

# The de-risking dilemma - does the process live up to its name?

Wholesale de-risking by financial institutions may seem like a viable compliance strategy when dealing with certain customers, but in the long-term may cause more harm than good.

## What drives a financial institution to de-risk?



### Regulatory pressures

- Heightened sensitivity to Counter-Terrorist Financing risks
- Increased oversight by domestic and international regulatory authorities
- Growing consequences of a compliance failure



### Business pressures

- Higher compliance costs and unsustainable procedures
- External pressures for robust Know Your Customer's Customer
- Value of opportunities becoming unfavourable

However de-risking can bring with it some unintended consequences...



#### Social cohesion

Disruption to vulnerable sections of society as they are forced out of the traditional financial system.



#### Client experience

Poor customer experience, resulting in client flight to alternative providers and damage to the institution's reputation.



#### Legal risk

Threat of class actions or discrimination claims by those effectively excluded from the banking system.



#### Regulatory scrutiny

Growing oversight of regulators concerned at a disproportionate level of wholesale de-risking instead of case-by-case evaluations.



#### Displaced risk

Instead of tackling the AML threat, de-risking can divert funds to less regulated areas and shadow banking services.

Of course this has to be balanced against the risk-based status quo - which could be costly...

Utilise multiple disparate systems



Add more resources



Scale up operations



Spend more money



...unless you consider the compelling alternative

### The intelligent risk-based approach

Remove data isolation



Add new and alternative data



Expand risk intelligence



Leverage analytics and linking technology



Create a single risk view