AML PACKAGE – FORMAT FOR REPORTING SUSPICIONS AND PROVIDING TRANSACTION RECORDS

AMLA'S CONSULTATION ON DRAFT ITS

AMAFI's answer

AMAFI is the trade association representing financial markets' participants of the sell-side industry located in France. It has a wide and diverse membership of more than 170 global and local institutions notably investment firms, credit institutions, broker-dealers, exchanges and private banks. They operate in all market segments, such as equities, bonds and derivatives including commodities derivatives. AMAFI represents and supports its members at national, European and international levels, from the drafting of the legislation to its implementation. Through our work, we seek to promote a regulatory framework that enables the development of sound, efficient and competitive capital markets for the benefit of investors, businesses and the economy in general.

AMAFI thanks the AMLA for the opportunity to respond to its consultation on the draft ITS on the format for reporting suspicions and providing transaction records.

GENERAL COMMENTS

As a preliminary matter, AMAFI supports the harmonisation objective pursued by the AMLA through this draft ITS: consistent and standardised reporting formats are, in principle, conducive to more effective cooperation between Financial Intelligence Units (FIUs).

Prioritising Form over Substance Runs Counter to the Commission's Burden-Reduction Objective

This draft ITS comes at a moment when the European Commission has itself called for a decisive cultural shift in financial regulation. Commissioner Maria Luís Albuquerque has described that shift, away from formalistic compliance and towards a focus on material risks and substance, as one of the most demanding yet essential dimensions of the reform agenda and has been unequivocal: "*compliance is about substance, not form*"[1].

It is precisely against this dimension that the draft ITS, in its current form, gives cause for concern: its level of granularity and its mandatory-field logic create the risk of prioritising formal exhaustiveness over the substance of the suspicion reported.

AMAFI observes that the level of granularity required by the reporting templates appears very high and that this level of detail may not always be proportionate nor relevant to the needs of the report.

This exhaustiveness would mechanically double, or even triple, the time required to complete the reporting of suspicions, without such additional burden having been assessed in terms of effective benefit for FIUs. This appears at odds with the objective of burden reduction set by the Commission (of 25 % overall).

Limiting reports to essential information and relying on the power of FIUs to request additional information

In this respect, AMAFI recalls that the framework established under the AMLR (*Regulation (EU) 2024/1624 of 31 May 2024*) allows FIUs to request additional information from reporting entities after the report has been submitted, within five working days, a period that FIUs may shorten in justified and urgent cases (*AMLR, Article 69, 1, (b)*). Requiring the transmission of an exhaustive set of data at the initial reporting stage does not appear to be necessary or proportionate and an approach based on a core set of information essential to the report, supplemented at the FIUs' request, would preserve the responsiveness of the reporting mechanism while easing the burden on entities.

This core set of information required at the initial reporting stage should, moreover, be limited to information already held by the reporting entity, without creating, in itself, an obligation to collect information beyond what is otherwise required under customer due diligence obligations and the knowledge of the business relationship. Certain data points, such as DP0310 and DP0311, appear to require information that reporting entities are not, as such, required to collect or retain under those obligations. Requiring such information in the report would indirectly extend, through the reporting format, the scope of customer due diligence obligations, which would not appear to be the purpose of that format.

To this end, it should be up to FIUs to collectively determine the information they consider essential and to confine the initial reporting stage to that core set, to preserve the speed and effectiveness of the reporting mechanism while additional information is provided at their request thereafter.

[1] Press conference by Maria Luís Albuquerque, European Commissioner for Financial Services and the Savings and Investment Union, 17 July 2026.

Complexity risks undermining reporting quality

AMAFI considers that collecting and structuring the required data would leave obliged entities with a choice between two options, neither of which is satisfactory:

- either undertaking IT developments to isolate the relevant data within their client management systems, entailing substantial development costs;
- or, entering the information manually, an approach that, given the high number of data points and the mandatory-field logic, generates a heightened risk of error and, consequently, a low quality of the reports, possibly lower than those currently submitted.

This burden would weigh unevenly across obliged entities: while larger investment firms are generally better able to mobilise the financial resources required for this type of project, smaller structures, by contrast, do not have comparable means. Beyond its effect on the quality of the report, this heightened risk of error carries a further consequence under the mandatory-field logic: an error or omission could in itself be regarded as a breach attributable to the reporting entity, thereby compounding an operational difficulty with a compliance risk.

An approach that creates compliance risk

A significant number of data points are qualified as "mandatory if available", meaning that the reporting entity must complete them wherever it holds the corresponding information. Combined with the breadth of the data points concerned, this qualification is a source of legal uncertainty: a data point held by the entity but not entered in the report might be regarded as a breach to its reporting obligations, even where the information in question would have no bearing on the substance of the reported suspicion or may be held in locations not easily accessible such as archives. Such would be the case, for example, of data points DP0310 and DP0311 relating to the client's former address.

Exposing entities to compliance risk for an omission that is immaterial to the suspicion reported would epitomise the formalistic approach the Commission has expressly called to move away from, sanctioning form over substance.

Just as the "mandatory if available" qualification may lead entities to complete a field for fear that an omission be held against them, an "optional" classification would not lead them to refrain from doing so: faced with the same possibility that an omission might later be held against them, in a context where their liability under the AML/CFT framework may be engaged, reporting entities would tend, as a matter of caution, to complete as many fields as possible wherever they hold the corresponding information. This logic places a disproportionate compliance risk on reporting entities and AMAFI calls for the scope of these qualifications to be clarified.

Clarifying the application timeline and leaving sufficient implementation time

Article 10 of the draft ITS provides for a two-phase adaptation period but leaves the implementation periods of the second phase unspecified (*Draft ITS, article 10(3)*), so that obliged entities are presently unable to determine by which date they must be operationally ready.

AMAFI therefore invites the AMLA to specify the duration of the periods provided for in Article 10(3) and to provide a more precise estimate of the timeframe within which obliged entities will be expected to be ready, so as to allow them to carry out the appropriate IT developments and adapt their operational processes, which will require a significant implementation period.

DATA POINTS

AMAFI would like to provide comments on the following data points:

- **Data Point DP0007 – Report type**

DP0007	REPORT	Report Information	Report type	Type of report that is being submitted	Technically mandatory	

This data point, classified as "*Technically mandatory*", requires the reporting entity to indicate the type of report being submitted. According to the interpretative note (*Section 1 – Reports of suspicions, 1.1, page 7*), the value selected determines which categories of data points must be completed: for an STR (*Suspicious Transaction Report*), the data points under the "*products and services*" and "non transactional activity" categories do need not be completed; for an SAR (*Suspicious Activity Report*), the data points under the "*transaction*" category do need not be completed, and only certain "*account*" data points are to be completed where relevant. A third value, "*Both*", is also available.

AMAFI considers that the distinction drawn between these categories lacks clarity. The boundary between a "*transaction*" and an "*activity*" is not defined, whereas many suspicions may relate to either, as the very existence of the "*Both*" option suggests. This classification is not neutral: because it determines which data points are mandatory, an inaccurate categorisation could lead to the omission of data points otherwise expected and thereby expose the reporting entity to a possible allegation of incomplete reporting. More broadly, this distinction reflects an excessive level of granularity that complicates the reporting approach and is liable to generate confusion rather than the clarity sought.

AMAFI observes, more broadly, that the difficulty identified above stems in large part from the need to categorise a report from the outset. The very existence of the *"Both"* value shows that a report may already cover a transaction and an activity at the same time. An architecture built on a shared set of information common to all suspicions, rather than on an initial choice between a transaction-based and an activity-based report, would therefore be consistent with the framework the AMLA has designed. Such an approach could support harmonisation, reduce duplicate reporting requirements and simplify implementation while maintaining the availability of detailed transaction information for FIU analysis. It would also help address some of the boundary and classification issues raised previously, by reducing the need for entities to make an upfront categorisation between SAR and STR.AMAFI invites the AMLA to consider whether a reporting framework based on a common set of information, rather than on an upfront categorisation, could be envisaged. AMAFI therefore invites the AMLA to define the boundary between a "*transaction*" and an "*activity*", so as to ensure that reporting entities can determine with certainty which category applies and which data points are consequently required.

- **Data Points DP0008 to DP0011 – Report – "Urgency" data points**

DP0008	REPORT	Report Information	Urgency	Identified need for a particularly swift treatment from the FIU.	Technically required	
DP0009	REPORT	Report Information	Urgency type	Identification of the reason for the need for a particularly swift treatment from the FIU.	Technically required	DP0008
DP0010	REPORT	Report Information	Urgency date	indication of the date identified as the latest reaction possible for the FIU.	Mandatory if available	DP0009
DP0011	REPORT	Report Information	Urgency description	Description of the urgency identified.	Mandatory if available Mandatory if "other"	DP0009

These data points, classified as "*Technically required*" and "*Mandatory if available*", form a set relating to the urgency of the report of suspicions: DP0008 captures the need for swift treatment by the FIU, DP0009 identifies its reason through an enumeration, DP0010 records the latest possible reaction date, and DP0011 allows a description of the urgency.

AMAFI recognises that reporting entities may wish to indicate urgency within the explanation of why an activity or transaction is considered suspicious, but they should not be required to do so. Requiring obliged entities to assess and characterise urgency would transfer to them the responsibility for prioritising and processing reports, which should normally rest with the FIUs.

AMAFI further observes that the criteria and transaction types to be considered under the interpretative note (DP0009) appear very broad and would not constitute reliable guidance for identifying which reports should be prioritised, as they include no materiality features such as the amount of the transaction.

As regards DP0010, AMAFI considers that further clarification is needed: the AMLA should specify whether the "latest reaction possible for the FIU" is intended to correspond to an objective or external deadline for the entity (for example, the lapse of a settlement or execution time made mandatory under payment systems, schemes or market rules).

AMAFI therefore invites the AMLA to reclassify these data points as "*Optional*", so that the characterisation of urgency is not imposed on reporting entities but remains available to them where they consider it relevant, and to clarify the intended meaning of the data point DP0010.

- **Data Point DP0014 – Crossborder correspondent services**

DP0014	REPORT	Report Information	Crossborder correspondent services	Indication whether the report is submitted as a correspondent services provider such as correspondent banking activities.	Technically required	

This data point requires the reporting entity to indicate whether the report is submitted in its capacity as a correspondent services provider, such as for correspondent banking activities. It is classified as "*Technically required*", i.e. mandatory for every report, without any conditional dependency.

AMAFI notes, however, that correspondent services concern specific situations, so that this data point should not be made mandatory for all reports submitted by obliged entities.

AMAFI therefore invites the AMLA to reclassify DP0014 as a "*Mandatory if relevant*" data point.

- **Data Point DP0018 – Possible predicate offence type**

DP0018	REPORT	Suspicion Details	Possible predicate offence type	Type of possible underlying criminal offence (e.g., Drug trafficking, Tax fraud)	Mandatory if available	DP0017

The data point requires the reporting entity to qualify the suspected underlying criminal offence by reference to a detailed list and is classified as "*Mandatory if available*". The interpretative note specifies that it is intended to capture the main reason that triggered the decision to report and that such reason does not need to be substantiated or further investigated, as it is based on suspicion only.

AMAFI supports the objective of linking the suspicion to a category of predicate offence, as this may usefully inform the FIU's analysis.

However, AMAFI considers that the proposed list is too detailed for the following reasons:

- reporting entities may not have access to all the information necessary to determine the precise criminal-law qualification of the suspected conduct;
- an excessively detailed list is not well suited to a cross-border framework, given that criminal offences are not fully harmonised across the Union.

Reporting entities can therefore only proceed on a best-efforts basis, and an inaccurate qualification should not be held against them where the suspicion has been reported in good faith.

AMAFI therefore invites AMLA to simplify the list so as to allow reporting entities to classify the suspicion under broad categories of predicate offences (such as tax fraud or organised crime), without being expected to identify the precise underlying offence, and to ensure that an inaccurate qualification cannot, in itself, be regarded as a failure to comply with reporting obligations.

- **Data Point DP0022 – Content TAGs**

DP0022	REPORT	Suspicion Details	Content TAGs	Label attached to the case reported for the purpose of identification or to give other information.	Mandatory if available	

This data point requires the reporting entity to attach a label ("TAG") to the case reported and is classified as "*Mandatory if available*". The interpretative note specifies that TAGs are to be provided by the obliged entity in accordance with guidelines issued by the FIU and may be of three types: a specific typology (e.g. Ukraine/Russia), linked activities grouped under a single TAG after informing the FIU, or "*Other*" as defined by the FIU.

AMAFI understands the rationale for this mechanism and recognises that specific features of the national environment in each Member State may, in certain cases, justify the use of country-specific TAGs. It notes, however, that since the applicable guidelines are to be issued by each FIU, there is a risk that the TAGs used may diverge from one FIU to another. While a degree of national flexibility may therefore be necessary, it should not result in the fragmentation of a framework whose objective remains the harmonisation of suspicious transaction and activity reporting across the Union.

AMAFI therefore invites the AMLA to ensure that the various FIU guidelines are sufficiently coordinated and consistent with one another, while allowing national specificities to be taken into account where justified.

- **Data Points DP0023 to DP0024 - Action taken regarding the suspicion reported**

DP0023	REPORT	Suspicion Details	Action taken regarding the suspicion reported	Indication whether an action has been taken regarding the suspicion reported.	Technically required	
DP0024	REPORT	Suspicion Details	Description of the action taken regarding the suspicion reported	Description of the action taken regarding the suspicion reported.	Mandatory	DP0023

These data points require the reporting entity to indicate whether an action has been taken regarding the suspicion reported (DP0023, classified as "*Technically required*") and to describe it (DP0024, classified as "*Mandatory*").

AMAFI observes that the scope of these data points is unclear. The examples given in the interpretative note encompass measures of two distinct kinds: measures taken ahead of the report, such as requests for clarification or due diligence measures, and measures taken after or concurrently with the report, such as refraining from carrying out transactions or termination of the business relationship. These two types of measures do not carry the same meaning for the FIU: the former relate to how the suspicion was formed, whereas the latter relate to the current state of the account or the business relationship and may call for a swift reaction.

AMAFI therefore invites the AMLA to clarify the scope of these data points and, for the sake of clarity, to address actions taken before the report and actions taken after the report under two separate data points.

- **Data Point DP0101 – Connection to obliged entity/natural person**

DP0101	NATURAL PERSON	Person-Reporting Entity Relationship	connection to obliged entity - natural person	Connection between the natural person and reporting obliged entity	Technically required	

This data point characterises the connection between a natural person and the reporting entity and is classified as "Technically required". According to the interpretative note, the possible values all relate to the status of a natural person (customer, occasional customer, prospective customer, or non-customer, depending on whether customer due diligence has been performed under Article 19 AMLR).

As it is "Technically required", this data point appears to have to be completed in every report. Where the report concerns only a legal person that is a customer of the reporting entity, this would not raise any particular difficulty, insofar as the reporting entity could report a natural person, such as the beneficial owner or the legal representative, identified as part of the customer due diligence it has performed.

A difficulty arises, however, where the natural person cannot be identified, in particular where the report concerns a non-customer legal person, in respect of which the reporting entity has by definition performed no customer due diligence. In such a case, the reporting entity does not necessarily hold any information on a natural person. Because the data point is "*Technically required*", the absence of such information could prevent the submission of the report.

AMAFI therefore invites the AMLA to provide for a "*Not available*" value for this data point and to reclassify its treatment as "*Mandatory if available*" in respect of non-customers. This would prevent the reporting of a suspicion from being blocked by the unavailability of information that the reporting entity cannot reasonably be expected to hold, while preserving the completeness of reporting where the information is available.

- **Data Point DP0124 – Employment status**

DP0124	NATURAL PERSON	Person Details	Employment status	Employment status of the natural person as known at the date of the report	Mandatory if available	

This data point requires the reporting entity to indicate the employment status of the natural person as known at the date of the report, through an enumeration (employed, self-employed, unemployed, retired, student, mandatory military service).

AMAFI considers that requiring this information on a systematic basis would entail technical and data-quality constraints for reporting entities, whereas, where the employment status is relevant to the suspicion, reporting entities are already able to describe it (for instance, an inconsistency between the employment status and the amount of inbound transfers) within other existing data points, and notably within DP0015, which captures the detailed explanation of why the activity or transaction is considered suspicious.

AMAFI therefore invites the AMLA to reclassify DP0124 as an optional data point rather than "*Mandatory if available*", so that it is completed only where the reporting entity considers it relevant to the suspicion.

- **Data Points DP0126 to DP0127 – Action taken regarding the suspicion reported**

DP0126	NATURAL PERSON	Suspicion Details	Action taken regarding the suspicion reported	Indication whether an action has been taken regarding the suspicion reported.	Mandatory	
DP0127	NATURAL PERSON	Suspicion Details	Description of the action taken regarding the suspicion reported	Description of the action taken regarding the suspicion reported.	Mandatory	Action taken; TRUE

These data points require the reporting entity to indicate whether an action has been taken in respect of a natural person (DP0126) and to describe that action (DP0127), and are both classified as "*Mandatory*". They overlap with data points DP0023 and DP0024, which already capture, at the level of the report, whether an action has been taken and its description. The interpretative note distinguishes them by providing that DP0126 and DP0127 are to be completed in addition to DP0023 and DP0024 where a specific action was taken regarding a natural person.

AMAFI considers that this distinction does not justify maintaining separate mandatory data points. Making the action taken in respect of each natural person a mandatory field, in addition to the corresponding fields at the level of the report, appears disproportionate: where an action concerns a specific natural person, it can be described within DP0023 and DP0024 or within the description of the suspicion (DP0015). This could result in an unnecessary multiplication of mandatory fields, liable to generate uncertainty as to which field is to be used in a given case.

AMAFI therefore invites the AMLA not to maintain DP0126 and DP0127 as separate mandatory data points, the information they capture being already covered by DP0023 and DP0024.

Data Points DP0128 to DP0132 – Unknown person details

DP0128	NATURAL PERSON	Unknown person details	given name(s) unknown	Uknown given name(s)	Mandatory if available	DP0101; Unknown
DP0129	NATURAL PERSON	Unknown person details	person family name unknown	Unknown family name	Mandatory if available	DP0101; Unknown
DP0130	NATURAL PERSON	Unknown person details	Unprecise birthday date	Unprecise birthday date	Mandatory if available	DP0101; Unknown
DP0131	NATURAL PERSON	Unknown person details	Estimation of birthday	Estimation of birthday	Mandatory if available	DP0101; Unknown
DP0132	NATURAL PERSON	Unknown person details	Any form of identification	Any information available on the unknown person and the relation with primary subjects.	Mandatory if available	DP0101; Unknown

These data points, which fall under the "*Unknown person details*" sub-category and are triggered where DP0101 takes the value "*Unknown*", allow the reporting entity to record information about a natural person who has not been identified: unknown given name(s) (DP0128) and family name (DP0129), an imprecise date of birth (DP0130), an estimated date of birth (DP0131), and any available information on the unknown person and their relationship with the primary subjects (DP0132).

AMAFI would welcome clarification as to the situations these data points are intended to cover. It is unclear in which circumstances a reporting entity would submit a report in respect of an "unknown" natural person, and how such a report would articulate with the identification obligations otherwise applicable. AMAFI therefore invites the AMLA to specify, in the interpretative note, the scenarios envisaged for these data points.

Data Point DP0133 – Other identity

DP0133	NATURAL PERSON	Other identity	Other identity	Indication whether the person reported is known to have another identity (other name or person details).	Mandatory	

This data point, classified as "*Mandatory*", requires the reporting entity to indicate whether the natural person is known to have another identity (another name or other personal details), in which case the relevant data points of the "person names" and "person details" sub-categories are to be completed a second time.

AMAFI considers that the scope of this data point and its articulation with DP0108, which already captures the alternative names or aliases used by the natural person, call for clarification. It is unclear which situations DP0133 is specifically intended to cover that would not already be addressed by DP0108, and where the "other identity" to be reported corresponds to an alternative name or alias, the two data points would appear to overlap.

AMAFI further observes that the existence of another identity is, by nature, information that the reporting entity holds only where it has been able to identify it, and which may well be unavailable. A "*Mandatory*" treatment is therefore not appropriate for this data point.

AMAFI therefore invites the AMLA to clarify the intended scope of DP0133 and its relationship with DP0108, and to reclassify it from "*Mandatory*" to "*Mandatory if available*".

- **Data Point DP0201 – Connection to obliged entity/legal entity**

DP0201	LEGAL ENTITY	Entity Relationship	connection to obliged entity - legal entity	Connection between the entity or arrangement and reporting obliged entity	Technically required	

This data point characterises the connection between a legal entity and the reporting entity and is classified as "*Technically required*". According to the interpretative note, the possible values relate to the entity's status as a customer, occasional customer or prospective customer, or as a "non-customer".

AMAFI would welcome clarification as to the situation the "non-customer" value is intended to cover. It is unclear which non-customer legal entities are expected to be reported (for instance, any entity appearing in the reported transaction, or only those directly implicated in the suspicion) and what information a reporting entity is expected to provide in respect of a legal entity on which it has, by definition, performed no customer due diligence.

AMAFI therefore invites the AMLA to specify the scenarios envisaged for the "non-customer" value and the extent of the information expected in such cases.

- **Data Point DP0203 – Risk classification**

DP0203	LEGAL ENTITY	Entity Relationship	Risk classification	Risk classification applied by the obliged entity to perform customer due diligence	Mandatory	DP0201 - Customer, occasional customer, prospective customer

This data point, classified as "*Mandatory*", requires the reporting entity to indicate the risk classification (high, medium, low or unknown) applied to the customer. The interpretative note specifies that this is not the classification in the context of the suspicion, but the one applied to perform customer due diligence.

The purpose of customer risk classification is to calibrate due diligence measures according to a customer's risk characteristics, a process distinct from the detection of unusual transactions and the characterisation of suspicions, which are based on the features of the transaction or activity. The reporting of a suspicion should not, moreover, lead to situations in which the FIU would call into question the risk classification applied by the reporting entity to its customers.

AMAFI therefore invites the AMLA to reconsider the relevance of this data point and, in any event, to confirm that it is not intended to serve as a basis for the FIU to challenge the customer risk classification applied by reporting entities.

- **Data Point DP0210 – Entity previous name(s)**

DP0210	LEGAL ENTITY	Entity Name	entity previous name(s)	The previous name or trade name under which the legal entity or arrangement has been legally established, incorporated, settled or otherwise created	Mandatory if available	

This data point, classified as "*Mandatory if available*", requires the reporting entity to provide the previous name or trade name under which the legal entity has been legally established, incorporated or otherwise created.

AMAFI considers that the AMLA should specify that the previous names of client legal entities are to be limited to those of which the reporting entity has actually become aware in the course of the business relationship, such as previous names recorded where a client changed its legal name after its onboarding with the reporting entity. A reporting entity cannot reasonably be expected to hold an exhaustive history of the previous names of a legal entity, in particular those predating the business relationship.

AMAFI therefore invites the AMLA to clarify that DP0210 is to be completed only in respect of the previous names of which the reporting entity has actually become aware in the course of the business relationship.

- **Data Point DP0215 – Entity tax number**

DP0215	LEGAL ENTITY	Entity Identification	entity tax number	Tax reference number or value added tax (VAT) registration number assigned to the entity	Mandatory/Mandatory if available	DP0201 - Customer, occasional customer, prospective customer

This data point requires the reporting entity to provide the tax reference number or VAT registration number of the legal entity and is classified as "*Mandatory/Mandatory if available*". AMAFI questions the added value of this data point as a mandatory field: the unambiguous identification of a legal entity is, in principle, already ensured by its legal identification number (DP0214), together with the type of identifier (DP0212) and the relevant registry (DP0213), and, where available, its Legal Entity Identifier. The tax number may not appear necessary at the initial reporting stage for identification purposes.

AMAFI invites the AMLA to reconsider the treatment of DP0215, so that it is not systematically mandatory where the legal entity is already identified by another reliable identifier, and to clarify the applicable treatment.

- **Data Points DP0222 to DP0223 – Action taken regarding the suspicion reported**

DP0222	LEGAL ENTITY	Suspicion Details	Action taken regarding the suspicion reported	Indication whether an action has been taken regarding the suspicion reported.	Mandatory	
DP0223	LEGAL ENTITY	Suspicion Details	Description of the action taken regarding the suspicion reported	Description of the action taken regarding the suspicion reported.	Mandatory	DP0222; TRUE

These data points require the reporting entity to indicate whether an action has been taken in respect of a legal entity (DP0222) and to describe that action (DP0223), and are both classified as "mandatory". They overlap with data points DP0023 and DP0024, which already capture, at the level of the report, whether an action has been taken and its description. The interpretative note distinguishes them by providing that DP0222 and DP0223 are to be completed in addition to DP0023 and DP0024 where a specific action was taken regarding a legal entity.

AMAFI considers that this distinction does not justify maintaining separate "mandatory" data points. Making the action taken in respect of each legal entity a mandatory field, in addition to the corresponding fields at the level of the report, appears disproportionate: where an action concerns a specific legal entity, it can be described within DP0023 and DP0024 or within the description of the suspicion (DP0015). This could result in an unnecessary multiplication of mandatory fields, liable to generate uncertainty as to which field is to be used in a given case.

AMAFI therefore invites the AMLA not to maintain DP0222 and DP0223 as separate mandatory data points, the information they capture being already covered by DP0023 and DP0024.

- **Data Points DP0310 to DP0311 – Date of the previous address**

DP0310	ADDRESS	Generic Address	Status of the address	Indication whether the address is known as the current address or a past address.	Mandatory if available / Optional	DP0101 or DP0201: if customer / occasional customer / prospective customer with CDD, Mandatory if available. For other values, optional.
DP0311	ADDRESS	Generic Address	Date of the previous address	Indication of the latest date when the previous address was known by the OE as the then current address of the natural person or legal entity.	Mandatory if available	DP0310; Previous address

DP0310 indicates whether an address is a current or a previous address and is classified as "*Mandatory if available*" for customers, occasional customers and prospective customers subject to customer due diligence. Where the address is a previous address, DP0311, classified as "*Mandatory if available*", requires the latest date on which that address was known to the reporting entity as the then-current address of the natural person or legal entity.

AMAFI considers, first, that a previous address, and the date attached to it, are generally immaterial to the substance of the suspicion at the initial reporting stage. Requiring these data points on a systematic basis would create technical and data-quality constraints for reporting entities without demonstrated added value for the FIUs. Moreover, this is information that reporting entities are not required to collect under their customer due diligence obligations, so that requiring it within the report would extend the scope of the information they are otherwise obliged to hold, as noted in AMAFI's general comments.

AMAFI considers, second, that the content expected under DP0311 is unclear. It should be specified, in the interpretative note, whether the date to be reported is that on which the reporting entity was informed of the change of address and recorded the new address in its systems, or another date. Should this be the intended meaning, AMAFI suggests that the name of the data point be adjusted accordingly to reflect it.

AMAFI therefore invites the AMLA to reclassify DP0310 and DP0311 as "*Optional*" data points, and to clarify the expected content of DP0311.

- **Data Point DP0315 – Electronic banking data**

DP0315	ADDRESS	Electronic localisation	Electronic banking data	The internet protocol address linked to the transaction or activity in question OR The internet protocol address at the time the business relationship established And the device identification numbers.	FIU-required	

This data point, classified as "*FIU-required*", requires the reporting entity to provide electronic localisation data, namely the IP address linked to the transaction, activity or establishment of the business relationship, together with device identification numbers.

AMAFI considers that this data point should be completed only where the electronic localisation data are both relevant to the substantiation of the suspicion and actually available to the reporting entity, because such data are not necessarily available at the reporting stage.

AMAFI further observes that, as a "*FIU-required*" data point, DP0315 may be activated by some FIUs and not others, which would create a risk of divergence across Member States for a field intended to contribute to harmonised reporting.

AMAFI therefore invites the AMLA to provide that DP0315 is to be completed only where the electronic localisation data are both relevant to the suspicion and available to the reporting entity, and to ensure that its use remains consistent across FIUs.

- **Data Point DP0501 – Connection between account and obliged entity**

DP0501	ACCOUNT	Account Relationship	connection between account and obliged entity	Connection between the holder of the account and the reporting obliged entity	Technically required	

This data point requires the reporting entity to characterise the connection between the account holder and the reporting entity and is classified as "*Technically required*". The interpretative note explains that its purpose is to determine the treatment of the subsequent data points, depending on whether customer due diligence has been performed in relation to the account holder, and that a "Non-Customer account" value is provided to cover situations where the reporting entity holds no data on any subject linked to the account.

AMAFI would welcome clarification as to how these two propositions are to be reconciled. The interpretative note states, on the one hand, that the account holder is in a relationship with the reporting entity and is expected to be reported as a natural or legal person; and, on the other hand, that a "Non-Customer account" value is needed for cases where the reporting entity holds no data on any subject linked to the account. It is unclear how a reporting entity could hold no data whatsoever on the holder of an account while that account is nonetheless in a relationship with it, since an account held by the reporting entity presupposes, by construction, that the holder has been onboarded and subject to at least some due diligence.

AMAFI therefore invites the AMLA to clarify the situations envisaged by DP0501, and in particular the "non-customer account" value, to remove this apparent inconsistency.

- **Data Point DP0505 – Account status**

DP0505	ACCOUNT	Account Details	account status	Operational status of an account as at the date of reporting	Mandatory if available	DP0501 - Customer, occasional customer, prospective customer

This data point requires the reporting entity to indicate the operational status of the account at the date of the report (active, closed, suspended/frozen, dormant, blocked or other), and is classified as "*Mandatory if available*". AMAFI notes that DP0104 and DP0206 already capture the operational status of the business relationship.

AMAFI observes that, where the business relationship rests on a single account, the status of that account and the status of the relationship coincide, so that DP0505 and DP0104/DP0206 would then capture the same information. Where several accounts are attached to the same relationship, by contrast, each account has its own status, distinct from that of the relationship.

AMAFI therefore invites the AMLA to clarify the articulation between DP0505 and DP0104/DP0206, and to avoid requiring the same information twice where the business relationship rests on a single account.

- **Data Points DP0506 to DP0507 – Suspended account**

DP0506	ACCOUNT	Account Details	Suspension end date	The date when suspension (or other measure preventing the execution of transactions) ends	Mandatory	DP0505 - Suspended/Frozen, Blocked
DP0507	ACCOUNT	Account Details	Suspended Amount	The amount of funds (in the currency of the account) subject to Suspension	Mandatory	DP0505 - Suspended/Frozen, Blocked

These data points, classified as "*Mandatory*" where the account status (DP0505) is "*Suspended/Frozen*" or "*Blocked*", require the reporting entity to indicate the date on which a suspension, or another measure preventing the execution of transactions, ends (DP0506) and the amount of funds subject to that suspension (DP0507).

AMAFI considers that further clarification is needed as to the situations of suspension these data points are intended to cover. In particular, the AMLA should clarify whether they are limited to situations of asset freezing and restrictive measures, including those decided as a result of incomplete customer due diligence, or whether they extend to other forms of suspension.

AMAFI further considers that a "*Mandatory*" treatment is not appropriate for these data points, as the end date of a suspension in particular may not be known to the reporting entity, a suspension having by nature no predetermined term.

AMAFI therefore invites the AMLA to clarify the scope of the suspension situations referred to in DP0506 and DP0507, and to reclassify these data points as "*Optional*".

- **Data Points DP0509 to DP0510 – Account balance**

DP0509	ACCOUNT	Account Details	account balance	The balance on the account(s)	Mandatory if available	
DP0510	ACCOUNT	Account Details	account balance timestamp	The date and timestamp related to the reported account balance	Mandatory if available	DP0509

These data points, classified as "*Mandatory if available*", require the reporting entity to provide the balance of the account(s) being reported (DP0509) and the date and time associated with that balance (DP0510).

AMAFI considers that an account balance is a point-in-time figure, accurate only as at the timestamp recorded under DP0510 and liable to change immediately thereafter, so that its reporting is of limited relevance to the substance of the suspicion. Requiring it on a systematic basis would create technical and data-quality constraints for reporting entities without demonstrated added value for the FIUs.

AMAFI therefore invites the AMLA to reclassify these data points as "*Optional*".

- **Data Point DP0519 – Additional information**

DP0519	ACCOUNT	Other information	Additional information	Indication of any additional information related to the account	Mandatory if available	

This data point allows the reporting entity to provide any additional information relating to the account, in free-text form, and is classified as "*Mandatory if available*".

AMAFI observes that the very purpose of this data point is to enable the reporting entity to provide complementary information that it considers relevant, on the basis of its own assessment. A "mandatory if available" treatment sits uneasily with that purpose, as a field intended to capture whatever the entity deems useful should not be one whose omission could be regarded as a shortcoming in its reporting obligations. AMAFI notes, moreover, that the equivalent "other information" data points for natural persons (DP0136) and legal entities (DP0224) are classified as "optional", so that DP0519 is treated inconsistently with data points of the same nature.

AMAFI therefore invites the AMLA to classify DP0519 as "*Optional*", in line with the treatment of the equivalent data points DP0136 and DP0224.

- **Data Point DP0603 – Unique transaction reference**

DP0603	TRANSACTION	Transaction Identification	unique transaction reference	The unique code used to identify a transfer of funds or other type of asset	Mandatory if available	

This data point requires the reporting entity to provide the reference or identifier of the transaction, and is classified as "*Mandatory if available*".

AMAFI considers that this data point calls for clarification, as the interpretative note does not specify which reference is expected. A transaction may bear several identifiers, such as the internal reference assigned by the reporting entity or a reference assigned by the FIU.

AMAFI therefore invites the AMLA to specify which reference is expected under DP0603.

- **Data Point DP0606 – Transaction completion date and time**

DP0606	TRANSACTION	Transaction Details	transaction completion date and time	The date and time in which funds or other types of assets became available to the subject	Technically mandatory	DP0616 - Completed

This data point requires the reporting entity to indicate the date and time on which the funds or other assets became available to the subject. It is classified as "*Technically mandatory*" where the transaction status (DP0616) is "completed".

AMAFI observes that the completion date and time may not always be known to the reporting entity, in particular where it is not in a position to ascertain the moment at which the funds were made available to the beneficiary, or in the case of transactions with deferred settlement. As the data point is "technically mandatory", the unavailability of this information could prevent the submission of the report, even though the reporting entity cannot reasonably be expected to hold it in every case.

AMAFI therefore invites the AMLA to provide that, where the completion date and time are not available to the reporting entity, this should not prevent the submission of the report, and to reclassify the data point accordingly as "*Optional*".

- **Data Point DP0610 – Transaction currency exchange rate**

DP0610	TRANSACTION	Transaction Details	Transaction currency exchange rate	Rate between the currency in which the transaction was conducted and the local currency at the day and time the transaction has been initiated or completed	Mandatory	DP0608, DP0609 (not equal)

This data point requires the reporting entity to indicate the exchange rate between the transaction currency and the local currency. It is classified as "*Mandatory*" where the transaction currency (DP0608) and the amount in local currency (DP0609) differ.

AMAFI observes that, technically, payment messages specify the conversion of the amounts, but not the exchange rate itself. That rate is in any event derivable from the transaction amount and the amount in local currency, which are already reported under DP0607 and DP0609, so that the FIU is able, where necessary, to reconstruct it directly from data already at its disposal.

Requiring the exchange rate as a separate mandatory field could therefore lengthen the time needed to complete the report. AMAFI further questions the relevance of requiring this data point at the initial reporting stage.

AMAFI therefore invites the AMLA to reclassify DP0610 as an "*Optional*" data point.

- **Data Point DP0808 – Activity purpose**

DP0808	NON TRANSACTIONAL ACTIVITY	Activity details	activity purpose	A description of the activity. This can include but is not limited to purpose of the activity as stated by the customer.	Mandatory if available	

This data point requires the reporting entity to provide a description of the activity, which may include the purpose of the activity as stated by the customer, and is classified as "*Mandatory if available*". AMAFI notes that DP0801 already requires details about the nature of the activity linked to the suspicion.

AMAFI considers that this data point calls for clarification, as it would otherwise appear redundant with DP0801. The definitions of the two data points largely overlap, and it is unclear what DP0808 is intended to capture that would not already fall within the description of the nature of the activity under DP0801.

AMAFI therefore invites the AMLA to clarify the intended scope of DP0808 as distinct from DP0801, so as to avoid any redundancy between the two data points.

- **Data Points DP0901 to DP0902 – Object type**

DP0901	OBJECT	Object type	Object type	Type of object concerned by the transaction or activity reported.	Technically required	
DP0902	OBJECT	Object information	Registration or immatriculation number, including cadastral information	Any information allowing to precisely identify an object, such as a registration number, immatriculation or cadastral information.	Mandatory if available	DP0901

DP0901 requires the reporting entity to indicate the type of object concerned by the transaction or activity reported, and is classified as "*Technically required*"; DP0902 requires the registration, immatriculation or cadastral number identifying that object, and is classified as "*Mandatory if available*".

AMAFI considers that these data points call for clarification, in particular as to how an "object" is to be determined. The list of object types set out in the interpretative note is non-exhaustive, as it includes an "Other" value, so that reporting entities lack a clear basis for deciding whether the underlying asset of a transaction should qualify as an "object" to be reported. As DP0901 is technically required, this uncertainty is liable to affect the submission of the report itself.

AMAFI therefore invites the AMLA to provide, at the least, criteria that reporting entities should take into account in determining whether an underlying asset qualifies as an "object", such as its value or its vulnerability to money laundering according to the relevant national or sectoral risk assessments, and to reclassify DP0901 from "*Technically required*" to "*Mandatory if available*".