#### FSA update – MSON 2021

#### 26 March 2021 Colin Manley & Andrew Kermode



ISLE OF MAN FINANCIAL SERVICES AUTHORITY

Lught-Reill Shirveishyn Argidoil Ellan Vannin

#### Contents

- Supervisory model and engagement
  - Life cycle of a firm
  - Assessment and engagement
- Supervisory intervention and firm remediation
  - Triggers
  - Types of intervention (the "toolkit")
  - Outcomes
- Key observations and learning points
  - Governance
  - Risk appetite / business model
- Whistleblowing



## Life cycle of a firm



Remediation & resolution can overlap with intervention & / or enforcement



#### Assessment and engagement: overview

- Assessment of a firm is based around RISK and IMPACT
- To assess Risk, the common approach is to consider Inherent Risk (the risks a firm runs before mitigation) and the quality of Governance, Management and Controls.



 Supervisory tools can then be deployed to address the higher residual risks, and the focus may differ depending on a firm's impact rating. These supervisory tools may include intervention measures.

#### Assessment: information sources





#### Engagement

- Generally, higher impact or higher risk = more engagement
- Engagement is **targeted** and not strictly formulaic need to be flexible
- Engagement model includes:-
  - Inspections: targeted programme
  - Thematic work (this may include an inspection element)
  - Periodic meetings: can be focused on specific topics, or with specific functions (e.g. compliance, internal audit, independent directors)
- Inspection process has been reviewed and is now being piloted, key changes include:-
  - More time for desk based review of material (pre inspection)
  - Consistent presentation of reports across all sectors
  - Focus on observations and conclusions only (not setting actions)
  - Firm must put in place an appropriate action plan

# Intervention / remediation: why is this happening?

- Firm self identifies and reports material issues
- Most sectors should be mature and understand the requirements
- Material deficiencies observed despite cycles of inspections
- Too many instances where remediation of historic issues has not been effective, hasn't stuck or obvious that lessons not learned
- Some pockets of cultural / governance issues remain
  - Tone from top and / or adequacy of oversight
- Business model / risk not supported by suitable or adequate resources

We must have appropriate tools, and credible deterrents, to use, where needed



## Intervention / remediation: triggers

- Inspection work
  - Uses other sources of information to drive focus
- Intelligence
  - Tip offs / other regulators / open source
  - Whistleblowing
  - May itself lead to an inspection
- Self reporting by firms
  - Encouraged (open and transparent)
  - Root cause?
  - Materiality



## Intervention / remediation: approach



## Intervention / remediation: toolkit

- Discussion and agreement (do not use formal powers)
- Directions, for example:
  - to do something (to address a problem); or
  - refrain from continuing to do something (to stop the problem getting worse)
- Appoint a third party to prepare a report, or advise, on the affairs of a firm, for example:
  - To review past matters and current state of play
  - To act as a "signatory" for specific business ("no objection process")
  - To review a firm's remediation and provide third party assurance effectiveness of changes
- Use directions and appointments in *combination*
- Can use public statements
- The above are supervisory powers, not enforcement
- Remediation Panel considers approach adopted participants from across supervision & enforcement for more serious matters



#### Intervention / remediation: outcomes

- 1. Firm moves back into "compliance"; intervention tools removed
- Firm needs more time for change; intervention tools varied / adapted (phased) – firm eventually moves back into "compliance"
- 3. May still lead to enforcement investigation (firm or individuals) or public statements
- 4. Firm cannot remediate successfully other action pursued, likely to include enforcement



## Key observations / learnings

- Governance
  - Tone from the top
  - Lack of board oversight
  - Conflicts management
  - Willingness to address issues flagged internally
  - Independent challenge / health checks
  - Willingness to change and learn from third parties
- Risk appetite / business model
  - Adequacy of resources
  - De-risking (AML/CFT)
  - The role of compliance



## Whistleblowing

- Firm requirements
  - Frameworks required for all regulated entities; clearly communicated to staff
  - Encourage the reporting of improper or unlawful behaviour
  - Internal reporting structure; staff to raise concerns directly with the Authority if they feel not being adequately addressed internally
  - Adequately and appropriately protect the whistle-blower from any negative repercussions arising from reporting in good faith, including confidentiality
  - Ensure that matters are considered objectively, and appropriate action taken



## Whistleblowing

- To the Authority
  - Ideally after raising directly with employer, and remain unsatisfied at end of process
  - FAQ on whistleblowing on FSA website
  - We will treat the communication sensitively and do our best to protect identity
  - Very important intelligence
  - Internal process to consider all reporting / disclosures; we will use the information to shape our work in a discrete manner
  - Can't inform whistle-blower what action taken; restricted information
  - The protection is under employment law; protected disclosure matter for employment tribunal

