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Abstract

Money laundering is a huge problem that is faced by financial institutions and banks are mandated by the government to have strict policies and procedures towards anti-money laundering reporting. The outcome of a complex investigation process is a Suspicious Activity Report (SAR) which is used by Financial Crimes Enforcement Network (FINCEN) to trace back criminals and to curb the money laundering activities. This thesis work involves developing a quality rating methodology for SAR reporting at the bank and rates the critical elements in determining the quality of a SAR. The results of the quality scoring mechanism have been validated by using Multivariate tools and techniques. Mahalanobis-Taguchi Strategy (MTS) and Principal Component Analysis (PCA) were used to come up with the measurement scale to distinguish the good and bad SARs and PCA was used to list the critical elements that were listed by the MTS approach. The results of the analysis were presented towards the end of the thesis and this methodology can be used to determine the quality rating of SARs.
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1.0 Overview of Anti-Money Laundering

“Money launderers subvert legitimate financial mechanisms and banking relationships by using them as protective covering for the movement of criminal proceeds and the financing of crime and terrorism, and, by so doing, can ... undermine the integrity of United States financial institutions and of global financing and trading systems upon which growth and prosperity depend…”

- USA PATRIOT ACT, Section 302(3)

Recent estimates suggest that around US$500 to 1 trillion is laundered worldwide annually by drug dealers, arm traffickers, and other criminals. Bank acts as gatekeepers for legitimate financial system and they serve to protect the system through their thorough vigilance on preventing organized crimes and terrorist financing. Banks play a major role in prevention, detection and reporting of money laundering activities. Patriot Act requires each financial institution – including broker-dealers, investment companies and insurance companies – to develop and institute and anti-money laundering compliance solutions that must, at a minimum:

- Include internal policies, procedures, and controls
- Designate a compliance officer to administrator and oversee the program
- Provide for on-going employee training; and
- Include an independent audit function to test the program

The law mandates all the commercial banks to file a Suspicious Activity Report (SAR) if any of the transactions supported by them is found to be suspicious. SAR will include the detailed information, such as contact information of the bank, the subject contact
information and a narration of why the investigator feels that the transaction is suspicious from the anti-money laundering policies and procedures.

The act also identified five types of special measures available to the Secretary of Treasure in dealing with a Primary Money Laundering Concern (PMLC).

- Recordkeeping and Reporting
- Information Relating to Beneficial Ownership
- Information Relating to Payable-Through Accounts
- Information Concerning Certain Correspondent Accounts
- Prohibitions or Conditions on Opening or Maintaining Certain correspondent or Payable-Through Accounts

1.1 Direct Beneficiaries

For financial institutions, the business environment has never been tougher. Globalization, convergence, consolidation and e-commerce have created a marketplace that is increasing in complexity with the speed of Moore’s law. And now that anti-terrorism legislation with provisions to combat money laundering has been signed into law by President Bush, the landscape promises to become even more challenging for financial institutions to navigate.

With regulatory requirements stepped up and extended throughout the industry as a result of the USA Patriot Act, N2 in the UK, and other national anti-money laundering regulations, financial institutions are facing a spate of new risks and responsibilities in the global fight against money laundering and fraud. Adding to their burdens in the

---

compliance battle is the increasing sophistication of the schemes used to perpetrate fraud, the fresh opportunities provided by e-commerce and other emerging business models and the exponential growth in recent years of transactions, accounts and remote customers. The stakes are as high as the challenges tough. Failure to stem incidents of money laundering—or even to simply investigate and report potentially suspicious activity—could result in civil or criminal action, reputation-killing negative publicity and stiff penalties that can stretch to multi-million dollar figures. In recent years, a number of financial institutions have incurred fines of $5, $10 and even $20 million dollars.

While banks, broker-dealers and exchanges are confronting some regulations specific to their individual industries, all will be required to develop anti-money laundering prevention policies, designate a compliance officer, establish a training program and set up a testing/audit function. In addition, financial institutions will be required to engage more actively in “know your customer” directives.

As a result, most financial institutions are realizing that their current monitoring and compliance systems are not capable of meeting the new demands. Financial institutions will be the direct beneficiary of the quality scoring mechanism for SARs that we try to implement This thesis will research into quality scoring techniques to make financial institution be in compliance with government regulation to avoid any possible violation and will also drive down the cost of managing an AML organization.

1.2 Indirect Beneficiaries

In response to terrorists’ attacks in order to strike at the source of terrorist funding, the Patriot Act sets broad parameters and ambitious goals for financial institutions to identify and prevent any possible money laundering activities.
So we see the indirect beneficiaries of our anti-money laundering solution will be government and people under the protection. Using the information provided by financial institutions, government agency can identify and prevent possible terrorists’ activity and improve homeland security.

1.3 System Description – A System Architect’s view

The picture described shows the cost-intent diagram of the system using OPM methodology. The holistic picture shows the various interfaces of the system and the cost and profit involved in constructing the entire system by identifying the beneficiaries, operand, intent, cost, profit, technologies, design and implementation aspects of the system.

Figure 1.3.0 Systems Architect View
1.3.1 Intent of the system

The intent of the system is to provide valuable information to the government in order to trace the money laundering suspects in the bank. The needs of the system is to capture the suspects who launder money illegally to different countries or different banks domestically and to trace the suspects back with the help of government systems.

![Diagram of System Operating Intent](image)

**Figure 1.3.1 Systems operating intent diagram**

1.3.2 Operating Intent of the system

The operating intent of the system is as shown in the above figure. The operating intent gives the various steps in the operations of the system to achieve its goals.

- Cases are created in the system for internal tracking in the system
• Backups are simultaneously created and contingency planning is also done for future uses.

• Investigation is done by the financial unit by use of advanced tools and techniques

• Interfacing with FBI to find any known suspects by name checking and suspect checking list with OFAC procedures

• Information exchanged with the FBI about the suspects who are laundering money

• Information submitted in the form of suspicious activity report to the government

• Suspect being traced back by financial crimes enforcement network.
2.0 Suspicious Activity Report

The final outcome of the investigative process is compiling the information generated in the form of a Suspicious Activity Report (SAR) which is filed to the Financial Crimes Enforcement Network (FINCEN). The information generated from the SAR filings play an important role in identifying the potential illegal activities thereby preventing the flow of illicit funds through our financial system. This information should be accurate and time critical and should include all the readily available information due to due diligence efforts. The SAR narrative contains information about 5W1H analysis which composes the elements of Who? What? When? Where? Why and How? These SARs are important for the law enforcement officials to track the criminals with the help of information provided in the report. The SAR has critical information regarding the money launderer and has a narrative portion which describes in detail about the activity that the person is engaged in and the mode of doing money laundering.

2.1 Why is SAR Quality Important?

Most of the financial Institutions are doing an excellent job of reporting suspicious activity, but still there is room for lot of improvements in the quality of the reporting procedure. The SAR’s that are being reported have no suspect identification or activity characterization and no sufficient narrative to explain why the activity was being reported. Investigators who do the money laundering investigation fill all the portions of SAR, but do not provide sufficient narrative for the “OTHER” portion of the SAR document which is critical for law enforcement officials to follow up. Inexperienced investigators add spread sheets and computer printouts for documentation and when this additional information is received at the Detroit Computing Center, narrative format is
key punched and all the additional information are not punched/ included with narrative. SAR which doesn’t provide a clear narration of the suspicious activity will tend to be of minimum use to law enforcement and this narrative portion is critical to law enforcement officials and care should be taken to fill this narrative portion of each SAR completely. Google search of SAR quality statistics reveals the following information  

During the year from July 1, 2002 to June 30, 2003, financial institutions (as defined by 31 CFR 103) filed approximately 300,000 SARs. The following issues were identified:
- Four percent were filed without a suspect name.
- Eight percent did not list an address for the suspect.
- Twenty-three percent did not provide the suspect’s social security number.
- Four percent did not provide any indication of what suspicious activity occurred.
- Six percent did not complete the narrative.

These are some critical quality elements for SAR reporting and SARs submitted without this information will not be useful for Law Enforcement in tracking the money laundering criminals. Financial Crimes Enforcement Network (FINCEN) stresses the importance of data elements in a SAR and mandates high quality SAR elements from all the financial institutions. If any of the information such as name, address of SSN is not available, then “unknown” or “not available” should be listed in the boxes provided on the SAR form. The SAR form is considered complete when all the information in the boxes are filled and there are no blank critical fields. Certain items are marked with an asterisk sign (⋆) which denotes that those elements are critical for the law enforcement

---

2 This statistics was taken from the “SAR Activity Review Trends, Tips and Issues – November 2003 edition”
officials to track the criminals. These fields might include Subject’s name, Identification and address, type of suspicious activity and the narrative.

By following these set of guidelines, the law enforcement can do its investigation in an efficient manner and this also helps in the following reasons

- It provides an indication that investigators at the bank considered all the elements and the “unknown” or “not available” data field indicates that the investigators at the bank were aware of the missing field. It helps to clear the ambiguity among law enforcement officials.
- Law enforcement understands that some data fields were missing during the time of reporting and it eliminates the need for FINCEN to call the bank for more details about the person.

2. 2 Research Objectives

2.2.1 Problem Statement

There is currently no quality assessment of the input to the AML investigation process Suspicious Transmittal Memo (STM) or one of the outcomes of the AML investigation process (SAR). The quality of the SAR impacts the law enforcement investigation’s completion time, the accuracy of the assessment for case opening, and the prioritization of the referral. The quality of the SAR is an input into the assessment performed by the Office of Comptroller of Currency (OCC) and impacts the AML audit rating. To be able to assess current baselines and the impact of process improvements, a quality assessment process must be established for SARs.
2.2.2 Objective

The following were set as the objectives of this thesis and a quality scoring mechanism was to be developed for suspicious activity reports as a result of my thesis work. The objectives were

1. Assess characterizes of STMs and SARs using Subject Matter Experts (SMEs) to define and weight quality assessment criteria and categories for STMs and SARs.
2. Assess OCC guidelines and/or recommendations regarding SAR requirements.
3. Develop an assessment tool that provides a scoring mechanism that can be applied to SARs to assess the quality of the product.
4. Validate the tool for reproducibility and repeatability of results.
5. Outline a procedure for the implementation of an ongoing measurement process.

2.3 Approach

I approached the problem challenge from two different perspectives. Since the problem of measuring quality of a SAR is an objective approach and it depends on the individual making the decision of whether the SAR is of good quality or not, I wanted to introduce a numerical rating system which can guide the audit department or be helpful in measuring the quality of the document. First part was a literature research on white papers to find the critical elements in measuring the quality of the document. I sought the help of subject matter experts and investigators who have been doing money laundering research for a long period of time to have some input for the critical variables in the SAR document. After several brainstorming meetings, we proposed a cause and effect matrix, which listed out 7 most important variables in measuring the quality of the document.
I wanted to verify the critical elements that were shortlisted by the subject matter experts and by using Robust Engineering methodologies, we were able to verify the critical elements for measuring the quality of a SAR. Mahalanobis Taguchi System (MTS) was used to measure the abnormal distances from the normal reference group, orthogonal arrays and Signal to Noise Ratio (S/N ratio) was developed to validate the scale developed by using Larger the Better S/N ratio. An alternative research approach known as the Principal Component Analysis (PCA) was used to compare the MTS methodology that was proposed. The research methodologies will be described in detail in the later portion of this thesis.

2.4 Organization of the Thesis

This thesis is based on the application of Mahalanobis Taguchi System for building a robust measurement scale. The first chapter gives a good overview of the Anti-money Laundering system and the role of bank in preventing money laundering. This chapter also explains about the intent and cost of an anti-money laundering system and shows the operating intent of the system. The second chapter provides a description of the suspicious activity report and the approach towards the problem statement. Third and fourth chapter will provide a literature overview of robust engineering methodologies and research approach of MTS and principal component research in detail. The fifth chapter provides conclusions and recommendations for future work.
3.0 Literature Review

3.1 Use of Robust methods in Measurement Scale

Genichi Taguchi introduced the concepts of Robust Engineering after several years of research and these techniques have been effectively used by many industries in providing a cost effective methodology and to optimize their operations processes. These concepts are called Taguchi methods.

According to Taguchi methods, the quality has been classified into

- Customer-driven quality
- Engineered Quality

While the customer quality deals with the quality from the customer’s perspective such as size and color, engineered quality deals with the engineering attributes of achieving the quality. Engineered Quality involves addressing the quality attributes that deviate from the ideal function. This thesis report uses Mahalanobis distance (MD) to analyze the quality of suspicious activity reports (SAR) and MD is similar to the engineered quality analysis, where in the abnormality or deviation is measured from a known reference group known as the Mahalanobis space.

This analysis makes use of Robust Engineering Methods to design Information Systems, which really involves the use of different patterns and to analyze the interactions between different variables. Development of such systems in a real world is a difficult and daunting task which needs to have predictions done accurately based on the information available in different systems. Such predictions need to be accurate and time sensitive and it is based on the multiple variables defining the systems (multidimensional systems). When the multidimensional measurement capabilities are not measured properly, they
can lead to inaccurate predictions causing the systems to fail. We have developed a multivariate measurement scale which measures the various conditions of multivariate systems so as to take appropriate actions. Mahalanobis distance is the measurement of distance by measuring the correlation between the variables. This distance is used for the construction of the scale and we use robust methods to measure the accuracy of such a scale. This strategy wherein the scale is constructed and accuracy is measured using robust methods is called MTS (Mahalanobis Taguchi Strategy)

3.2 Taguchi Methods

Taguchi methods are based on five principles which are as follows\(^3\).

- Measurement of Function using energy transformation
- Understanding the interaction between the control and noise factors in the system
- Use of Orthogonal arrays and Signal to Noise ratio for better efficiency and accuracy
- Two Step Optimization
- Tolerance design using quality loss function

\(^3\) Taguchi principles have been used here from book on “The Mahalanobis-Taguchi Strategy – A Pattern Recognition System by Genichi Taguchi and Rajesh Jugulum”
3.2.1 Measurement of Function using Energy Transformation

This principle states that it is necessary to find the ideal function that governs the system. Taguchi states that it is necessary to understand the system functionality in order to improve the product quality.

3.2.2 Understanding the interaction between control and noise factors in the system

This principle states that it is not necessary to understand the interactions between the control factors, but to understand the interactions between the control and noise factors to understand the system, and to build a robust design.

3.2.3 Use of orthogonal arrays and S/N ratios

Orthogonal Arrays are used to minimize the number of combination trials needed for the experiment. S/N ratios are needed to validate and improve the accuracy of the MTS system as it captures the magnitude of the real effects after including the effects of noise. Thus orthogonal arrays help to test all possible combinations efficiently and S/N ratios help to validate the measurement system.

3.2.4 Two Step Optimization

This involves two steps for the optimal design where in the first step is to maximize the S/N ratios and the second step is to adjust the sensitivity of the system to the desired level. This is usually done by adjusting the mean after the variability in the system is minimized.

3.2.5 Tolerance Design using Quality Loss function

This principle is based on the tolerance design and it involves quality loss function and quality engineering (QE) The first four principles use the concept of parameter design
and this principle states that the loss associated with the performance deviation is proportional to the square of the deviation.

### 3.3 Multivariate Diagnosis – Techniques and Tools review

There are several tools used to analyze multidimensional systems and the following section will discuss the benefits and limitations of such tools

#### 3.3.1 Principal Component Analysis

Principal component analysis is helpful in data reduction and data interpretation. The objectives of PCA is of two folds and it is given below

- To reduce the dimensionality of the data set
- To identify new underlying variables and interpret data

For example, if we have \( n \) components representing a system variability, we use \( k \) to explain the variability, so that \( k < n \). The \( k \) principal components are linear combination of \( n \) random variables. These linear combinations represent the selection of a new coordinate system obtained by rotating the original system to explain the variance-covariance structure through few linear combinations. The mathematical technique used in PCA is called the Eigen analysis which is used to solve the Eigen values and vectors of a square symmetric matrix with sum of squares and cross products.\(^4\) The limitation of Principal Component Analysis is that it is not helpful in reducing the dimensionality of original variables.

---

\(^4\) [http://www.fon.hum.uva.nl/praat/manual/Principal_component_analysis.html](http://www.fon.hum.uva.nl/praat/manual/Principal_component_analysis.html)
3.3.2 Stepwise Regression

In multivariate applications, Stepwise Regression is used for selection of a useful subset of variables by adding or excluding variables so that their contribution to the overall response variable might be determined. It is an iterative process and the variables that are added or removed by the user is most crucial in this process of iterations. This has limitations as it does not always guarantee the best subset regression model.

3.3.3 Test of Additional Information (Rao’s Test)

This test is to identify a set of useful variables by using Fisher’s linear discrimination function; subsets are tested for importance by the F-ratio. If the F-ratio is high, it denotes that the selected variables provide useful information and if the F-ratio is low, it indicates that the variables can be discarded. Subject matter experts select the subset of variables and try to apply the F-ratio test in order to determine the significant variables. There is a serious limitation in this method and F-ratio test cannot be adequate to decide the important variables.

3.3.4 Multiple Regression

In multiple Regression the dependent variable Y is estimated from a set of P independent variables X₁, X₂...Xₚ. Multiple regression is used to relate the several independent variables to a dependent or criterion variable and is based on least squares estimate method. It might be complex if the number of variables involved is high.
3.4 Mahalanobis Taguchi System (MTS)

The Mahalanobis distance (MD) is a single measure of degree of divergence in the mean values of different characteristics of a population by doing a correlation analysis between the variables in multidimensional systems. MD is very sensitive to the intervariable changes in the reference data, and it classifies the observation into different groups. In other words, MTS measures the nearness of unknown points from the mean point in a group. Mahalanobis measurement scale was developed by an Indian Statistician P.C Mahalanobis and it is used to measure distances between variables in multidimensional space. It is much accurate than other scales such as Euclidean scale, because correlation between the variables is considered in this scale and this scale represents the distance between the variables in quantitative terms. Euclidean distance is also used in measurement of unknown point from group mean point, but there are two significant disadvantages.

- Euclidean distance does not provide a statistical measurement of the fit between the unknown and reference set.
- Euclidean distance doesn't account for the distribution of points

3.4.1 Objectives of using a MTS scaling mechanism

The objectives of MTS are to measure the abnormality by introducing a scale which is based on all the input characteristics. The scale is constructed by dividing the original distance by k number of variables and by creating a reference group called as the Mahalanobis space (MS)
A reference scale is needed for measurements to be made. For a single system, a measurement scale or a reference point can be easily created, where in for a multiple variable system, the reference point is created with help of group of observations. Zero point is used as the reference point of scale and the distances are measured from this scale. These set of observations are called Mahalanobis distance and these observations are similar and not same. The next step in MTS is validating the accuracy of the scale. For the observations outside the Mahalanobis space, the distances are measured from the center of the group depending on the mean, standard deviation and correlations depending on the group. The observations other than the normal group have a larger distance and hence to measure the accuracy of the scale, we use a Signal-to-Noise ratio. S/N is used to measure the accuracy of the predicted variables and it is used to measure the correlation between the input variables to the output variables in the presence of noise factors in the system. For an accurate system, there should be good correlation between the predicted variables to the input variables. Mahalanobis distance is used to accurately measure the important input signals/variables that might affect the prediction variables and S/N ration measures the accuracy of the prediction variables. In a multidimensional system, there will be a lot of combination to be tested and hence it will be difficult to test all the possible combinations. Orthogonal Arrays (OA) can be used to predict the important variables by minimizing the number of variables to be tested. MTS assigns the variables to the column of Orthogonal Array and based on this OA, important variables are identified in the system.
Mahalanobis distance calculation

MTS is calculated by following equation

\[ MD = \frac{1}{k} Z_i Z_i^T C^{-1} \]

Where \( Z_i \) is the standardized vector for values of \( X_i = 1..K \)

\( C \) is the correlation matrix

\( K \) is the number of variables

\( T \) is the transpose of the vector

3.4.2 Gram-Schmidt’s Orthogonalization process

In MTS, we measure the degree of abnormality and usually, higher the distance, higher the abnormality or severity in measurement scale. The higher distance can be an indicator of good or bad abnormality and it depends on the situation. So it is extremely important to determine the direction to distinguish between a good and a bad abnormality.

3.4.3 Direction of Abnormality in MTS

MTS can be very helpful to identify the abnormal conditions from a reference group, but the direction of abnormality is important to determine before determining it as a good or a bad abnormality. For example, in a student admission system, a group of students can stand as a abnormal condition and it should be analyzed whether the abnormality is in a good or bad way. If the abnormality is in a good way, then scholarships can be given. But the direction of the abnormality cannot be determined by using the inverse of correlation matrix which is MTS. MTGS (Gram-Schmidt) method is helpful to determine the direction of abnormalities.
3.4.4 Stages in constructing a MTS

There are four stages involved in constructing MTS. They are

Constructing a MTS scale

On a higher level, this stage involves selecting the variables so that they are uniform and using the Mahalanobis space as a reference point for the scale. The variables are defined and the corresponding data for all the variables are selected. The standardized values of the variables are computed. The Mahalanobis Distance (MD) for all observations is calculated by the inverse of the correlation matrix and the base for the measurement scale is determined.

Validation of MTS approach

On a higher level, this stage involves identifying the conditions outside the space and measuring the Mahalanobis distance to see if they validate the subject matter expert’s opinion. We also validate the accuracy of the scale using S/N ratio. The abnormal conditions are determined and the MD’s corresponding to the abnormal conditions are calculated. This is calculated by using the correlation matrix of the normal variables by normalizing the abnormal conditions using the mean and Standard Deviation. The MD of an abnormal scale would have higher values and this validates the MTS approach.

Identify the critical variables

On a higher level, this stage involves finding out the useful set of variables using orthogonal arrays and S/N ratios. S/N provides an important contribution in finding out the critical variables in the MTS approach. The gain in the S/N ratio is helpful in determining the useful set of variables.
Monitoring the useful variables

This stage is used for monitoring the scale to check if any appropriate action needs to be taken. Threshold conditions are set and corrective action is taken based on the values of MD.

3.5 Use of Orthogonal Arrays in MTS

OA is used in design of experiments to minimize the number of experiments and to determine the effect of several factors and required interactions. Orthogonal Arrays are efficient tools to test multifactor experimentation. The variables can be identified using OA’s and can the variables are assigned to different columns of an array. For all the possible combinations, MD is calculated and accuracy of the scale is determined by using S/N ratio.

3.5.1 Signal to Noise ratio

S/N ratio will be highly useful to measure the accuracy of predicted variables. S/N ratios are calculated with all possible combinations in orthogonal Array based on the Mahalanobis distance outside the group. The S/N ratios are calculated at level 1 (presence) and level 2 (absence). Signal to Noise ratio is useful in understanding the magnitude of real effects after making adjustments to noise. The S/N ratio should be higher to have very high accuracy levels and these three types of S/N ratios are used. They are

- Larger-the-better
- Nominal-the-best
- Dynamic type.
The larger the better S/N ratio is used if the level of abnormality is not known. Nominal the best type of S/N ratios are used if the reference has a mixture of normal and abnormal variables. When the levels of abnormal are known, dynamic type is used.

3.6 Principal Component Analysis

Principal Component Analysis (PCA)\(^5\) is a multivariate analysis where in the data is rotated so that there is maximum variability projected on the axes. PCA\(^6\) aims at reducing a large number of variables into a smaller set which contains as much information as the large set. This is done by transforming the correlated variables into a set of uncorrelated variables which are linear combinations of the original variables. There are combinations of variables and the first principal component is the combination of variables which has the maximum amount of variation. There can lot of different combinations and PCA is used to reduce the dimensionality of the data set by retaining as much information as possible. PCA is the projection of observations along the orthogonal axes which is defined by the original variables. The first axis accounts for the maximum variation, the second axis contains the second most maximum variation and is perpendicular to the first axis, the third axis contains the third most maximum variation perpendicular to first and second axis. However if there is no correlation between the variables, then PCA has limitations in converting them into uncorrelated variables and hence the dimensionality can’t be reduced.

PCA can be used to

- Reduce the number of variables

\(^5\) http://www.eng.man.ac.uk/mech/merg/Research/datafusion.org.uk/pca.html
\(^6\) http://www.itl.nist.gov/div898/handbook/pmc/section5 PMC55.htm
3.6.1 Covariance Matrix

Standard deviation and Variance can analyze the data in a one dimensional way which tells that you can do a statistical analysis independent of the other dimensions. However if the analysis needs to be done with respect to each other's dimension, Covariance should be used. Covariance is a measure between 2 dimensions and if there are 3 dimensions, we measure covariance between (x, y), (x, z), (y, z) dimensions. If covariance is positive, it denotes that both dimensions increase together. If covariance is negative, when one dimension increases, then other dimension decreases. If covariance is zero, then the two dimensions are independent of each other. The covariance values are created and are put into a matrix form which is known as the covariance matrix. The important point to notice here is that covariance of (x, y) is equal to covariance of (y, x).

3.6.2 Steps in Principal Component Analysis

The following steps are done to find the principal component and to reduce the dimensions in the data set.

Collecting data

Step 1 involves collection of all data elements required for the analysis. The data can be of any dimensions and we define the original variables in the data set.

Subtracting the mean

Step 2 involves subtracting the mean across the dimensions. For example, if we have x and y dimensions, we subtract x elements mean from each of x values and y elements mean from each of y values. This produces a data set in which mean is zero.

---

**Covariance matrix calculation**

The covariance matrix is calculated to know the relations between the dimensions and this helps to determine the type of inter-relation between the x and y elements (positive, negative or zero).

**Calculating the Eigen values and Eigen vectors**

It is important that then Eigen vectors are unit vectors for PCA analysis and provides useful information about data patterns. The eigen vectors are plotted on a graph and they are perpendicular to each other. The eigen vector with highest eigen value is the principle component of the set and is the most important element between the data dimensions.

**Choosing Components and Feature vector**

After the eigen vectors are found, they are arranged with their eigen values ranked from highest to lowest and this helps to reduce the components that have lesser significance. This involves forming the feature vector which is a collection of p eigen vectors from n eigen vectors such that p < n and thus the dimensionality of the data set is reduced picking the most significant elements.
4.0 Assessing quality of a document
The context of use of information in any document is the key to accurately defining its quality. It is therefore not enough to just identify the dimensions used for accessing quality. Quality needs to be accessed within the context of the generation and use of the information. It also greatly depends on the usefulness of data from the user's point of view. "Quality data cannot be assessed independent of the people who use data"

When assessing such a suspicious transmittal memo for quality, there are certain very important keywords, facts, data or information that an investigator is looking for. In doing so, he is looking to gather vital information to proceed with the case. So, a quality rating should in effect mimic the estimate of a document by an experienced investigator. What information an investigator looks for when going through a document will therefore be the keywords or patterns that a rating system should search for when estimating quality.

In general for any document, it is important to identify the factors we are going to measure, and to consider how much each of these factors is important, that is, what will be the weight for each factor. Multiplying the quality rating of each of these factors by its weight will give the actual value. And a sum of these values will ultimately be the quality rating we assign for a document. Although factors like storage methods, retrieval, security, accessibility, availability, navigation and others are important, we will be considering the information or content in the document only, for estimating its value from an investigators point of view.

So, the primary elements we will consider are:
Element Weight:

Simple Ratio

Simple Ratio is the ratio of desired outcomes to the total outcomes. Since the exceptions are measured in a quality testing, simple ratio is the ratio of undesired outcomes to the total outcomes in a scenario. Some of the traditional form of data quality metrics such as free-of-error, complete and consistency take this dimension of simple ratio.

Free-of-error

Metric

Free-of-error represents the accurate data representation and is calculated as a ratio of the number of data units in error to the total number of data units subtracted from 1. To establish the free-of-error ratio, we need to establish or clearly define as what constitutes a data unit and what constitutes an error.

Completeness

Completeness can be viewed from three different dimensions namely

Schema Completeness

This is an abstract level and it is defined as the degree in which the entities and attributes are not missing from schema
Data level completeness defines the column completeness as a function of missing values in the column of a table.

Population completeness

Population completeness includes the range of data elements that should be present in a column to ensure population completeness. If certain data elements are missing from a column, it can lead to population completeness.

**Metric**

This can be calculated by measuring the number of incomplete items to total number of items and subtracting from 1

Consistency

Consistency can be measured by assuring that data is consistent of same values across different tables.

**Min or Max operation**

To handle dimension that require aggregation of multiple data indicators, minimum or maximum operators can be applied. Two variables that make use of minimum operations are believability and appropriate amount of data

Believability

*Believability* is the extent to which data is regarded as true and credible. Among other factors, it may reflect an individual’s assessment of the credibility of the data source, comparison to a commonly accepted standard and previous experience.

Metric

Each of these variables is rated on a scale from 0 to 1, and overall believability is then
assigned as the minimum value of the three. Assume the believability of the data
source is rated as 0.6; believability against a common standard is 0.8; and believability
based on experience is 0.7. The overall believability rating is then 0.6 (the lowest
number) As indicated earlier, this is a conservative assessment.

**Appropriate amount of data**

A working definition of the *appropriate amount of data* should reflect the data
quantity being neither too little nor too much.

**Metric**

A general metric that embeds this tradeoff is the minimum of two simple ratios: the ratio
of the number of data units provided to the number of data units needed, and the ratio of
the number of data units needed to the number of data units provided.

**Timeliness**

*Timeliness* reflects how up-to-date the data is with respect to the task it is being used for.

**Metric**

Timeliness can be measured by the metric of one minus the ratio of currency to volatility
Currency is defined as the age plus the delivery time minus the input time. Volatility
refers to the length of time data remains valid; delivery time refers to when data is
delivered to the user; input time refers to when data is received by the system; and age
refers to the age of the data when first received by the system.

**Accessibility**

A dimension reflecting ease of data attainability.
Metric
The metric emphasizes the time aspect of accessibility and is defined as the maximum value of two terms: 0 or one minus the time interval from request by user to delivery to user divided by the time interval from request by user to the point at which data is no longer useful.

Weighted Average
For the multivariate case, an alternative to the min operator is a weighted average of variables. If a company has a good understanding of the importance of each variable to the overall evaluation of a dimension, for example, then a weighted average of the variables is appropriate. To insure the rating is normalized, each weighting factor should be between zero and one, and the weighting factors should add to one. Regarding the believability example mentioned earlier, if the company can specify the degree of importance of each of the variables to the overall believability measure, the weighted average may be an appropriate form to use.

4. 1 Assessment Techniques
To use the subjective and objective metrics to improve organizational data quality
requires three steps

- Performing subjective and objective data quality assessments;
- Comparing the results of the assessments, identifying discrepancies, and determining root causes of discrepancies;
- Determining and taking necessary actions for improvement.

Information Quality (IQ) is one of the important aspects of any investigative process. The input to the investigative process (STMs) and the output of the investigative process (SARs) is heavily dependent on the information quality of the STMs that is submitted by various banking centers and business units all around the country. If the information quality is low, there might be a substantial delay in the process of investigation trying to identify the required information for the investigation. So the problem of low IQ is one of the pressing problems for Anti-money laundering process and we will discuss about the various methods of assessing quality scores and the key elements of information quality for SARs.

IQ scoring is considered difficult because the scoring is of subjective nature. User is an important source of Information Quality metadata. It is the user’s expertise that decides that whether the information is good or not. In case of an extremely subjective content like STMs, the main element for scoring IQ is the understandability of the document and its usefulness to the investigative process.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Element</th>
<th>Weight</th>
<th>Assessment method</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Accuracy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consistency</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timeliness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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We will discuss about the key IQ criterions for the scoring process.

### 4.1.1 Subjective Criteria

- Concise Representation of the event
- Interpretability of the event
- Relevancy to the investigation
- Understandability of the comments
- Value added to the investigative process
4.1.2 Objective Criteria

The scores of the objective IQ can be determined by analysis of the information. So at this stage, we analyze the SARs for the following parameters. These methods should not be much time consuming and it should be updated with new scores on a regular basis.

- Completeness of the SAR received
- Responsiveness of the submitter
- Usefulness of the documentation
- Reliability of the information in the SAR
- Timeliness of the SAR received
- Accuracy of the information

Process methodology for subjective criteria

Understandability doesn’t have an obvious unit and so care should be taken to define the rule when defining it as well as assigning it. This rule should be well described; intuitive and it should be easy for the subject matter experts (SME) to assign appropriate scores. These scores have a range of 1-10 and should be clearly mentioned to the SME’s.

Examples of good and bad write-ups should be defined as a part of the training process

Objective Criteria

To assess the precise score, sampling techniques can be used to reduce the time consuming process of evaluating all the SAR’s. This score should be continuously monitored for improvement of IQ. Assessment can be done with respect to the user of the information as well as with respect to the information source itself.
4.2 Data quality elements

Data unit

Definition

Data unit is a predefined unit of data whose quality is being assessed (Ballou et al. 1998). Data unit may consist of one or more components and data unit can be a number or a record or a file or a spreadsheet or a report.

Data unit can be a predefined data definition that specifies the items in the data unit and their format. For example, a SAR can have data elements such as Account number, SSN and Address. Account numbers should be numerical, SSN should be a nine digit numerical number and Address can be twenty alphanumerical characters.

Completeness

Definition

Data unit is complete, if each of the data items constituting the data unit has been assigned a value conforming to the data definition for data item. If they are not, data unit is incomplete.

Examples of Incompleteness

- If SSN in the above example contains a 8 digit number instead of 9, the data unit is said to be incomplete.

- Data unit is said to be incomplete if it contains only Account number, SSN but not for the address.
Structural and Content Completeness

Ballou and Pazer (2003) present a definition of completeness that has two components. The metrics for each of these two components are

- Structural
- Content

Structural Completeness = Values that are recorded / Values that could have been recorded

Content Completeness = Content that is conveyed / Content that could have been conveyed.

Accuracy

Accuracy is based on the data quality dimension of garbling (Wand and Wang, 1996)

Definition

Given that the data unit is complete, the data unit is incorrect if either of the two following conditions holds

- The data unit maps back to meaningless real world state
- The data unit maps back to wrong real world state.

Example

From our previous example, account number that maps to the correct data definition, but a non-existing account in the bank. The data is complete, but not accurate. The account number can be satisfying the completeness criteria of data definition, but it might be garbled making it useless. Even if the account number exists in the bank, it is not the correct account number for the record/data unit. Hence the data is complete, but not accurate.
Time Related Quality

This section can be treated in terms on currency and volatility.

Currency

Currency is the time duration from the time, the real world state changes to the time when the information system is updated. It is defined as the “age of the output information” (Kriebel, 1979)

Volatility

Volatility is the rate of change of real world system or the time for which data is valid (Ballou and Pazer, 1985)

The other time related dimensions would be Timeliness, Currency and age of the data. Ballou and Pazer defined timeliness as when “recorded data value is not out of date” and Kriebel defined timeliness as “the availability of the information suitable to use” For our example, timeliness would be the minimum 30 day period that the SAR must be investigated from the day suspicious activity is detected.

Timeliness is a data quality dimension and it should be user dependent. Any function that measures the timelines factor should capture the user’s view of timeliness.
4.3 Critical element to be evaluated for assessing quality of SAR

According to Financial Crimes Enforcement Network, SAR document should have the following characteristics. They are as follows.

- Clear and accurate
- Concise
- Thorough
- Whether crime committed or continues to be committed information

There is a 5W-1H analysis that is described as a part of best practices for SAR reporting. The individual elements of the 5W-1H analysis were decomposed based on system architecting principles and they are as shown below.

Who

- Suspects
  - Relation with other suspects
  - Address (primary)
    - Other addresses (p.o.box, apt numbers, etc.)
- SSN
- Passport #
- Drivers license #
- Occupation
- Position/Title
- Nature of Business
Instruments involved

- Wire transfers
- Letters of Credit
- Travelers Checks
- Bank Drafts
- Casinos

Flow of Funds

- Origination
- Beneficiary
- All account numbers involved within Bank
- Account numbers at other institution
  - Name
  - Location
  - Are any MSB’s involved
  - Foreign and International accounts

When

- Date of activity – individual date and amount
- Period of activity
- (No tables/objects/ preformatted)

Why
• Industry/business (casinos, mortgage, etc…)

• Nature of activities of business of similar customers.

• How is our customer different?

How

• Picture of suspicious activity
  
  o Structuring
  
  o Wires
  
  o Large cash transactions
  
  o Unusual / Different business

• Beneficiary

• Date and Destination

• Amount transferred

• Accounts involved

• Frequency

Office of Foreign Assets Control verification

• Is suspect a citizen of OFAC list of countries?

Necessity

A SAR submitted should have the following characteristics. It should be

  • Clear and accurate in description
  
  • Concise enough without any irrelevancy
  
  • Thorough
- Whether the crime is committed
- Whether crime continues to be committed.

Information in a SAR

- Who is reported?
- What is reported?
- When was the crime committed?
- Where was the crime committed?
- Why is the crime being reported?
- How was the crime committed?

WHO

Suspect(s)  Occupation  Position/Title  Nature of Business

 Relation with suspect(s)

 Address (Primary)  Other address (P.O Box, Apt Numbers)

 Identification (Passport, Driv.Lic, SSN, DOB)

WHAT

CASH INSTRUMENTS

Wire Transfer  Traveler checks/Drafts  Deposit box  M.O  Casinos

Flow of funds
4.4 SAR Factor Scoring Analysis

The above information quality scoring elements were analyzed using subject matter experts and our team came with 7 important elements to analyze the quality of SAR narrative. The following seven elements and their appropriate scoring are shown below.

The definition of different elements is given below.

- Completeness- All the necessary fields should be filled and must agree with the Bank’s database.
- Accuracy- The data must exist in the Bank’s database and correspond to the subject in question.
- **Timeliness** - Timeliness is the time that it takes from the point that the activity or transaction is found to be suspicious by the investigator.

- **Objectivity** - Results should be based on “who, what, why, when, where and how” and not on speculation.

- **Relevancy** - Results should only contain facts that correspond to the decision of the case.

- **Understandability** - SAR should be easy to read and follow.

- **Concise** - SAR should be clear and succinct.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ELEMENTS</th>
<th>WEIGHT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Completeness</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accuracy</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timeliness</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Objectivity</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relevancy</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understandability</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concise</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.4 SAR element Scoring Sheet
The individual break down of scores and its corresponding value is as shown in the table below. See Appendix 2 for a SAR form to understand the breakdown of values. The completeness factor account for 50% of the weight, accuracy accounts for 20%, timeliness accounts for 14%, objectivity, relevancy, understandability and conciseness represents 4% each. Completeness is composed of 10 individual sections accounting for 2% each and a SAR portion which accounts for 30%. The 10 individual sections are as given below with their breakdown of elements at every stage and the corresponding scores. Accuracy of all the other elements account for 20% and timeliness accounts for 14%. The last four elements namely objectivity, relevancy, understandability and conciseness applies to the narrative portion of the SAR and hence must be scored with additional care as to ensure the quality of the document.

The completeness factor was given a weight of 50%. The score of 50% will be distributed accordingly.
Completeness

Fields in SAR form

(20%)

1. Part 1. Reporting Financial Institution Information
   Fields - Address of Branch, City, State, Zip Code
   (Elements - 9, 10, 11, 12 in SAR form) - 2 points

2. Part 1. Reporting Financial Institution Information
   Fields - Account Numbers affected, multiple accounts
   (Elements - 14 in SAR form) - 2 points

3. Part 2. Suspect Information
   Fields- Last Name, First Name, Middle, Address, City,
   State, Zip Code, Country, Phone Number, Work Phone
   (Elements - 15,16,17,18,20,21,22,23,24,25 in SAR form) -
   2 points

4. Part 2. Suspect Information
   Fields- SSN/TIN, Occupation/Business, Date of Birth,
   Forms of Identification
   (Elements - 19,26,27,29 in SAR form) - 2 points

5. Part 2. Suspect Information
   Fields- Relation to financial institution.
   (Elements - 30 in SAR form) - 2 points. If internal
Employee, activate 28, 31, 32 in SAR form)

6. Part 3. Suspicious Activity Information
   Fields: Date and Range of Activity
   (Elements – 33 in SAR form) – 2 points

7. Part 3. Suspicious Activity Information
   Fields: Total Amount involved in activity
   (Elements – 34 in SAR form) – 2 points

8. Part 3. Suspicious Activity Information
   Fields: Summary characterization of activity
   (Elements – 35 in SAR form) – 2 points

9. Part 4. Contact for Assistance
   Fields: Last Name, First name, Middle name, Title, Phone Number
   (Elements – 45, 46, 48, 49 in SAR form) – 2 points

10. Part 5. Suspicious Activity Description
    Fields: Explanation/Description
    (Elements – 52 in SAR form) – 2 points

Total of 20 points is distributed for elements in the SAR form and remaining 30% of the score is distributed for the Narration portion of the SAR depending on 5W-1 H analysis.

This scale was verified using Mahalanobis Taguchi Method and the results were validated using the Signal to Noise Ratio.
4.5 Data Collection

To validate using the MTS method, good and bad data were needed for the analysis and hence a sample set of good and bad SARs were created. SARs that were submitted by the investigators were taken and analysis was done to know the variables that are important in determining the quality of the SAR. Five different variables that were critical to the SAR quality were created and they are as follows.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factors</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Possible Values</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>X1</td>
<td>Completeness</td>
<td>Ok - 1 / Not Ok -2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X2</td>
<td>Accuracy</td>
<td>Ok – 2 / Not Ok -2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X3</td>
<td>Timeliness</td>
<td>Continuous data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X4</td>
<td>5W &amp; 1H</td>
<td>Ok (0,1)/Somewhat Ok (1,0)/Not OK(0,0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X5</td>
<td>Priority</td>
<td>Low - 1 /medium -2/ high-3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.5.1 Variable description

The five factors that were chosen for measuring the quality of the document were

Completeness – The completeness factor of a SAR has two values; if all the elements of the SAR are completed by the investigator, Ok is assigned. If some elements are missing,
then Not OK value is assigned. In numerical terms, Ok is equal to a value of 1 and Not Ok is equal to a value of 2. For a SAR to be complete, all the fields in the SAR should be filled with appropriate information. If the information is not available, then the slot should be filled with “unknown” or “Not available”.

**Accuracy** – Accuracy factor of a SAR has two values. If all the completed elements of a SAR are an accurate in terms of the information, then OK is assigned. If some of the completed elements are not missing, then a value of Not OK is assigned. In numerical terms, Ok is equal to a value of 1 and Not Ok is equal to a value of 2. This might include elements such as subject information, accounts held, banks involved and other useful information about the subject.

**Timeliness** – Timeliness is a continuous data and it is represented in terms of no of days before which the SAR should be submitted to the government. According to government mandates, the SAR should be submitted within 30 days from which the suspicious activity was determined. If the number of days exceed 30, the SAR might be useless in terms of tracking the criminals. Far the SAR to be of high quality, time should be less than 30 days.

**5W and 1H analysis** – This represents the narrative portion of the SAR and it is allocated a value depending on who, what, when, where, why and How. It has three values of Ok, Somewhat OK and Not Ok. Ok is represented as (0, 1) Somewhat OK (1, 0) and Not Ok (0, 0). For example, narrative portion of the SARs might involve...
speculative comments and the investigator classifies the activity as suspicious depending on his own thoughts and suspicions instead of evidence. This might be a false SAR that is being generated and investigated by the law enforcement officials. Other examples might be SARs without proper explanation or irrelevant information.

**Priority** – Priority of cases is given a value of a low, medium and high. Low cases were those which involved one or two accounts and took lesser time to investigate. The medium priority cases were little complex to investigate and hence involved longer time frame to investigate and involved no more than 5 through 10 accounts. High cases had very high importance and if they are not monitored, might involve in significant reputation risk for the bank. These high priority cases had a lot of accounts involved in the money laundering activity and takes days to investigate the case. The Low is given a value of 1, medium as 2 and high as 3.

The SARs that were submitted by the investigators were analyzed and a random set of SARs was taken from the database. Upon analyzing the SARs based on the above five elements, values were allocated based on the above set of rules. There were Ok’s, Somewhat Ok’s and Not Ok’s as shown below in the table. A comment section was provided, which explains the fact about the missing variable or the element in the SAR form and its corresponding value.
Table 4.5.2 Good SARs sample data

The similar procedure was repeated for good SARs and values were tabulated.

Completeness and accuracy were critical in the completing a SAR accurately, but the 5W 1H analysis was critical in measuring the narrative portion of the SAR. Some SARs were speculative; some SARs had the fields that were missing in terms of completeness and accuracy, SARs had a different timeline and hence the timeliness factor varied, but timeliness was within 30 days and hence did not affect the SAR quality. Most of the SARs were of medium priority and of low priority and the sample did not involve any high priority SAR. Hence corresponding tables were created for good and bad SARs and the table is as shown below.
Table 4.5.3 Good SAR Variable classification

The above tabulation shows the results of values tabulated in terms of numbers. The first case number shows that X1 which is completeness factor is Ok, X2 which is accuracy factor is Ok, X3 which is timeliness factor is 0 days, X4 which is 5W-1H analysis factor denotes that SAR is speculative due to 1,0 combination and X4 has been divided into X41 and X42 which represents the different combinations for the SAR. 0,1 stands for OK and 0, 0 stands for Not Ok.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case Number</th>
<th>X1</th>
<th>X2</th>
<th>X3</th>
<th>X4</th>
<th>X5</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Not Ok</td>
<td>OK</td>
<td>4 days</td>
<td>Ok</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>X4 - Speculative comment. X1 - A/c status listed as N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>OK</td>
<td>Not OK</td>
<td>4 days</td>
<td>Ok</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>X2 - Multiple Branch Indicator incorrect X4 - Speculative Comment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Ok</td>
<td>Not OK</td>
<td>3 days</td>
<td>Ok</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>X2 Account number incorrectly entered X4 - Speculative comment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Not Ok</td>
<td>OK</td>
<td>3 days</td>
<td>Ok</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>X1 - Account status listed as N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Not Ok</td>
<td>OK</td>
<td>2 days</td>
<td>Not Ok</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>X1 - Suspicious range date not documented X4 - SAR not needed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Not Ok</td>
<td>OK</td>
<td>1 day</td>
<td>Ok</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>X1 - Account status listed as N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>OK</td>
<td>Not OK</td>
<td>7 days</td>
<td>Ok</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>X2 - Unable to verify customer name</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Not Ok</td>
<td>ok</td>
<td>7 days</td>
<td>Ok</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>X1 - Address and Occupation of Suspect not specified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Status</td>
<td>Relationship</td>
<td>Time</td>
<td>Assessment</td>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Reason</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Not Ok</td>
<td>ok</td>
<td>2 days</td>
<td>ok</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>X1- Occupation field incomplete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Not Ok</td>
<td>OK</td>
<td>3 days</td>
<td>Ok</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>X1- Country field incomplete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Not Ok</td>
<td>Not OK</td>
<td>3 days</td>
<td>Somewhat</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>X1- Linked account numbers not found, X2 City and address incorrect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Not Ok</td>
<td>ok</td>
<td>2 days</td>
<td>ok</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>X1 - Suspicious date range not entered</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>OK</td>
<td>Not OK</td>
<td>1 day</td>
<td>ok</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>X2- Occupation and amount entered incorrect by corporate security</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Not Ok</td>
<td>ok</td>
<td>4 days</td>
<td>Ok</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>X1- Suspect information incomplete; Relation to FI incomplete</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.5.4 Bad SAR sample data
The abnormal or the bad SARs were classified based on the rules into numerical values and these values were based on completeness, accuracy, timeliness, and 5W-1H and priority elements. For example, in this case #1, X1 which is completeness has a value of 2 which is a Not Ok, X2 has a value of 1 which denotes that the SAR form is accurate,
X3 is timeliness which denotes that the time to file a SAR is 4 days, X4 which is 5W-1H analysis denotes that the SAR form is speculative and hence it has been classified as a Somewhat OK. It is interesting to note the combinations here as there are two sub variables for X4 which is X41 and X42. 1,0 denotes that the variable is somewhat ok, 0, 0 denotes that the variable is Not Ok and 0,1 denotes that the variable is Ok. X5 which is priority has been classified as a medium case.

**Construction of Correlation Matrix**

The above table is standardized with means and standard deviations of good SARs. The correlation matrix is constructed by analyzing the correlations between the variables and the correlation coefficient is calculated between two variables. Correlation Coefficient is calculated by finding the ratio the covariance of X and Y to the product of individual variances of X and individual Variance of Y.

The correlation matrix is as shown

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>X1</th>
<th>X2</th>
<th>X3</th>
<th>X41</th>
<th>X42</th>
<th>X5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>X1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-0.25</td>
<td>0.559017</td>
<td>-0.25</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X2</td>
<td>-0.25</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-0.55902</td>
<td>-0.25</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X3</td>
<td>0.559017</td>
<td>-0.55902</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-0.55902</td>
<td>0.559017</td>
<td>0.559017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X41</td>
<td>-0.25</td>
<td>-0.25</td>
<td>-0.55902</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X42</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.559017</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X5</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.559017</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 4.5.6 Correlation Matrix*
The inverse of this matrix is calculated and Mahalanobis distance is calculated for the good and bad SARs based on the equation shown in the beginning of the document.

### Mahalanobis Distance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S.NO</th>
<th>Normal</th>
<th>Abnormal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.92121</td>
<td>74.02424622</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.6303</td>
<td>78.5333786</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.75152</td>
<td>84.69091797</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.55758</td>
<td>2.084847927</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.13939</td>
<td>1.36473E+14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.890909553</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td>71.32121277</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td>34.47272873</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.557575762</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.084847927</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td>80.69091797</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.557575762</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.054545164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td>6.472726345</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.5.7 MD distance calculation
There is a good separation between the good and the bad SARs and this shows that this scale information is good and is able distinguishes between good and bad SARs
The next step involves validating the scale by testing different combinations of variables using suitable orthogonal array for testing. For all the different combinations, the Mahalanobis space was calculated and the abnormal MD’s are obtained with reference to the reference group. Larger the better S/N ratios were calculated due to the fact that the severity of abnormal were unknown and all the possible combinations were tested for cases that were abnormal because the abnormal cases were helpful in determining the accuracy of the scale with respect to the reference group.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Run #</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SN Ratios</td>
<td>3.940448</td>
<td>3.572437</td>
<td>0.11511</td>
<td>-1.73173</td>
<td>-2.4659</td>
<td>-3.23003</td>
<td>-1.79393</td>
<td>0.435322</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 4.5.8 S/N ratio**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Level 1</th>
<th>Level 2</th>
<th>Gain</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>X1</td>
<td>1.474066</td>
<td>-1.76364</td>
<td>3.237703</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X2</td>
<td>0.454237</td>
<td>-0.74381</td>
<td>1.198045</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X3</td>
<td>1.538569</td>
<td>-1.82814</td>
<td>3.366708</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X41</td>
<td>-0.05107</td>
<td>-0.2385</td>
<td>0.187432</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X42</td>
<td>0.315212</td>
<td>-0.60478</td>
<td>0.919994</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X5</td>
<td>0.044534</td>
<td>-0.3341</td>
<td>0.378638</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 4.5.9 Gain Chart**

From the optimization, average responses are calculated at two levels for presence and
absence and we find that X3, the timeliness has the highest importance in this analysis. This is calculated from the variables which have higher signal to noise ratio in the system. X2 which is completeness is also important is shown by the S/N ratio as the second most important variable. Accuracy is third most important, followed by 5W-1H analysis and the priority of the SAR.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case No</th>
<th>Normal</th>
<th>Abnormal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.921212</td>
<td>74.02425</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.630303</td>
<td>78.53338</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.751515</td>
<td>84.69092</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.557576</td>
<td>2.084848</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.139394</td>
<td>1.36E+14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.89091</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td>71.32121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td>34.47273</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.557576</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.084848</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td>80.69092</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.557576</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.054545</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td>6.472726</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.5.10 Validation of Scale
A confirmation run was run with the important variables and the results were found to match the original separation between the normal and abnormal SARs.

**4.6 Principal Component Analysis**

Principle component analysis (PCA) was done to determine the principal component and to find the inter relation between the variables. The results from principle component analysis are as shown below. The data set with 6 different variables was chosen for analysis and data set that was used for the analysis is as shown below. The collection of good and bad SARs in terms of the variables from X1...X6 is as shown below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>X1</th>
<th>X2</th>
<th>X3</th>
<th>X4</th>
<th>X5</th>
<th>X6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4.6.1 Sample Input Data

The analysis was done using Minitab and the results of the PCA are shown below. By looking at the eigen values we find that X1, X2 and X3 have the highest eigen values and they are arranged in the order from highest significance to lowest significance. By looking at all the variables from X1 till X6, we understand that X1, X2 and X3 are the three most important variables to determine the quality of the SAR. 5W 1H and SAR priority can be included if needed to determine the quality as they don’t have high levels of significance in PCA.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Eigen analysis of the Correlation Matrix</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>X1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eigenvalue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proportion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cumulative</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>PC1</th>
<th>PC2</th>
<th>PC3</th>
<th>PC4</th>
<th>PC5</th>
<th>PC6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>X1</td>
<td>0.321</td>
<td>0.370</td>
<td>-0.558</td>
<td>0.381</td>
<td>0.531</td>
<td>-0.146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X2</td>
<td>-0.365</td>
<td>-0.581</td>
<td>0.112</td>
<td>-0.002</td>
<td>0.705</td>
<td>-0.144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X3</td>
<td>0.065</td>
<td>-0.325</td>
<td>-0.709</td>
<td>-0.608</td>
<td>-0.129</td>
<td>-0.029</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X4</td>
<td>-0.581</td>
<td>0.017</td>
<td>-0.274</td>
<td>0.352</td>
<td>-0.360</td>
<td>-0.577</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X5</td>
<td>0.590</td>
<td>-0.230</td>
<td>0.260</td>
<td>-0.068</td>
<td>-0.073</td>
<td>-0.722</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X6</td>
<td>0.270</td>
<td>-0.606</td>
<td>-0.174</td>
<td>0.597</td>
<td>-0.265</td>
<td>0.321</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.6.2 Eigen Values
X1, X2 and X3 which stands for completeness, accuracy and timeliness are important in determining the quality rating for a SAR.

**Figure 4.6.1 Loading Plot of X1..X6**

This graph shows the loading plot of X1, X2, X3, X4, X5 and X6. There are six principal components shown which are perpendicular to each other. These components are linear combinations of original variables and PCA does help to inter relate the variables and to reduce the dimensionality of the data set.
5.0 Conclusion and recommendations

The above framework was developed as a result of quality score development for financial institution. This score was developed for Suspicious Activity Report (SAR) Quality Rating and was developed by use of multivariate methods namely Mahalanobis-Taguchi Strategy and principal component analysis. SAR is critical for government and law enforcement officials to trace criminal activities and it is necessary that SARs are completed with the highest quality possible. Rating the quality of a document is a difficult task to measure as it involves a lot of theoretical content and the quality score depends on the investigator.

We developed a scale using MTS strategy which listed the critical parameters necessary for rating the quality of a SAR. There are two sections to this SAR quality scoring which was described in the thesis. The first section of the thesis involved a lot of research into various literature reviews and search into research journals. From all these inputs and ideas, we had a lot of brainstorming and review meetings between the investigators, audit department, quality and productivity group and subject matter experts who created a scoring mechanism which was described. They came up with a list of 7 elements which included completeness, accuracy, timeliness, redundancy, understandability, reliability and conciseness. A scoring mechanism on a scale of 1 – 100 was developed and this score will be continuously monitored by the financial institution to achieve consistency and repeatability in this process. This scoring mechanism was verified with robust methodologies and as a result, Mahalanobis-Taguchi Strategy and Principal Component Analysis were done.
There were 24 elements that were listed initially as a part of this scoring mechanism and we found that out of 24, 5 elements are critical in measuring the quality of a SAR. The five elements were completeness, accuracy, timeliness, 5W-1H analysis and priority of the SAR. These elements were further verified by using the signal to noise ratio to validate the scale and there was a huge gap between the normal and the abnormal SARs. The analysis was done using principal component analysis and the analysis results verified that accuracy, completeness and timeliness are highly significant in determining the quality of the SAR.

As a part of future work, this scoring mechanism will be implemented at the financial institution to monitor the quality of SARs and to ensure high levels of repeatability. Monthly tracking will be done to monitor the investigator’s consistency in this process and to maintain high levels of standards and excellence.
Appendix

Appendix -1

Information Quality Scoring Criteria.

The following elements must be ensured to maintain the information quality in this process. Please note that many elements are similar and not all the elements should be compared at the same time.

Availability

Percentage of time an information source is "up".

Also: accessibility, reliability, retrievability, and performability

Accuracy

Quotient of the number of correct values in the source and the overall number of values in the source.

Also: data quality (as opposed to information quality), error rate, correctness, integrity,

Precision

Amount of Data

Size of result.

Also: essentialness

Believability

Degree to which the information is accepted as correct.

Also: error rate, credibility, and trustworthiness

---
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Completeness

Quotient of the number of response items and the number of real world items.

Also: coverage, scope, granularity, comprehensiveness, density, extent

Concise Representation

Degree to which the structure of the information matches the information itself.

Also: attribute granularity, occurrence identifiability, structural consistency,
appropriateness, format precision

Consistent representation

Degree to which the structure of the information conforms to that of other sources.

Also: integrity, homogeneity, semantic consistency, value consistency, portability,
compatibility

Customer Support

Amount and usefulness of online support through text, email, phone etc.

Documentation

Amount and usefulness of documents with Meta information.

Also: traceability

Interpretability

Degree to which the information conforms to technical ability of the consumer.

Also: clarity of definition, simplicity

Latency

Amount of time until first information reaches user.

Also: response time
Objectivity
Degree to which information is unbiased and impartial.

Price
Monetary charge per query.
Also: query value-to-cost ratio, cost-effectivity

Relevancy
Degree to which information satisfies the users need.
Also: domain precision, minimum redundancy, applicability, helpfulness

Reliability
Degree to which the user can trust the information

Reputation
Degree to which the information or its source is in high standing.
Also: credibility

Response time
Amount of time until complete response reaches the user.
Also: performance, turnaround time

Security
Degree to which information is passed privately from user to information source
and back.
Also: privacy, access security

Timeliness
Age of information.
Also: up-to-date, freshness, currentness

**Understandability**

Degree to which the information can be comprehended by the user

Also: ease of understanding

**Value-added**

Amount of benefit the use of the information provides.

**Verifiability**

Degree and ease with which the information can be checked for correctness.

Also: naturalness, traceability, and provability
Appendix -2
SAR FORM

Suspicious Activity Report
July 2003
Previous editions will not be accepted after December 31, 2003

ALWAYS COMPLETE ENTIRE REPORT
(see instructions)

1. Check box below only if correcting a prior report.
   - Corrects Prior Report (see instruction #3 under "How to Make a Report").

Part I Reporting Financial Institution Information

2. Name of Financial Institution:
   3. EIN

4. Address of Financial Institution:

5. City:
   6. State:
   7. Zip Code:

8. Address of Branch Office(s) where activity occurred:
   9. Multiple Branches [include information in narrative, Part V.]

10. City:
    11. State:
    12. Zip Code:

13. If Institution closed, date closed:

14. Account number(s) affected, if any:
   a. Closed:
      Yes No
   b. Not Closed:
      Yes No

Part II Suspect Information

15. Last Name of Name of Entity:
    16. First Name:
    17. Middle Name:

18. Address:

19. City:

20. State:

21. Zip Code:

22. Phone Number - Residence [include area code]:

23. Phone Number - Work [include area code]:

24. Occupation/Type of Business:

25. Date of Birth:

26. Admission/Confession:
   a. Yes
   b. No

27. Forms of Identification for Suspect:
   a. Drivers License/State ID
   b. Passport
   c. Alien Registration
   d. Other

28. Relationship to Financial Institution:
   a. Accountant
   b. Attorney
   c. Appraiser
   d. Broker
   e. Borrower
   f. Employee
   g. Customer
   h. Director
   i. Officer
   j. Shareholder

29. Is the relationship an insider relationship?
   a. Yes
   b. No

30. Date of Suspension, Termination, Resignation:

Catalog No. 2225L
### Part III  Suspicious Activity Information

33. Date of or date range of suspicious activity
   - From: / / Year
   - To: / / Year

34. Total dollar amount involved in known or suspicious activity
   - $ / 0

35. Summary characterization of suspicious activity:
   - a) Bank Security Act/Structuring
   - b) Bribery/Crime
   - c) Check Fraud
   - d) Check Kiting
   - e) Commercial Loan Fraud
   - f) Counterfeit Credit Card or Instrument
   - g) False Statement
   - h) Counterfeit Check
   - i) Counterfeit Credit Card
   - j) Counterfeit Instrument (other)
   - k) Credit Card Fraud
   - l) Counterfeit Instrument (other)
   - m) Counterfeit Credit Card
   - n) Counterfeit Instrument (other)
   - o) Credit Card Fraud
   - p) Counterfeit Instrument (other)
   - q) Credit Card Fraud
   - r) Counterfeit Instrument (other)
   - s) Credit Card Fraud
   - t) Counterfeit Instrument (other)
   - u) Credit Card Fraud
   - v) Counterfeit Instrument (other)
   - w) Credit Card Fraud
   - x) Counterfeit Instrument (other)
   - y) Credit Card Fraud
   - z) Counterfeit Instrument (other)
   - Other

36. Amount of loss prior to recovery
   - $ / 0

37. Dollar amount of recovery (if applicable)
   - $ / 0

38. Has the suspicious activity had a material impact on, or otherwise affected, the financial soundness of the institution?
   - a) Yes
   - b) No

40. Has any law enforcement agency already been advised by telephone, written communication, or otherwise?
   - a) DEA
   - b) FBI
   - c) IRS
   - d) Postal Inspection
   - e) Secret Service
   - f) State
   - g) Other Federal
   - h) U.S. Customs
   - i) Local
   - Other

41. Name of person(s) contacted at Law Enforcement Agency

42. Phone Number (Include area code)
   - (

43. Name of person(s) contacted at Law Enforcement Agency

44. Phone Number (Include area code)
   - (

### Part IV  Contact for Assistance

45. Last Name

46. First Name

47. Middle

48. Title/Occupation

49. Phone Number (Include area code)
   - (

50. Date Prepared
   - / / Year

51. Agency (If not filed by financial institution)
Part V  Suspicious Activity Information

Explanation/Description of known or suspected violation of law or suspicious activity.

This section of the report is critical. The care with which it is
written may make the difference in whether or not the described
incident and its possible criminal nature are clearly understood.
Provide below a chronological and complete account of the
possible violation of law, including what is unusual, irregular or
suspicious about the transaction, using the following checklist as
you prepare your account. If necessary, continue the
narrative on a duplicate of this page.

a. Describe supporting documentation and retain for 5 years.
b. Explain who benefited financially or otherwise, from the
transaction, how much and how
c. Retain any confession, admission, or explanation of the
transaction provided by the suspect and indicate in
the narrative whether it was given.
d. Retain any confession, admission, or explanation of the
transaction provided by any other person and indicate
who and when it was given.
e. Retain any evidence of cover-up or evidence of an attempt
to deceive federal or state examiners or others

Tips on SAR Form preparation and filing are available in the SAR Activity Review at www.fincen.gov/pubs_reports.html
Reference:
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