of FATF, and at the moment is on a -- it's what's called a call for action on FATF's website. In it they are assessed by FATF to have strategic deficiencies in their approach to tackling money laundering, and they call upon people to apply sanctions to try and get Iran to comply.

And as I say, Iran have sort of drifted into close contact with FATF and then out again over the last years.

So FATF sets AML/CFT standards. It promotes the implementation of those through the mutual evaluation process. But what it also does, it has a role in educating people in terms of money laundering techniques and methods and what have you.

And my involvement with FATF was through that sort of lens, so we're talking about the extent to which I was able to contribute to reports looking at different types of money laundering typologies. And I've worked on two of these. I was on the Typology Working Group for a report which looked at the role of hawala and other similar service providers in money laundering and terrorism finance. So I was part of the Typology Working Group.

I contributed to the report but I didn't author it. The report was actually written -- holding the pen was a chap called Scott Rembrandt from the U.S. Treasury. But I was involved, as I say, in some of the drafting and in the peer review process afterwards. And I was also fortunate enough to lead a Typology Working Group

Simon Lord (for the Commission)
Examination by Mr. McGowan, Counsel for the Commission

between 2013 and 2015, which looked at money laundering through the physical transportation of cash. And in that respect, I led the process which looked at producing that report. I drove the analysis of the -- you know, I sort of did the evidence gathering in respect of it. I went to various meetings in Paris and in Dakar -- not Dakar -- in Qatar and places like that. And ultimately I was the person who drafted the report.

So the report that's on FATF's website called "Money Laundering Through the Physical Transportation of Cash" was written by me. About 20 pages of it, I would say, maybe a bit less, originally came from colleagues who I'd worked with in the Dutch Treasury, but it was written in English with a Dutch accent, if that makes sense. So although it was -- the content was very, very good, I had to sort of like change it.

When I produce documents, I'm very keen that it just speaks with one voice, if you like. So I like to make sure that it's all -- it doesn't look like it's been assembled from lots of different people's sort of hashed together stuff. I like it to sort of all flow as a continuous product. And so I ended up sort of like helping to rephrase and reword. But you know, the Dutch were able to -- a colleague who I became good friends with contributed an awful lot to that report and I was eternally grateful.

But yeah. So that's the extent to which I was involved in FATF. I helped to -- helped with the content of the "Hawala and Other Similar Service Providers" report and I led the Typology Working Group, who wrote the "Money Laundering Through the Physical Transportation of Cash" report.

Both of those are on FATF's website. The first one, 2013; the second one, October 2015. Okay. We're going to get into those reports in just a bit and discuss them in a little more detail.

You mentioned that the FATF investigates countries' compliance with the standards that it sets and that they do so at least in part through something you refer to as the mutual evaluation process. I wonder if you might just explain to

Q

 Α

the Commissioner how the investigation is conducted and what the mutual evaluation process is.

Yeah. I mean, I'm not a FATF assessor. The first thing that you have to do is you apply to become an actual assessor, and there is a training course that you go on and FATF teach you how to go about doing it.

But essentially, as I understand it -- I know some people who are assessors and I've had a chance to talk with them about their experiences and how they've gone about it. And in its basic level, there's a call for evidence, so there will be a call -- so if a country is going to go through the MER process, there will be a call for people to submit information in respect of the extent to which the -- as I said there are 40 recommendations. There are a number of what they call immediate outcomes as well, which are looked at, and which address the effectiveness side of things. And you know, they cover things like money laundering prosecutions, regulatory functions and things like that.

So there's a call for evidence on the extent to which a country can demonstrate their compliance with these things and the extent to which their approaches are effective. And then there will be an onsite review. So FATF assessors will go -- having looked at all the evidence, FATF assessors will then go to a country for a two-week onsite where they will interview a whole range of people in a whole range of different situations, so people ranging from things like regulators, looking at police officers, looking at ministers, looking at parts of government and all sorts of things like that.

But at the end of that process, they will have formed an opinion about the extent to which that country's processes are compliant with the recommendations. And so they will talk about the level of compliance with the immediate outcomes, whether it's low, moderate or high or full. And then they will talk about the 40 recommendations themselves and then will talk about partially compliant, non-compliant, mostly compliant, or fully compliant.

And that report then is submitted to -- it's

 an extremely long report in almost every case. That report is then submitted to FATF themselves in a plenary process where everyone has a chance to review it, and the country itself has a chance to come back and address some of the issues that's been raised in the report. And eventually the report is signed off by FATF and published. And the whole process can take a couple of years. Thank you wentioned typology reports and

- Q Thank you. You mentioned typology reports, and you've been involved in the crafting of a couple of them. What is the purpose of those reports?
- Α It's essentially to -- we talked a little bit earlier on about making people aware of the way that money laundering works in certain circumstances, which can have benefits in a variety of ways, including helping people to address it from a law enforcement perspective, but also enabling people to -- you know, from across the globe, because these things are made publicly available on FATF's website. So anybody can look into it and use the information within them to address money laundering issues in whatever environment they find themselves in. if you're a bank, you can build into your risk assessment process. So that's the purpose. you know, they like to get experts on board in order to deal with these things.

I haven't been involved in this for a while, so the process by which they decide that a report is going to be commissioned, I'm not currently cited on. But back in the -- when I -- I know when we did the cash one, for example, FATF had conducted an audit of all of the reports that it had commissioned and had discovered that dealing with cash laundering was not one that they'd covered. And so they decided to commission a report on cash laundering because it was a gap in what was there, and I applied to be the Typology Working Group leader and I was accepted to do that, initially with a colleague, but later on just by myself.

- Q And is there an opportunity for the member countries to contribute to the body of knowledge which informs the report?
- A Yeah, a hundred percent. So it's an entirely collaborative process. So the first thing that happens is the working group leader is appointed,

 and as I say, in the case of the FATF one, it was me. For the hawala one it was a chap I mentioned called Scott Rembrandt from the U.S. Treasury.

What then happens is there is a call for people to join what's called the Typology Working Group. So this is a group of people from different countries who think that they have something to offer in respect of the typology being discussed, and who can sort of add value to what it is you're trying to do. So people are then sort of -- and generally, you know, if you want to be on a Typology Working Group, I think it's unusual for you not to be allowed onto it.

FATF meets on a quarterly basis, I believe it is. I can't remember as it's been a while since I've been there. But it meets on a quarterly basis in Paris, and at those meetings it's a chance for the Typology Working Group to come together from different countries and to sit down and talk about how we're going to progress the typology and what we're going to put in it and things like that.

So everyone then - I mean - so with the cash one that I was involved with, and it was the same process with the hawala one, we collaboratively decided what the report should be looking to cover, and then we looked at how we were going to gather the evidence in respect of the questions that we -- what we needed to cover. And certainly for the FATF one and for the hawala one as well, we then came up with a questionnaire -- it was about 20 pages, if I remember rightly -- which had a load of questions on it which asked individual countries to say about, you know, how they address certain things and what their opinion was on certain things.

So that questionnaire was circulated through FATF and the FATF-style regional bodies, and then all of that evidence -- all of the responses to those questionnaires come in and then have to be sort of assessed. All that information has to be analyzed.

The other thing that we do is there is a call for case examples, because one of the best ways of illustrating a point in one of these reports is to get a case that shows what's actually happened, you know, a real case where

 something's happened. And so we applied for lots of case examples.

Certainly in respect of the cash one, we had about 70 responses to the questionnaire and literally from all over the world, from places like Kazakhstan and Yemen and St. Vincent and the Grenadines and all sorts of places like that, as well as the obvious countries like the UK, Russia, and things like that, and we had hundreds of individual cases.

So then -- the process then is -- and I'll mention about the fact that I'd already decided that I was going to physically write in. But then it's a question of pulling all the information together, and this is where -- very lucky to be working alongside some very good people from the Tunisian Financial Intelligence Unit and also from the Dutch Treasury, because they were then able to volunteer to take away all of the information that we received through the questionnaire process and to do the analysis on that and to visualize it in terms of charts and all the rest of it. So there was a lot of that done.

And then it's a question of pulling all that together in a report, the report going to the Typology Working Group for initial comments and assessments and suggestions on how it can be amended, and then there's a peer review process where it goes out to the whole of the FATF and people write in some comments. And it took up about 18 months of my life, this whole process did. It was enjoyable but it was challenging in some respects as well.

- Q So I gather, given the process that's undertaken, these reports aren't specific to any one jurisdiction or any particular locale?
- A No. It's designed to give a reflection of some -- you know, some FATF-style regional bodies and some countries will do smaller reports which just focus on a particular area. But certainly in terms of the hawala one I was involved with and the cash one, it was global. It was a global representation.
- Q I wonder if we might now move to discuss the typology report respecting hawala and other similar services that you were involved in.

44

45

46

47

Simon Lord (for the Commission) Examination by Mr. McGowan, Counsel for the Commission

1 Yes. Α 2 MR. MCGOWAN: Madam Registrar -- and I'll just say for 3 the benefit of participants, Mr. Lord's two FATF 4 reports are attached to our FATF Overview Report, 5 which is Exhibit 4. They're appendices BB and LL 6 to that Overview Report. 7 Madam Registrar, I wonder if you might just pull up the first page of the FATF report 8 9 entitled "The Role of Hawala and Other Similar 10 Service Providers in Money Laundering and 11 Terrorist Financing." 12 Q That's your report, sir? 13 Α Well, as I say --14 It's the report you were involved in? Pardon me. 0 15 Α I was involved in the production of it, yeah. didn't actually -- I wrote some of it and I 16 17 contributed to the writing of other parts. 18 in terms of actually putting the whole thing 19 together, as I say, it was a guy from the U.S. 20 Treasury who was principally involved in that, 21 and he was the Typology Working Group leader. 22 Thank you. 23 MR. MCGOWAN: Mr. Commissioner, I don't intend to ask 24 that to be marked. It's already before you as 25 part of Exhibit 4. 26 So you crafted part of it and I --27 MR. MCGOWAN: You can pull it down now, Madam 28 Registrar. 29 I gather you're familiar with the report? 0 30 Α Yeah, absolutely. Yeah. And you view it as authoritative? 31 Q 32 Α Oh, most definitely, yeah. I mean, the -- like I 33 say, the nice thing about these reports -- so in 34 terms of -- one of the things that happened in terms of producing it was there was a -- the 35 36 questionnaire thing I've already described was 37 sent out and lots of responses came back to it. 38 But there was then a meeting to discuss the report in Dakar, in Senegal, and I went along to 39 40 that meeting with my colleague who I was working 41 with on the report. And we sat round a table 42

with people from Pakistan and from China, from

the Netherlands, from France, from the USA and

absorbed into the report. So in terms of -- and

everybody contributed to the discussions in

respect to the report, and all of that was

lots of different things like that.

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

these are all people who are experts in their own field. So in terms of the content that went into it, it's about as authoritative as you could get at that point in time. So yeah, most definitely.

Okay. Now, hawala and other similar services are

- Okay. Now, hawala and other similar services are more common in some countries than others, I gather.
- A Yeah.
- Q And let me just maybe first ask you, did you receive contributions from countries -- just western countries or countries where some of these services are more common as well?
- Α I mean, like I mentioned, I mean, Pakistan and China were two of the contributors to the I mean, you have to bear in mind that report. the responses went to the chap in the U.S. Treasury and not me. But in terms of the -- you know, sitting round the table and talking about this type of stuff, it was a range of people from western countries like the UK and the Netherlands and the USA to countries like, as I say, Pakistan, from China and various other countries. There was a chap there from Liberia, for example, who was giving us the benefit of understanding how these things had evolved in his country after civil war and stuff like that. So yeah, from across the spectrum.
- Q And hawala and other similar services, are these all informal value transfer systems? Is that what we're talking about?
- So the first thing that we had to overcome Α Yeah. was part of the process. The original title of the report was going to be just "Hawala and Its Role in Terrorism Financing and Money Laundering." And a lot of us came to the discussions in Dakar to say that actually that's not entirely the correct way of addressing it, because informal value transfer systems, when you want to talk about them in a bit more detail, they share common characteristics but they don't all operate in the same way. You know, the way that Chinese underground banking works, for example, is not the same as might be the Black Market Peso Exchange or something like that.

And so hawala is a particular type of IVTS that emerged in South Asia and the Middle East and what have you many centuries ago. But it's

not the type of IVTS that works out of China, that works out of Somalia, that works out of various other things.

And so one of the things that we had to come up with was a phrase that was -- included hawala but wasn't just hawala, which is how we ended up with "Hawala and Other Similar Service Providers." It's a little cumbersome but it, you know, "HOSSP." If you call it like that, then that's what it comes to.

So yeah. It's -- there are a lot of places where this type of service exists. But as I say, they evolve to meet local circumstances.

One of the things I always say when I talk about this -- and this is one of things that we bring out when we're doing the training for the Expert Laundering Evidence Cadre, is you need to understand what the purpose of an IVTS mechanism is. And the example I always quote is like the recent conflicts in Iraq and Syria. So obviously we were in a situation where Daesh had taken over large proportions of those countries. But in terms of the actual people firing guns at each other and trying to blow each other up, the number of people involved in that were probably not much more than maybe 250-300,000, maybe 400,000 people.

But the population of those countries combined, I think that Syria is 20 million people and Iraq is 40 million people. All of those people, the rest of those people who weren't actively involved in the fighting, have then got to go on and try and live their lives in some way, shape or form. So you know, they want to get their kids to school. They want to put fuel in their car. They want to earn money. They want to be able to buy food and all that sort of stuff.

And when you're in a conflict-affected state and the financial systems around you have collapsed, an informal value transfer system is what emerges to fill the gap. And so that's why you get them in lots of different places where the financial system is either not there at all or is unreliable or is not trusted by the local authorities.

And as I say, it's really important to get

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 Examination by Mr. McGowan, Counsel for the Commission

that across. IVTSs are legitimate mechanisms that arrive for a legitimate purpose and are widely used legitimately. But they are abused for money laundering and terrorism finance purposes too. And it's important to be able to realize what's legitimate, for legitimate purposes, but also what's abuse.

You're on mute, Patrick.

- Q Sorry, thank you. What was the scope of the project that you set about for the FATF in this instance?
- A It was essentially that. So it was the -- to understand what the legitimate uses were and how these systems manifest themselves, but also to be able to recognize when the systems were being abused for money laundering and terrorism finance purposes. So it's being able to look at the good and spot the bad essentially.
- Q Okay. I wonder if you could just in a general way explain the features of an informal value transfer system and how it works.
- Α Essentially, it's money transmission at its most basic. Quite a lot of the time these type of systems are tied to specific geographic regions, ethnic communities and what have you, and essentially what they do is they arrange for transfer and receipt of funds or equivalent value without the physical need to transfer the funds So you're transferring value but not themselves. necessarily the funds. So there won't be a straight line remittance from point A to point B through the banking system. It will be someone will make a deposit of funds in one location and will receive an equivalent value in another location, less fees and commission, but without there actually being a physical connection between the two. And they generally involve a process which I generally refer to as cash pooling. So the people who are involved in these type of networks have available to them pools of funds in different locations, not always cash. Sometimes it's money in bank accounts, sometimes But pools of funds in different it's trade. locations and you receive the payment into one of those pools and make a payment out of another And then over time there will be a settlement arrangement between the pools to keep

 them in balance. Because obviously if all the money went one way, you would end up with lots of money in one place and not in another, and you would have to have some sort of settlement mechanism in place.

So settlement can take place through trade, through cash, through net settlements over a long period of time, quite often through the banking system. They're informal in so far as this type of stuff often happens outside of the formal financial system, but by no means all the time. They often interact with financial systems as well.

Like I mentioned, the key thing about them is that although they are abused, there's no doubt about it, for criminal purposes, they are widely used for legitimate purposes across the globe, reasons of geography, culture, lack of banking access, all sorts of reasons like that.

For example, in places like Syria, for example, where there's still an awful lot of difficulty, NGOs -- non-government organizations -- charities, extensively use IVTS to get aid money from the U.S. and British governments into those sort of locations to try and help the population. Somalia is the same. So they're extensively used for those purposes as well.

In general terms, it's cash in/cash out, but by no means not always. Certainly remittances are generally sort of you pay cash into one and then you receive cash at the other end, but the cash isn't actually physically transported. It comes from settlement. But it can be settlement through other methods as well, including things like through bank accounts and such like that.

All sorts of reasons why these people choose to use them. I've mentioned about the fact that they are sometimes the only option where there is war, conflict, strife, things like that. But also things like -- it can also be things like pricing, speed, cultural preference. But sometimes, because criminals perceive them as to be safer than putting their money through legitimate financial systems.

And the other thing I think it's important to realize -- and this is something that we talk about on the Expert Evidence Cadre quite a lot --

is there are shades to how these systems work. So at one end of the scale -- and we call this the complicity scale -- at one end of the scale you have businesses which are entirely compliant with local regulations, do customary due diligence. If they're required to be registered, they are. And they do everything that they can to stop their systems being abused.

But then there are people who are basically just not competent in running these sort of businesses and allow things to slip through. There are some people who are willing to turn a blind eye. There are some people who actively collaborate with criminals. And there are some businesses which have been set up for the sole purposes of money laundering and terrorism finance.

One of the key things when you look at that is understanding where somebody is on that complicity scale because that will enable you to best assess the way in which you can combat the issue that you have in front of you.

So if someone is just a bit of an incompetent, then a bit of training and a bit of assistance to put the right systems in place and all the rest of it might be necessary. If someone is criminally complicit, then arresting them and prosecuting them is the right thing to do.

So obviously there's a whole range of approaches that you can put in place and there's -- you know, and the extent to which you engage with the regulator -- put regulatory pressure on, things like that.

- Q Right. Your report describes three types of informal value transfer systems: traditional, hybrid, and criminal.
- A Yeah, that's right. And that's a reflection of that essentially.
- Q Yes.
- A So you've got the pure traditional ones, which are the ones where -- like I've mentioned about NGOs in Syria, where the sole purpose of the remittance is to allow people to go about their daily lives, to receive money from the diaspora in overseas countries and what have you, enable NGOs to work. So those are the pure ones.

Hybrid ones are ones like I've mentioned which are in the middle of the complicity scale, which are -- do some legitimate stuff and some non-legitimate stuff for whatever reason, whether it's blind eye or what have you.

And then there are the criminally complicit ones whose role is to actively sort of engage in criminal activity, terrorism finance, things like that.

- Even in circumstances where an individual is using some form of informal value transfer system for a legitimate reason, do they sometimes engage with criminal proceeds through that process?
- Α The way that mechanisms work -- it's probably a good idea to go back and consider the idea of a cash pool in this sort of situation. So we're talking about a situation where people in one location -- there can be criminal funds coming into the cash pool. Now, I've already said, for the purposes of transferring the value overseas on behalf of a criminal -- now, I've already said that the money doesn't physically move from the location where it's received. That's the whole point of it. There is no actual -- and it's a value transfer system. Which means that the person who's involved in the IVTS mechanism has got to find something to do with that cash because he has to make it work for him. Generally there's a profit to be made or something like that.

So what you can effectively do is repurpose that cash in order to settle a remittance coming the other way, so that the drug trafficker, say, wants the money transferred out of the system, but it might be that someone wants to receive money in that jurisdiction from someone from overseas. And so one of the ways in which people can be caught up in the system is the use of criminal funds which are repurposed to a completely legitimate transaction coming the other way. And we see that quite a lot. That's a feature of the Chinese underground banking, which I know we're going to talk about later.

But also there's a process called cuckoo smurfing, which I can explain in a little more detail. And that's essentially what it is, taking criminal money, putting it into the bank

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 account of someone who's expecting a remittance from another country for a legitimate purpose.

- Q You used the word "smurfing" there.
- A Yeah.
 - Q I wonder if you could just explain to the Commissioner what that refers to.
 - So there is a general perception amongst Α criminals, and it still exists now, that if you take a large amount of money and you break it down into much smaller amounts, and then pay those smaller amounts into a bank account, that that will somehow go below the radar and won't attract law enforcement's attention. perception generally is not true. But it's referred to as smurfing, or structuring in the I believe the term "smurfing" came out in about the 1980s. Everyone knows smurfs are like a lot of little blue identical small people running about, and it's the process of there being lots and lots of small identical deposits in one place, which is supposed to come under perceived reporting restrictions. I mean, in the UK there is not a financial limit for reporting suspicious activity reports. But people still seem to think that if you're paying in less than 5,000 pounds, it won't get reported. It's not actually true. And actually banks are really, really good now at spotting -- banks know exactly what smurfing or structuring is. And one of the things that is almost guaranteed to get a suspicious activity report generated is when some breaks down a big amount of money into lots of little bits and pays it in over a series of days into the same bank account. Banks are very good at spotting that. But that's essentially what smurfing is.

Cuckoo smurfing is the process of using criminal money and putting it into a legitimate bank account, but the analogy only works if you know what a cuckoo is.

- Q All right. Are there features of certain jurisdictions which make them more likely to attract operators who run informal value transfer systems?
- A Yeah. I mean, so like I say, culturally there are a lot of people -- I mean, something like 50 percent of the world's population is unbanked. I

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

mean, that's the first thing. So if you are in a situation -- if you're in a jurisdiction where access to the formal banking system is difficult or non-existent, then like I've said, informal value transfer systems emerge to fill the gap.

There are also cultural reasons why people prefer to use IVTS. Some people just don't trust In Iran, for example -- I know because banks. I've spoken to a chap who was from the Institute of Persian Studies in one of the universities in the UK -- there is a general feeling that you're an idiot if you put your money where the government can see it. So people like that prefer to use an informal value transfer system because they don't want people who -- basically they don't want scrutiny of where their money is and where it's going and where it's going and what it's being used for and things like that.

So generally a population with a mistrust of the banking system or a country where the banking system is either not very good or non-existent --Somalia is a good example of that. There's hardly a banking system at all there. Places like Afghanistan, where war, civil unrest has destroyed the banking system. That's where you'll get IVTS. But also in places like the UAE, for example, where something like at least 85 percent of the population is non-Emirati. They are low paid migrant workers who've gone there to earn a bit more money, and they will use IVTS as a way of transferring money back to their families, things like that. So there are a whole range of reasons why people will use IVTS.

- Q And what about countries like Canada or the UK? Are there features of those countries that might lead to the presence of IVTS?
- A Yeah. I mean -- the point about the situation in countries like the UK and Canada and the USA is that we don't make a definition in between IVTS and a money service business. So in the UK, the definition of a money service business is any undertaking -- let me see if I'm getting this right -- any undertaking which by way of business operates a currency exchange office, transmits money or any representation of monetary value by any means, or cashes cheques made payable to its customers. Now, what that means is that if you

 are operating an informal value transfer system, you are transmitting money or a representation of monetary value by any means, and that means you're actually officially a money service business and you're caught by the regulated sector. And so you are obliged under law to register with HM Revenue and Customs and the Financial Conduct Authority, to conduct due diligence, to know your customer, to monitor transactions and things like that.

So IVTS does exist in the UK because there are people who do this type of stuff and don't register with HMRC and the FCA as they are supposed to. And those are within certain communities where they simply prefer -- there is a general distrust of authority, and people just prefer not to engage with them.

So I mentioned a little bit earlier on, we see quite a lot in the UK, people in the Iraqi Kurd community conducting IVTS activities, often for entirely legitimate reasons because they want to send money back to their family in Erbil or Kirkuk or somewhere like that. But they've chosen not to register with -- or they don't realize they have to register with HMRC.

And the same is true of most jurisdictions. So in Canada it's the same. You know, your definition of an MSB is more or less the same as ours, and it's the same in the USA as well. So one of the things about IVTS is it's important to recognize that in some countries, it is simply a money service business.

- I wonder if you can explain to the Commissioner the way in which criminal organizations either use existing informal value transfer systems to launder funds or create such systems to facilitate the laundering of funds.
- A The way in which we see these sort of things abused -- and I'll give you an example of one I was looking at. And again, it related to people in the Iraqi Kurd community.

Generally the people who conduct these type of operations, it's a myth that they are underground, if you like. They are usually highly visible within the community that they serve, and quite a lot of these mechanisms serve a particular community or ethnic group. And

that's because they have the ability to receive funds in one jurisdiction, but more importantly the ability to pay out were people like Western Union and things like that probably wouldn't. So I mean, you know -- so an Iraqi Kurd-based IVTS system is going to be able to pay out in places like Sulaymaniyah and urban Kirkuk, where -- which are going to be beyond the reach of most money transmission systems. And they're going to be operated by people who come from that jurisdiction and who know how things work and who have the contacts back home in order to make that happen.

So in this particular case I was looking at, there was -- essentially they had control -- the people who were operating in the form of IVTS had control of a number of bank accounts set up in the names of individuals into which they could receive money for the purpose of transferring it back to northern Iraq and places like that, to Kurdistan.

There was no actual direct line transfer. There were occasional movements of goods in between the two ends to make the two ends balance, but there was no actual online transfer because people wanted to send money out from Kurdistan as well as send money in. In that situation, what you had was lots of people doing minor remittance, and minor remittances tend to be relatively low value, so a few hundred pounds here, there, a few hundred pounds there, maybe up to 1,000 pounds if it was for a business-related transaction. And you could look across all of the deposits that were being made and you could see that most of that was what was going on. in the middle of that, there was a deposit for 45,000 pounds, which was completely out of character with everything else. And the simple situation was that one of the guys in that community had got himself involved in drug trafficking and he knew that there was a guy in his community who could facilitate the transfer of money back to Kurdistan, and went along and said, you're the money guy. I'll give you 10 percent if you transfer this money for me. where the guy normally makes like two or three pounds per transaction, he was going to make a

 couple of hundred pounds on that one payment. And so he took the money.

And it's essentially like that, is the way that people come into it. And eventually, if someone allows that to happen more and more, they develop a reputation for allowing that to happen more and more and the dirty money starts pushing the good money out of the door, and the guy can make lots more money by making a commission. Because he can essentially charge what he likes, you know. If someone comes along and says, I've got all this money, he says yeah, okay. Well, it's going to cost you 20 percent for me to send it, and the guy is willing to pay it, it's very hard to resist that temptation. So that's generally the way in which those happen.

The way in which we see IVTS operating mostly, though, is through professional money laundering networks who operate across the globe and essentially move money from -- move value from one location to another on behalf of multiple groups. And they may have some legitimate customers, but they have an awful lot of criminal ones as well, and the criminal ones tend to outweigh the legitimate ones.

- I wonder if you could just walk the Commissioner -- we'll come to a map you created to display this graphically in a minute. But I wonder if you could just in a general way walk the Commissioner through how a professional money launderer uses an IVTS to facilitate the laundering of funds.
- A Okay. There's an important distinction to make here, is generally the criminal doesn't know how it works. All the criminal knows is he meets a guy in a carpark at whatever time, hands over a bag of cash to the guy who is the representative of the money launderer, and all he knows is he receives a bag of cash in another location, in another currency, a short while later, less a commission. And as far as he's concerned, he's buying currency in another location with currency he's deposited in, say, the UK or Canada or something like that.

The way it actually works is the guy who runs the IVTS network, like I've mentioned before, has got pools of funds in numerous

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 different locations, and he receives the money into one location and he's got -- let's say for the sake of argument that someone wanted to transfer the money from the UK to Spain. will be a handover of cash in the UK, and then a short while later there are details passed about the guy who's going to receive the funds in Spain, and the reverse happens in Spain. someone who works for the IVTS operator takes money from the cash pool that's available to him there -- and it's going to be in euros as opposed to in sterling in the UK -- and just hands that to the guy who was meant to receive it. And the more these businesses operate, the more locations they have where there are different pools of funds, as I say, either in cash or in bank accounts or whatever, and the more this is likely to happen. So the same guy the next week might say, can you move my funds to the Netherlands for me? He says, yeah, I can do that. I've got pools of funds there. Give me the cash. couple of hours later he gets the cash in the Netherlands.

And that's essentially how it works, payment into a cash pool and payment out. It's the method of settlement between the cash pools and how they're kept in equilibrium that is the exercise that the IVTS operator has to work out. And that's where the London Underground map, as it's so called, comes into it. It's the diagram -- I have to explain this in court all the time essentially to juries on how this works. And so I felt the need to have one diagram with everything on it so that people could see how the system works in totality and how it was kept in equilibrium. And that's what that diagram is.

- MR. MCGOWAN: Well, maybe that's a convenient time to move to the diagram. Madam Registrar, if you could please pull up the IVTS map. And Mr. Commissioner, just while she's doing that, I'm just going to step away from the screen for a second and close a window. There's some construction that's started next to me.
- O Can you see that, Mr. Lord?
- A I can, yeah. I've got -- you can't see it, but behind my laptop I've got a big screen with it on so I can --

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

Simon Lord (for the Commission)
Examination by Mr. McGowan, Counsel for the Commission

O I have the same.

MR. MCGOWAN: Mr. Commissioner, I wonder if I just might ask, can you see the document at a sufficient size that you can make out the words and the graphics?

THE COMMISSIONER: Yes, I can. Thank you.

MR. MCGOWAN: Okay. Madam Registrar --

- Maybe I'll ask you, Mr. Lord. I gather it would be convenient for this portion of your evidence to leave this map up on the screen so people can see it.
- A Yeah. You need to be able to see it so I can take you through it.
- MR. MCGOWAN: Madam Registrar, if we could just leave that on the screen then.
- Q And, Mr. Lord, rather than me asking you questions and trying to fumble my way through this map, I think I'll let you just take it over and explain it to the Commissioner.

But maybe just before we do, I'll ask -this map, has it been given a nickname by your colleagues?

Yeah. Α It's known as the London Underground map, and that's because of all the various different colours and arrows all over it. What I've tried to do is each individual step of the process and each settlement, I've tried to colour coordinate so you can see where the money goes in and comes out of the system and how the value is transferred. And I've tried to illustrate it through the control of the guy in the middle, the international controller, who I've put in Dubai because that's where some of them are, but not all in that respect. And the idea is to demonstrate how money is ingested into the system, is repurposed within the system and disposed of, and how the value moves in between different parts of the system, all at the same time, but it's kept in equilibrium.

So I'll try and go through it in as brief steps as I can, and please step in if you think I'm going too fast or you don't understand anything I've said.

So the key to the system is the chap in the middle who's highlighted in yellow, and this is a guy who we refer to as the international controller. This is a description that we've

 developed over a period of time which is reasonably well recognized now in law enforcement, certainly in the Five Eyes countries, as the guy who is in overall control of the informal value transfer system that is being used.

And an example of a guy like this, to bring this up, is a chap called Altaf Khanani, who was prosecuted by the DEA in the USA a few years ago, and he ran a network essentially which worked like this.

The important thing to say about this is we know this is how it works. We spent a long time pulling together evidence from numerous different cases and looking at the way in which this sort of thing impacts across the globe from different law enforcement partners. So we're as confident as we can be that this is how the system operates. So we're not guessing. We know this is how it works.

So as I've said, the key to it is the guy in the middle, the guy who's highlighted in yellow was the international controller.

And as I've mentioned, the system works [indiscernible - recording] there being pools of funds in lots of different locations around the world. And you'll see on the diagram we've got cash pool 1, which is in the UK. There's a UK flag there. Underneath that at the bottom there's cash pool 2 in the Netherlands, then there's one in Turkey, cash pool 3, and one in Iran, cash pool 4, and one in Pakistan, cash pool 5. And the point about it is is that international controllers have funds in all of these different jurisdictions and are able to juggle payments coming in and out of the system.

I've made this UK-centric because I explain this in UK courts, but you could substitute Canada or the USA or Australia or whatever for the UK, and the system works in exactly the same way. And I've presented on this diagram in places like Australia and in Canada and in the USA and things like that, and everyone agrees this is how it works.

So we'll concentrate, if we can, on the guy who has got the bold lettering underneath him in cash pool 1 in the UK. He's the UK collector.

And what his role is, is to meet with the guy who's the criminal who's the originator of the cash and to collect it and to count it and to hang onto it and then to dispose of it according to the directions he receives from the controller.

There is a guy to his right who's called a coordinator, and he might be someone who has overall control of lots of different cash collectors in a particular area. And it's not unusual for a controller to have more than one coordinator. I mean, it's like a pyramidical structure if you like. There'll be a coordinator, probably at least one, in each jurisdiction, possibly more than one, and each coordinator may well have two or three cash collectors working underneath.

Over to the left you have a UK criminal who's a drug trafficker. Doesn't have to be a drug trafficker. It can be someone involved in any type of criminal activity. But I've used drugs basically because everyone understands that drugs are illegal, and so this is the laundering of proceeds of drug trafficking.

You'll see that he has got available to him 150,000 pounds which he's made by selling drugs, and in the UK that equates to probably around about three and a half, four kilos of cocaine. The price of cocaine in the UK at the moment is around about thirty-five to forty thousand pounds.

So he has been put in touch with the controller, may have used him before or has been put in touch with this guy through an intermediary. And there is still some debate about how that contact process works. But nonetheless, he gets in touch with the controller and says, I have got 150,000 pounds here and I would like that value to appear in the Netherlands. And you will see that the Dutch criminal down the bottom left-hand side of the diagram is the guy who supplied the drugs to the UK criminal, and the purpose of the transaction is for the UK guy to pay the Dutch guy. So what he needs is for his cash to appear in euros in the Netherlands.

So he hands over the cash to the UK

 collector, and generally they do that by what's called a token-based cash exchange. And I'll come on to explain that in a little more detail. I think we're going to cover that later, Patrick.

So the cash is handed over to the UK collector. The UK collector will then take the cash away to a safe location -- often his own home or a safe house -- and he will run it through a cash counting machine generally and he will report to the controller how much he's received. And he'll also report on anything that needs to be deducted from that total amount. So quite often there will be torn notes, there will be counterfeit notes, things like that. There will be shortages in the count and what have you which will need to be deducted. Because ultimately the controller is only going to pay out what he's received, less his commission.

So the controller receives a note of the count. So what he then does, he then gets in touch with the Netherlands collector, who you can see in cash pool 2, who is sitting on cash that he's received from the Dutch criminal underneath him. That cash has been given to him by the Dutch criminal because he wants it to appear in Turkey, and likewise there's a guy in Turkey who wants his money to appear in Iran, and what have you like that. And so you can see that the money has been ingested into the cash pools in various different locations through people who want the value moved somewhere else.

So the controller gets in touch with the Dutch collector and says, okay, what I need you to do is hand over 150,000 euros or the equivalent of 150,000 pounds in euros to this guy whose details I will pass on. Generally there will be a phone number and a token number. I'll explain how tokens work later on.

In this case -- and this is an important point to make out -- the Netherlands collector says, well, actually I haven't got enough money. I haven't got enough money in the cash pool to be able to settle that remittance on your behalf. So he reports that back to the controller. The controller isn't going to go back to the criminal and say, sorry, can't do it. Here's your cash back. He will always -- I've never encountered a

situation where the controller will say no to a transaction.

So what the controller does is he knows lots of other people who are engaged in the same type of activity as he is, and so to the left of the diagram you see there is a second controller, controller 2, who is also in the UAE. Now, these people are in competition with each other, but they will also work together as circumstances allow if it facilitates their business. the first controller does, the guy highlighted in yellow, is get in touch with the second controller and say to him, brother, I need 100,000 pounds worth of euros in the Netherlands. Can you -- have you got that? And on this occasion the second guy says, yeah, I can give you that, he says, but what are you going to give me in return? How are you going to pay me?

Sorry, excuse me while -- it's just gone off my laptop.

He says, yeah, I can supply that to you. He says, what are you going to do? He says, well, I've got 150,000 in the UK and I can give you some of that in exchange for euros in the Netherlands. Yeah, that's not a problem, he says.

So the next thing that happens is the controller gets back in touch with the UK collector and he instructs him to take 100,000 pounds of the 150 that he's collected and hand that over to a different collector working for the second controller. And there will be a handover between two collectors working for different groups. And I've actually dealt with cases where this has been the case, where the instructions are coming from two different controllers in different locations. And it's a handover in order to settle the balance of cash pools in between two different people.

So the cash is handed over in the UK, the 100,000 pounds, and then there is a reciprocal handover of 106,000 euros in the Netherlands to the Netherlands collector in the cash pool. Are we following this so far? Patrick, just nod if you get this so far. Yeah? Okay.

So now the Netherlands collector has got enough money in his cash pool and is now able to

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

settle a transaction on behalf of the UK criminal to the Dutch criminal. So he then takes all of the cash in his possession, he gets in touch with the Dutch criminal through the mobile phone number he's got, and there is a token-based cash handover to the Dutch criminal. And all of that will take place probably in an afternoon. that red transaction, in terms of the red arrows, has now been settled. And all the UK criminal is aware is he's handed over cash to a guy in the UK in a Sainsbury's carpark -- that's a supermarket in the UK, sorry -- and he's received a payment in a similar situation to the Dutch criminal in the Netherlands. So the UK drug trafficker is happy.

But the important thing to realize is now the UK collector in the cash pool 1 is still sitting on 50,000 pounds of criminal cash. the controller needs to find something to do with that money because he needs to make it work for him to make a profit. And I should say that the cost to the UK criminal for the handover in a process like that is between six and eight percent usually of the value. It can be more, it can be less, depending on things like how reliable the customer is, the extent to which there's Scottish, Northern Irish notes, you know, generally what the controller thinks he can get away with charging is what he will. But it works out generally around about six to eight percent.

So the UK collector is now sitting on 50,000 pounds in the UK which he has to find something to do with -- the controller has to find something to with. So the next thing that happens is, over to the right in cash pool 5, there is a Pakistani company which is importing goods from China. And what we're going to talk about now is trade-based money laundering and how trade is integrated into the whole system.

So the Pakistan company is importing goods from China. Now, the import -- the value of the goods that it's importing is in this case \$75,000. And I've tried to make the figures more or less add up so people can see how it's kept into equilibrium.

So the Pakistan company wants to import the goods but it is going to be liable for VAT and

 customs duty and various other charges in respect of the value of the goods. So he arranges with the Chinese company, the Pakistan importer does, to only invoice him for half of the value of the goods. So the goods are worth 75,000, but when they arrive in Pakistan their accompanying paperwork suggests they're only worth 37 and a half thousand pounds. And the Pakistan company pays the 37 and a half thousand dollars -- sorry, I'm talking about pounds. It should be dollars -- 37 and a half thousand dollars to the Chinese company, and so the payments and the invoice match up and everyone thinks it's all legal and above board.

But of course what that means is the Chinese company is down on the deal because it's sold \$75,000 worth of goods and has only received half the payment for it, and the Pakistan company's up on the deal because it's got goods and it's only paid half the value for it. What happens is there has to be a settlement to the Chinese company for the full value of the goods that it's exported, and the way that that works is the Pakistan company makes a payment to an exchange company in Pakistan that is complicit with the international controller. And so they make a payment of 37 and a half thousand dollars, and that money is then sitting and is there for the controller to use for some other purpose.

At the same time, we have a situation where the UK collector is contacted by the controller and he is instructed to take 25,000 pounds worth of the 50,000 pounds he's got left and to put it into the bank account of -- when I did this, MSBs in the UK could still get bank accounts. It's much more difficult for them now, but there are still ways around it. So he puts it into the bank account of a company, for example, that might be involved in sort of -- a shell company involved in this type of activity.

Commingled with that, there may well be money from UK migrants who quite legitimately want to send their funds back to Pakistan. The money that's in the high value dealer company or the MSB -- that's what H3D (phonetic) is. It's a company that deals with a lot of cash. That money is then sent to a money remittance company,

like an FX trader or something like that, with an instruction to pay 37 and a half thousand dollars to the Chinese company. And that is a settlement for the balance of the payment that they should have received from the Pakistan company but didn't.

And the important thing to realize here is if you were following the old adage of "follow the money," what you would see is the UK criminal's money going to the UK collector, it going into an MSB company and going to China, and you'd be saying to yourself as a financial investigator, well, why does my guy want his money in China? And the fact is he doesn't, and his money hasn't gone to China. His money has actually popped out in the Netherlands, but the actual money that he put into the collector has been used for a different purpose, to settle a trade transaction in between two completely independent people.

So that is that situation sorted. The Pakistan company has actually made the full payment for the goods and the Chinese company has received the full remittance. But in so doing, there has been a separate crime committed in Pakistan because there's been tax evasion and what have you, and a trade transaction has been integrated into the whole method of settlement between cash pools.

The UK collector is still sitting on 25,000 pounds of the UK criminal's drug money. He's been paid so the controller needs to find something to be done with it. So we'll move now over to the right-hand side of the diagram, and what you have is an Iranian company on the far right side of the diagram, which you can see, the green hash line there is importing medical goods from a UK company. And this is based on a real example I've seen.

Now, medical goods have never been subject to sanctions. We all know that Iran has been subject to sanctions on and off over various times imposed by the EU, USA and they've gone off and come back on again. Generally medical goods have never been sanctioned so there's always been a way in which an Iranian company can import goods for medical purposes. The UK company has

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 got all the right export licenses and is exporting the goods legitimately. However, because Iran is still subject to sanctions, it's almost impossible for the Iranian company to make a direct bank transfer to the UK company to pay for the legitimate goods that it's received.

So what happens instead is the Iranian company makes a payment to the Iranian saraf -- a saraf is a money exchanger like an MSB in cash So they make a payment which is the pool form. equivalent of 20,000 pounds plus commission, to the Iranian saraf, and say, can you make this payment to the English company. And the saraf says yes, I can do that for you. No problem. And what he does is he does is he sells that transaction to the controller for a profit, because the controller needs to buy up transactions coming into the UK. And do you remember I mentioned about the cuckoo smurfing, about the legitimate remittances? The controller needs to find inwards remittances into the UK that he can use the cash that he's got from the criminal to satisfy. And that's what he does. He gets the bank details of the UK company that has supplied the goods to the Iranian company, from the Iranian company, and then he gets in touch with the collector, the UK collector, and says, take 20,000 pounds of that 25,000 you had left and pay it into the bank account of that company, that UK company that has supplied the goods.

And so that transaction has now been settled. The Iranian company has paid and the UK company has received it, but there has been a value transfer from Iran to the UK in order to balance the cash pools.

And the final part of the jigsaw is in the UK there is an Iranian student that is studying medicine, again quite legitimately -- got the visa and everything like that -- his father is a doctor in Iran and wants to pay his son's tuition fees and to pay for his accommodation and things like that. And essentially the same process works. The Iranian doctor goes to the saraf in Teheran. He makes a payment of 5,000 pounds equivalent in Iranian rials, which is a bucketload of them, to the Iranian saraf. The

Simon Lord (for the Commission)
Examination by Mr. McGowan, Counsel for the Commission

saraf communicates the son's bank account details to the controller, who passes it on to the UK collector, and the UK collector takes the final 5,000 pounds that he's received and drops it into the son's bank account.

And that is what we refer to as cuckoo smurfing. So it's the use of funds received from a criminal which have subsequently -- the value of which have been transferred overseas, but the criminal funds are used to complete a separate and legitimate inward remittance into the UK. And that's essentially how the diagram works.

Did you follow that? Do you understand how that goes? Yeah? And as I say, we know that this is how it works. We've got lots and lots of examples of this and what have you. And we've got information from all sorts of sources so we know that this is how it operates. And I've seen that personally in a number of different cases where I have dealt with this type of activity.

- Q Thank you. Have we concluded with the diagram now, Mr. Lord?
- A Yeah. If you're happy that you understand it, then yeah. The important thing to emphasize is, in general terms, most IVTS mechanisms operate in this sort of way. Cash pools -- I mentioned it before. Payment into one, payment out of another, and a settlement mechanism which balances it all up in between.
- MR. MCGOWAN: Thank you. Well, Mr. Commissioner, I think I'm going to ask that this be marked as the next exhibit, please.
- THE COMMISSIONER: Very well. I think we are at Exhibit 11 now. Is that correct, Madam Registrar?

THE REGISTRAR: Yes, Exhibit 11, Mr. Commissioner. THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you.

EXHIBIT 11: IVTS Network Map

- MR. MCGOWAN: We can pull that down from the screen now, Madam Registrar. I see you've done that. Thank you.
- Q Mr. Lord, during your explanation, you made reference to token transactions. I wonder if you might just take a moment and explain those to the Commissioner.

 Α So a token. So one of the features of this type of activity, of informal value transfer systems, I mentioned is the fact that at some point, the guy who's made the money from the drug trafficking or whatever criminality it is, has to hand that cash to the guy who is the representative of the money laundering mechanism. Now, the difficulty they face is most of the time they'll never have met each other before, and these handovers -- I mean, I mentioned 150,000 pounds in the diagram. That's by no means unusual. We're not talking about small amounts It's a big hold-all -- big heavy holdof money. all full of cash, and it's clearly important for the guy who's handing it over to make sure he's handing it to the right guy, because there will be all sorts of consequences if he subsequently found that he'd given it to a stranger or something. All sorts of unfortunate consequences for him.

So a system had to be developed whereby, first of all there was some type of identification involved where a person could be sure that he was giving the money to the right guy, but secondly, so that the money laundering network could issue a receipt for the handover because one of the important parts of the system is that once cash is received by the money laundering network, they accept responsibility for the safe delivery of the funds to the remote location. And what that means is once they've accepted it, if by some unfortunate chance the collector gets two miles down the road and gets arrested by the police and has the cash seized, the money laundering network will still pay out.

Now, that's an important facet of the system. It builds in an element of insurance almost, in a funny sort of way, to the criminal, and it ensures that they keep on going.

The point about it is, is that the money laundering network -- it's not at all unusual for money laundering networks to be dealing with millions of pounds a week in this sort of way. And so they can afford to stand the loss of the odd cash seizure going missing. Bearing in mind that every time that they do this, they're charging six to eight percent of the total amount

 that they've picked up. It doesn't take long doing that for you to accumulate enough money to be able to stand the loss of a few of these things.

So what is the mechanism that has evolved in terms of making sure, first of all, that you're giving it to the right person, secondly, that there is a receipt passed? Now, clearly what you don't want is a situation where someone writes in a duplicate receipt book "Received from Mr. Joe Blogs the sum of 150,000 pounds for safe delivery to the Netherlands." Nobody -- obviously if you're a criminal, that would be suicide.

So what you have to do is come up with something which is going to blend into normal activity. These things are known as tokens. And that is -- and they're known as tokens in the criminal fraternity. That isn't a law enforcement concept that we've come up with. Criminals refer to these things as tokens themselves. We've become aware of that because obviously we do things like analyze telephones and what have you when we arrest people and we look at communications and things.

So the situation is it works on the basis of a unique serial number on a bank note. So what happens is -- in the diagram, where the controller gets in touch with the collector and says, go meet this guy in the supermarket carpark, the first thing they will ask him is, give me a token number. And what the collector will do is look in his wallet, take out a bank note, usually the lowest value one he can find -in the UK it's generally a five-pound note. if you've got a wad of Indian one-rupee notes, so much the better. And he will quote the serial number on that bank note to the controller, the key thing being that there is only one bank note in existence which has that serial number on it, so it's completely unique.

The controller will then transmit that serial number by whatever method he chooses, whether it be by the old-fashioned text message, or it might be on WhatsApp or Viber or Messenger -- some sort of messaging system -- to the guy who's going to hand the cash over. And he will also pass over the mobile phone number and

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

sometimes the car details of the guy who's going to collect the cash.

So the criminal who's got the bag of cash turns up in the carpark, sees a car that he's been described, has made the arrangements with the guy over the mobile phone, generally through a Satmap device or something like that, and then the two people will come together and the collector will take out of his pocket the bank note with the unique serial number on it. is only one bank note with that serial number on it so it proves incontrovertibly that the person in possession of the bank note is the guy to whom you should hand the cash. Because nobody else can have that bank note. The bank note has been provided by the collector to the controller to the criminal, and the criminal's got those details and so he knows that the guy in possession of that bank note is the guy he should be handing it to.

The bank note generally is handed over in exchange, because what that then does is it acts as a receipt for the guy who's handed the cash over, so he can go back and show his boss in the event of a loss. He says, now look, I've got the token, they've got the money. It's their problem if they've lost it. So it acts as a form of receipt and also as a transfer of acceptance for responsibility of the money.

That system is in use all round the world, wherever I've gone, wherever I've lectured in this type of thing. It is being used in Pakistan, in India. It's being used in Australia, New Zealand, Canada, in the USA, in the Netherlands, in Spain. It's in use everywhere. The interesting thing about it is is that criminal organizations know that we know how it works. But it's such a perfect system they haven't found anything better to -- they haven't found anything better to replace it with. I can guarantee that this type of activity has been happening all across the streets of the UK, in Canada, in British Columbia, in everywhere else, and it's been happening lots of times today.

Interesting. Thank you, Mr. Lord.

MR. MCGOWAN: Mr. Commissioner, I wonder if this might

46 47 Simon Lord (for the Commission)
Examination by Mr. McGowan, Counsel for the Commission

1 be a convenient time to a break, and I'm going to 2 suggest maybe just a 10-minute break. 3 THE COMMISSIONER: Yes, that's fine, Mr. McGowan. 4 We'll take 10 minutes. Thank you. And once again, 5 I just remind everyone to turn off both their 6 cameras and their mic. 7 8 (WITNESS STOOD DOWN) 9 10 (PROCEEDINGS ADJOURNED) (PROCEEDINGS RECONVENED) 11 12 13 THE REGISTRAR: The hearing is now resumed. 14 ensure you're muted unless you are speaking. 15 Thank you. 16 17 SIMON LORD, a witness, 18 recalled. 19 20 THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you. Yes, Mr. McGowan. MR. MCGOWAN: Yes, Mr. Commissioner. 21 Thank you. 22 23 EXAMINATION BY MR. MCGOWAN, continuing: 24 25 Q Mr. Lord, I understand after being involved in 26 the crafting of the typology report that we've 27 been working our way through, you subsequently had further opportunity to investigate the 28 29 prevalence and use of informal value transfer 30 systems in the United Kingdom, which ultimately 31 led to you authoring two additional reports on 32 that topic; is that right? 33 Yes. Are you referring to the Chinese ones 34 [indiscernible]? 35 Q Yes. 36 Α Yeah. Yes, that's right. 37 And maybe I will first pull up --38 MR. MCGOWAN: Madam Registrar, if you could pull up the report titled "Ethnic Chinese Money 39 40 Laundering in the UK, " the NCA report. 41 This is one of the reports that you authored 42 dealing with that subject? 43 Yes, it is. Α 44 MR. MCGOWAN: Mr. Commissioner, if that could be the

next exhibit, please.

12.

THE COMMISSIONER: Very well. That will be Exhibit

THE REGISTRAR: Exhibit 12.

EXHIBIT 12: Report entitled "Ethnic Chinese Money Laundering in the UK"

4 5 6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

1

2

- MR. MCGOWAN: If that could come off the screen, Madam Registrar, and if we could next have the second NCA report dated October 2019, "Chinese Underground Banking and 'Daigou'."
- Q That's another report drawing on your work in the United Kingdom on this topic?
- A That's right.

MR. MCGOWAN: If that could be an exhibit, please. THE COMMISSIONER: Yes. That will be Exhibit 13. THE REGISTRAR: Exhibit 13.

15 16 17

EXHIBIT 13: Report entitled "Chinese Underground Banking and 'Daigou'"

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

MR. MCGOWAN:

- Thank you, Mr. Lord. And I'm going to take you through these reports in a little bit of detail. But before doing so, I just want it to be clear, and I think you want it to be clear, that the focus of these reports was on a discrete group of operators and not intended to be any sort of generalization about any particular culture or society.
- No. It's one of those awkward things where, with Α an IVTS mechanism like this, you can't describe it without talking about the ethnicity of the But I want to make it people involved. perfectly clear that I am in no way suggesting that, first of all, everybody who uses this type of mechanism is a criminal or that Chinese individuals in particular are all criminals or whether they're more inclined to be involved in criminal activity or anything like that. nothing to do with that. It is simply the fact that -- I mentioned about the fact that certain money laundering mechanisms and certain forms of IVTS emerge in sort of ethnic corridors, if you like, and this is just one of those. So we have people who are, I mentioned earlier on, involved in IVTS in between the UK and Kurdistan. this is IVTS in between the UK and China
- Q Right. And I'm sure you'll agree the vast

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 Simon Lord (for the Commission) Examination by Mr. McGowan, Counsel for the Commission

- 1 majority of Chinese expatriates who work and live 2 abroad are perfectly law abiding. 3
 - Absolutely, one hundred percent, yeah. Α
 - Right. And this report, I gather, is designed to 0 address a relatively small group of individuals who seek to circumvent the law and launder the proceeds of their crimes and the proceeds of the crimes of others?
 - And again, it's criminal abuse of the Α Yes. system really. The operation of the system is out with the laws of China, but for the most part -- most of the people who are involved in it are simply trying to move legitimate money, albeit through a mechanism that's illegal in its country of origin.
 - Right. And the observations you make in this Q report, I gather, are instructive for the situation in the United Kingdom. Are they also instructive for experiences elsewhere, including in Canada?
 - One of the things -- I've been looking at Α Yeah. this in some detail since at least early to middle 2018, and I've done quite a lot of consulting of international partners in respect of it. And one of the things that has taught me is that what we are seeing in the UK is not at The same system or a variation of all unusual. the same system are operating in the UK, in the USA, in Canada, in Australia, in New Zealand, most European countries. So yeah, the UK experience is not unique by any stretch of the imagination.
 - What was the purpose for which you authored these Q two -- and I should clarify. You were the author of these reports?
 - Yes, I wrote them both. Α Yeah.
 - Q And what was the purpose for which you authored
 - Well, like I said, one of the -- one of my roles Α in the National Assessment Centre is to basically ensure that the UK has a current and up-to-date understanding of all of the money laundering threats. In respect of the threat from Chinese underground banking, "Ethnic Chinese Money Laundering in the UK," it had always been there and there had always been -- you know, the system was always being operated. And in fact I sort of

started to -- became more and more aware of it when I was doing the report for FATF in 2012. mentioned about the fact that there was a guy from China. He was from the anti-money laundering bureau of the People's Bank of China, as it happened. He was part of the Typology Working Group. And one of the presentations he did was talking about Chinese underground banking in China and what they do about it as a form of So I've always been aware of it. around about 2015 in the UK, we started noticing it more. And opinions are divided as to whether the activity had always been carrying on on a particular level and we just hadn't spotted it, or whether the actual amount of this type of stuff that was going on was increasing. My personal opinion is that all of a sudden there was an upswing in the volume of money laundering and the number of cases that we were seeing. wasn't just a case of we spotted it more.

And one of the most significant things that we spotted with it was that the people who -- the criminals who were pushing their money through the system, who were abusing the system, were not just Chinese. The mechanism had always existed for Chinese people laundering money through a Chinese mechanism. But now we started to see people who were involved in drug trafficking who were white British organized crime groups up in the North of England or Albanian drug trafficking groups or Western Balkan drug trafficking groups -- all sorts of people for whom it appeared that Chinese money launderers were providing the service.

So because of that, and because it appeared that similar attention was being paid to this in other countries as well, I suggested to the people I work with in the National Assessment Centre that we should maybe study it in a bit more detail and produce reports. And as I said, the purpose of the report is twofold. Number one, to inform law enforcement and to put things into context. But secondly, to make the -- and I've talked about public-private partnership and information sharing before -- to make sure that our partners in the private sector were also aware of it so they could build the information

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

- into their risk management methods and techniques.
- Q And was one of these reports originally intended to be internal and one to be distributed more widely?
- Yeah. So the one that's called "Ethnic Chinese Α Money Laundering in the UK" -- there's actually two versions of this. The original one was issued -- I'm sure everyone is aware. There's a government-protected marking system in place in the UK and in all other countries, and you can share more sensitive information as long as you protect it appropriately. And the first version of the "Ethnic Chinese Money Laundering in the UK" assessment was issued for internal government use only at "official sensitive" level, which meant that only people that were cleared to see sensitive intelligence could see it. However, it became apparent that there was a lot of interest in this topic, especially from the private sector. And so we worked then to redact out the sensitive intelligence in the original version and to bring the classification down to "official," which meant that we could share it with anybody in the private sector, because we could see that there was a justifiable purpose for doing that, you know, like I mentioned in order for the private sector to manage risk effectively.

And so that's what that is. The version you've got in front of you is the official version with the sensitive stuff redacted out. But nothing was taken out which would affect the understanding of the typology, if you like. It was only some of the source of the intelligence and, you know, and the response and things like that that we had to take out.

- Q Right. And the two reports we've just marked cover a lot of the same ground; is that fair?
- A They do, yeah. So the one that's been released as "Chinese Underground Banking and 'Daigou'" was released for a specific purpose. I mentioned Project Princekin a little bit earlier on, the initiative with Barclays and the JIMLIT and the NAC, that was produced mainly for that.

 Essentially the reason we did it was because -- I mentioned on Project Princekin that there was a

 Simon Lord (for the Commission)
Examination by Mr. McGowan, Counsel for the Commission

day of action where 95 or so bank accounts were identified with lots of money in that had come in, we believe, from criminal activity. And there were going to be mass applications for account freezing orders on -- all in one day.

We were aware in the Expert Laundering Evidence Cadre that we were likely to get 95 requests for assistance in these cases because this type of stuff is the sort of thing we -it's our bread and butter, explaining how typologies work and what have you. We clearly couldn't deal with 95 requests all at once. what we needed was a document that set out how Chinese underground banking and daigou and what have you worked and how they're abused by the criminal fraternity, that could be used in way in which people who were applying for court orders -- for account freezing orders for forfeiture could include that document in the papers which would essentially not supplant but sort of fulfil the role that an expert would in demystifying the procedures to a court. that's what that document was for.

But subsequent to that we made it available to anybody who wants it really. It's available on the NCA's website if you log into the NCA website. And it's been widely distributed to all sorts of people. And in fact, both of these reports -- like I say it's widely distributed. We've actually given copies of both of these reports to the Chinese government.

- Q And the other report has also been distributed to some extent as well in --
- A Yeah, very widely. Very widely. It's been shared amongst the -- everybody who was a contributor to the JIMLIT has got a copy. We've sent it to law firms. We've sent it to -- like I mentioned, I did a presentation to the Institute of Money Laundering Prevention Officers, which include staff from insurance companies, money service businesses, and all the rest of it. Anybody who's asked for a copy of it, we've given a copy.
- Q Okay. So maybe what I'll do is spend a few minutes in your paper titled "Ethnic Chinese Money Laundering" and walk you through that with some questions about some of the points you

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

Simon Lord (for the Commission) Examination by Mr. McGowan, Counsel for the Commission

1 address in the report. 2

- Α Yeah.
- Maybe I'll start by asking you, what does the Q term "ethnic Chinese money laundering" refer to?
- Α So what we're talking about here is the abuse of an informal value transfer system that operates within the Chinese community. And as I say, it's -- I'll emphasize again, I'm not saying that everybody who uses this mechanism are criminals. It's a form of IVTS that has grown up in a particular community and is as a result of local conditions, but it is abused by criminals for money laundering purposes. So when I say ethnic Chinese money laundering in the UK, it's an abuse of a system that is specialist to the Chinese community, but the money that's being laundered through it is coming from a whole range of criminals and not necessarily just Chinese individuals.
- You say in the first paragraph of the report: Q

Money laundering by UK based groups comprised of ethnic Chinese nationals presents a significant threat to the UK.

- Yes. Α
- And the scale of the threat has been 0 unquantified. I wonder if you could explain what that threat is, what the risk or the harm that flows from that is, and any progress you've made since drafting this report in quantifying it.
- Α I'm always wary about putting figures on things. The difficulty is, if you put a figure in a report, everyone just quotes the figure and doesn't read the report. So I -- and the truth is, if anyone says that they can accurately quantify this, then they're lying, quite frankly, because there are so many different things that emerge and there's so many different systems and so many different ways of measuring it.

It's certainly into hundreds of millions of pounds in the UK and could well be into billions of pounds. As an illustration of that, the abuse of the Barclays Bank accounts that we mentioned in Project Princekin, in this 12-month period, that was 120 million pounds. And that's just one bank. And there are a whole load of different

banks in the UK. So we are certainly talking hundreds of millions and potentially into billions.

Like I say, the situation we were in is that we were reasonably well acquainted with the different types of money laundering that were taking place in the UK, and then all of a sudden -- well, I say all of a sudden -- but there was an inexorable rise in the number of these cases that we were seeing, to the point where almost every case that we tripped over there was a Chinese cash collector in it.

And so we got to the point where we were thinking, well, actually this is a really significant threat. This is something that has emerged over the last few years and is now a really significant threat. I mean, it's something that we have to deal with because it's not something that we'd been seeing for a long period of time.

So essentially that's what I mean. It's a significant threat to the UK. The interesting thing is at the moment, under the COVID-19 restrictions, because it relies on individuals of Chinese descent who are quite often Chinese citizens, and it also relies on the use of bank accounts set up by Chinese students in the UK, a lot of those people have returned to China. Under the COVID-19 restrictions, the threat has actually diminished quite significantly. But once it all comes under control, we're expecting it to step up again.

Have you done any analysis to why that risk escalated so significantly in recent years? To be honest, I don't know what the answer to Α that is. I wish I did. I suspect it's a combination of things like a bigger risk appetite. So with the control networks that I described earlier on, hundred, hundred and fifty thousand pounds at a time, Chinese groups were willing to take three, four, five hundred thousand pounds in one setup. They have the capability of paying out -- I mentioned about the fact that cash pools, more or less anywhere where there is a significant Chinese diaspora will -we will see this type of mechanism operating. And as you're aware, there are significant

 Chinese communities all round the world. So they have a capability of paying out anywhere where criminals want their money.

And the other thing is, is they are highly competitive on price. We understand that the charges that are being levied by Chinese money launderers undercut some of the more traditional groups. So obviously the criminals are going to go for them.

- Right. I wonder if you could just give the Commissioner an example how a criminal organization might exploit the informal value transfer system, Chinese underground banking, to launder funds.
- A So it essentially works -- it's a supply and demand thing. The system has arisen in the UK and China largely because the Chinese government is more than happy for people to make lots of money in China. It's got a socialist sort of market economy. But the Chinese government want all that money to stay in China, thank you very much, because obviously it makes the country richer and what have you.

So what they do is they impose a limit on the amount of money that individual citizens are allowed to transfer out of China on an annual And they also impose restrictions on what basis. you're allowed to do with the money when you transfer it out. So the first thing -- so the restriction is \$50,000. That is quite widely publicized, but we've done some work through our liaison officers who are in China to get copies of the actual legislation. In nearly all circumstances -- not exclusively, but in nearly all circumstances the maximum amount of foreign exchange that an individual citizen can purchase in a year is \$50,000. And you have to do that through a foreign exchange settlement account with a bank. So there are no -- Western Union and MoneyGram do operate in China but only through bank branches and they're actually more expensive than the banks themselves.

So essentially, if you're going to transfer money out of China, you have to do it through a bank, so you have to go in and you have to buy the foreign currency off the bank essentially, and they will do the transfer for you. And the

rules, which are set by the State Administration of Foreign Exchange, are overseen and applied by the bank. So if you go into a bank and you say you want to transfer money out of China, the bank are going to ask you what it's for. And if it doesn't meet one of the criteria that are set out by the State Administration of Foreign Exchange, the bank will simply refuse to do it.

One of the things that you are not allowed to do with your funds when you transfer out of China is to buy property with it. That is seen as an individual direct investment and is prohibited by the Chinese government. You can invest overseas if you're a Chinese individual, but you have to go through something called the Qualified Domestic Institutional Investor Program, which, as you might imagine -- everything in China is state controlled and the QDII process is state controlled and the Chinese government have -- essentially control what money goes where and how it can be seen and all the rest of it.

Now, what we have is a situation in the UK where wealthy Chinese citizens want to get their money out of China and buy property in the UK. And it's not just in the UK. It's in Vancouver and it's in all of the big cities all round the world. It's in Auckland in New Zealand, it's in Australia and all the rest of [indiscernible].

So Chinese citizens who are wealthy don't want to comply with the government's restrictions in terms of where their money goes. So they want to get their money out but the government won't let them, so they are forced to turn to an informal mechanism for doing it.

Now, what that creates is a demand for funds in the UK -- we're talking about the UK here -- and what we also have on the same token are criminals in the UK who have got lots and lots of cash which they have made from drug trafficking and other crimes, and they want the money moved out of the UK somewhere else. And what the Chinese underground banker is able to do is put the two halves of that transaction together.

So it's a supply and demand thing. There is a supply of cash derived from criminal activity in the UK and there is a demand for inward

remittances from China to the UK for what would be regarded as illicit purposes in China. We would probably regard it as a legitimate transfer of funds from China to the UK to buy property. That's not criminal. It is in China but it's not in the UK. And the Chinese underground banker puts the two halves together.

So what happens is the Chinese cash collector, who is working for the controller -the Chinese controller for want of a better word
-- meets the criminal in the carpark, as I've
already described, takes the cash off the
criminal and then uses that cash to pay it into
the bank account of the individual who wants to
buy property with it in the UK. But also for
other purposes. There are other reasons people
want to move money out of China, and we'll come
to what that is in a minute.

Clearly the criminal has to get something out of it. There's no point in him giving his cash to a Chinese guy in the UK and the Chinese guy buying property with it. That's not the money laundering process. The criminal wants his cash somewhere else. If you're a drug trafficker and you're importing cocaine, then you may well want it in South America, and what the Chinese controller is able to do, like I've previously described, is receive the cash in the UK and make an equivalent payment, less a commission, in somewhere like South America on behalf of the criminal.

In return, what happens -- so the guy in China who wants to transfer his money out of China, he makes a payment to a bank account controlled by the individual in China, and he then receives cash in the UK in return for the payment into the bank account. And clearly that money in the bank account then, the controller in China can do what he likes with it. So it's an offsetting arrangement essentially and a cash pooling arrangement.

So on the one hand, it supports remittances out of China to the UK for reasons which the Chinese government would regard as illicit but we would probably see as a legitimate transaction. And it also supports the transfer of the value of the criminal funds out of the UK to somewhere

- else. And that's essentially how the process works.
 - Q And I gather the ready supply of cash in the UK from illicit purposes is part of what feeds and fuels this dynamic?
 - A Yeah. It's supply and demand, like I say.
 There's a demand for money in and there's a
 demand for money out, and there's lots of cash
 from drug trafficking and various other sources
 which is available for use for that purpose.
 It's repurposing criminal funds essentially.
 - Q You mention in the report and discuss something called daigou.
 - A So what daigou is, is it's personal shopping. I mean, I'm told that daigou is a Chinese word which means buying on behalf of. I've never been able to confirm that, but until I hear to the contrary, that's what I'm going to say. And what you're essentially -- what you're talking about -- it arose in a small way with people who have come to the UK buying things like designer handbags and sending them back to China and selling them there, because these type of things are heavily counterfeited in China or are not available while the genuine article is subject to significant tariffs and stuff.

So people realized that they could buy designer goods in the UK, export them to China, sell them there and make a profit. Now, that's okay, but the difficulty is, of course, when you sell them in China your money's in China. If you want to continue operating that system, you've somehow got to get the money back out of China, back to the UK again, in order for you to continue this type of activity. And that's where the Chinese underground banking comes in.

Now, we've also seen -- it's not just designer goods. We've also seen it with infant formula. There was a lot of this in Australia. Back in around -- I can't remember -- 2008, something like that, there were some stories in Chinese media of babies that had been fed counterfeit infant formula milk and had died as a result of it, which meant there was a big demand for the genuine stuff sourced from western countries. And people were going into like supermarkets in Australia and things like that

Simon Lord (for the Commission)
Examination by Mr. McGowan, Counsel for the Commission

and buying up whole shelves full of baby milk and packing it up and sending it off to China and making huge profits into it.

As I say, and that's what daigou is. But the difficulty is, of course, as I say, it relies on the same set of circumstances, money in China that has to be removed from China, which is satisfied by cash from criminals being used to purchase the goods in the UK, or anywhere else for that matter. And daigou is something that manifests itself everywhere you look. It's in Canada, it's in the UK, it's in Australia, it's in New Zealand, it's in France, Belgium, Spain, everywhere.

- Q Okay. You have a section of your report that addresses gambling and a connection between gambling and Chinese underground banking. I wonder if you could walk the Commissioner through that.
- Α Yeah. So it's essentially the same issue. China most gambling is illegal. You can do things like sports betting and stuff like that, but if you want to gamble serious amounts of money in a casino, that is not a permissible purpose for your \$50,000 essentially. So if you want to move, say -- you want to come to the UK, you want to come to B.C., you want to come to Australia or something like that and go on a gambling holiday, which -- gambling is deeply embedded in Chinese society and lots of people like to do it, but the government has taken steps to make it illegal. So if you want to continue with your gambling practices, you can't remove your money from China to gamble it in another location because the bank won't let you. you're forced into the same type of money laundering mechanism.

And so what we see in the UK -- and this is reflected in Australia and in Canada as well -- is that people come to the UK and they receive cash from a money launderer to enable them to gamble in a casino. The important thing to realize is the gambling process is a symptom of the money laundering and not part of the money laundering process itself because what's happening is the individual who is gambling is making a payment from a bank account in China to

the Chinese IVTS operator and in return he's receiving cash which has come from criminals in whatever country he happens to be in.

So the actual placement of the cash with the gambler and the use in a casino is not part of the money laundering mechanism. It is simply a reflection of the fact that the guy who's doing the gambling can't get his money out of China to do it. And again, it's a supply and demand thing. A guy wants his money in a casino and the Chinese underground banker is able to take criminal money and satisfy that remittance.

- Q So the value of the amount that's laundered may have been legitimately earned by the Chinese gambler?
- A Yeah. So the guy who's gambling it, yeah. I mean, it may well be that he's a wealthy individual and he's got lots of money and he just wants to fritter it away unnecessarily. So it could be derived from an entirely legitimate source, but the money he's gambling in B.C. or in Australia or in the UK, wherever it happens to be, has come from a criminal source. But he may not be aware of that.
- Q The actual funds that are used in the casino?
- A Yeah. And what happens --
- Q -- [indiscernible overlapping speakers] you're putting forward?
- Α That's -- and I'm pretty sure that that's the case. Because that's the way it works everywhere else. If I take you back to the Iranian system I was describing, it's a similar situation to that. It's a bit like what we would call cuckoo smurfing. So if someone wants to move their money out of Iran, can't, so they go to a saraf in Iran and they -- that transaction is sold to the controller and they use criminal cash in the destination to fund that inward remittance, and it's the same in respect of gambling. And what happens is the UK criminal receives a payment out of a cash pool somewhere else in return for him paying his money into the -- you know, making it available in the UK or Canada or wherever it happens to be.

You always have to remember what the criminal gets out of it. There is no -- there is no benefit to a criminal to just give his money

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

to somebody to play in a casino and lose. You know, if you have spent all that time and effort and the risk of arrest and all the rest of it importing cocaine, giving it to a guy who's only going to lose it all on the tables is not a money laundering mechanism. That's just a way of wasting the money. The criminal has to get something out of it, and that's the important thing about all of these mechanisms. handing his cash over to someone in whatever jurisdiction it is. He's receiving his funds somewhere else. It's not a loan that's being given to the guy -- I'll give you this money and you give it me back later. He's actually receiving a payment somewhere else in turn for him having these funds over in that location.

- Q And what's the benefit of the payment somewhere else to the money launderer or criminal organization?
- Α Well, it means that if he's in a situation where he wants to pay his supplier -- if you're a drug trafficker, for example, you might be importing cocaine from Brazil, then you need to pay for the drugs in Brazil. So you pay your money over to the underground banker in whatever location you happen to be in where you're selling the drugs, and in return you receive a payment from a cash pool in Brazil to pay your supplier. Or it might be that -- it might be the situation, for example, where you actually want your money in China, but the gambler has paid money to the controller in China and he can make a payment to you out of that money that he's received in China.

And that's the mechanism. It's transferring the value of the criminal funds to another location on behalf of the criminal.

- Q And in the United Kingdom, following along from the gambling example, how is the cash typically delivered to the gamblers?
- A It can be in a whole variety of ways. The most common thing that happens in the UK is the abuse of Chinese student bank accounts. And this is what I was talking about, about the Project Princekin thing. The first port of call in the process that we see overwhelmingly and the most common thing is that cash is collected from the

criminal and then it's deposited into a bank account that's been set up by a Chinese student.

And what happens is -- so in the UK -- it's important to realize in the UK that we have more Chinese students than any other ethnic group [indiscernible]. Last year to June -- I think it was June or July 2019 -- we issued 107,000 student visas to Chinese individuals who want to come to the UK to study -- entirely legitimately. And they're more than welcome to come in. Actually they are a valuable source of funds to the education sector in the UK.

What happens is, when they get to the UK -- and again, we know this because some of the people that we've interviewed in respect of the use of their bank accounts told us this. All Chinese students, in fact almost everybody in China, uses a social messaging platform called WeChat. It's very similar to WhatsApp except that it's got a payment function built on the back of it that can be used to transfer money as well. And like everybody has, there are WeChat groups for their family and what have you and people set up WeChat groups in universities for people on different courses and things like that. They're mostly Chinese students.

What happens is, those WeChat groups are infiltrated by representatives of the money launderer in the UK, and the Chinese students are offered the opportunity to make a little bit of extra money. And what they say is, you're doing money remittance on behalf of Chinese citizens in the UK who are unbanked and want to send their money back to China. And all you're going to do is make your bank account available to us and you will receive money into the bank account and then you've just got to send it with a wire transfer where we tell you to, and in return for that you can keep some of the money that you receive. there are some Chinese students who are able to make two or three thousand pounds a month by doing this.

Like I mentioned, with Barclays and the Princekin example, they identified 20,000 compromised accounts into which this type of cash had been paid, and nearly all of them had been set up by Chinese students studying in the UK.

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 And essentially that's what will happen. The cash goes into those accounts and then a payment will be made to the gambler in order for him to go and to do the gambling. Or, in an extreme example, the guy might pick the cash up off the criminal and go and meet the gambler outside a casino and just physically give it to him.

Q Going back to the student bank account example, what are you doing in the UK to combat that?

Α Well, there's range of different things. mentioned that we have in the UK a four-P approach: pursue, prevent, protect, prepare. So the first thing is, is we were able to identify -- we had the day of action that I mentioned earlier on about bank accounts. Barclays identified 95 bank accounts to us, lots of money in them, and then we can go out and apply for account freezing orders and to forfeit the money in the bank accounts. Because what we're saying is the person who operates the bank account may not be a criminal but the funds in the bank account are because we -- you know, our understanding of the mechanism is, that's cash that's been taken off a criminal and paid into that account as the first stage in the money laundering process. So that's the first thing we can do is we can apply for account freezing orders on those accounts.

The other thing that we've been undertaking is that we have done some work with the Chinese government. We've been engaging with the Chinese government on this. We've spoken to the Chinese Embassy and we've been working with the Chinese government to get the message out to Chinese students who come to the UK not to get involved in this type of activity. Basically to put the word out to sort of say, this is what you are likely to encounter when you come to the UK. Don't get caught up in it. Because the other thing -- aspect that's important to consider is that if you get involved in doing this on a routine basis, you actually fall under the definition of a money service business in the UK, transmitting money or any representation by way of business. And that means you can be committing a criminal offence of not registering

Simon Lord (for the Commission)
Examination by Mr. McGowan, Counsel for the Commission

 as a money service business.

The other thing that we've done is that we've actually gone into universities with the agreement of the university and we've been gathering all the Chinese students together in a lecture theatre and we're saying to them, this is the situation. This is what we are seeing in terms of how this money laundering mechanism works. And if any of you are doing this through your bank accounts, you need to be aware of it is not money remittance on behalf of poor unbanked Chinese individuals in the UK. You are actually the first stage in the money laundering process. So do not let your accounts be compromised in that way.

And the other thing we do is we go out and arrest people if we think they're actually complicit, obviously. There's that side of it.

MR. MCGOWAN: Mr. Commissioner, I note the time. This would be a convenient time to break until tomorrow morning.

THE COMMISSIONER: All right. Thank you, Mr. McGowan. We will adjourn 'til tomorrow morning at 9:30. MR. MCGOWAN: Thank you.

A Thank you.

(WITNESS STOOD DOWN)

THE REGISTRAR: The hearing is adjourned for the day and will recommence on May 29th, 2020, at 9:30 a.m. Thank you.

(PROCEEDINGS ADJOURNED TO MAY 29, 2020, AT 9:30 A.M.)