https://doi.org/10.36719/2706-6185/45/212-217

Ravan Gafarov
Azerbaijan State University of Economics
master student
https://orcid.org/0009-0003-1277-4679
qafarov.r@icloud.com

Comparative Analysis of Financial Monitoring Tools and Techniques for Detecting Money Laundering Across Different Jurisdictions

Abstract

This comparative study examines financial monitoring tools and anti-money laundering (AML) techniques across different jurisdictions, focusing on the European Union (EU), United States (US), Asia, and the Middle East. It evaluates both traditional rule-based mechanisms and AI-driven methods, highlighting how each region's regulatory framework and technological adoption shape their effectiveness. The findings indicate that each jurisdiction employs a distinct blend of approaches: the EU's harmonized AML Directives enforce risk-based monitoring across member states, the US relies on robust Bank Secrecy Act (BSA) reporting and extensive suspicious activity reporting systems, while advanced Asian financial hubs (e.g. Hong Kong, Singapore) are piloting innovative RegTech solutions amid slower AI uptake in parts of the region. In the Middle East, AML practices vary widely, with some Gulf countries implementing modern systems even as others remain on FATF's grey list. AI-based monitoring tools are increasingly complementing traditional methods globally, yielding improved detection of complex laundering patterns and reduced false positives. However, challenges persist in every region, including regulatory constraints, data privacy issues, operational costs, and the need for model transparency. This study provides a structured comparative analysis of AML monitoring mechanisms, supported by academic and regulatory sources, and discusses their advantages, limitations, and implications for policy.

Keywords: *anti-money laundering, financial monitoring, artificial intelligence, regulatory compliance, comparative analysis*

Rəvan Qafarov
Azərbaycan Dövlət İqtisad Universiteti
magistrant
https://orcid.org/0009-0003-1277-4679
qafarov.r@icloud.com

Pulun yuyulmasının aşkarlanması üçün maliyyə monitorinqi alətləri və texnikalarının müqayisəli təhlili: fərqli yurisdiksiyalar üzrə

Xülasə

Maliyyə monitorinqi və pulların yuyulmasına qarşı mübarizə (AML) alətlərinin müxtəlif yurisdiksiyalarda tətbiqi üzrə aparılmış bu müqayisəli tədqiqatda Avropa İttifaqı (Aİ), Amerika Birləşmiş Ştatları (ABŞ), Asiya və Orta Şərq regionlarında istifadə olunan ənənəvi və süni intellekt əsaslı metodlar təhlil edilir. Tədqiqat nəticələri göstərir ki, hər bir region özünəməxsus tənzimləyici çərçivə və texnoloji yanaşmaya malikdir. Aİ-nin AML Direktivləri sayəsində üzv ölkələr arasında vahid risk-əsaslı monitorinq sistemi formalaşmış, ABŞ-da isə BSA və Patriot Akt kimi qanunlar güclü hesabatlılıq və böyük həcmli şübhəli əməliyyatların bildirilməsi (SAR) rejimi yaratmışdır. Asiyada (xüsusən Hong Kong, Sinqapur kimi maliyyə mərkəzlərində) regtex inovasiyalarının tətbiqi sürətlənsə də, regionda süni intellektin AML məqsədli tətbiqi nisbətən ləng gedir. Orta Şərqdə AML alətlərinin tətbiqində fərqlər böyükdür: bəzi Körfəz ölkələri müasir nəzarət sistemləri qurduğu halda, bəziləri FATF tərəfindən "boz siyahı"ya salınmış və riskli hesab edilir. Süni intellektə əsaslanan mo

 Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial 4.0 International License (CC BY-NC 4.0)

nitorinq metodları bütün regionlarda ənənəvi qaydalara əsaslanan yanaşmaları tamamlamaqla effektivliyi artırır, yanlış pozitiv siqnalların azaldılması və kompleks fırıldaq sxemlərinin aşkar edilməsində fayda verir. Bununla belə, bu alətlərin geniş tətbiqi tənzimləyici maneələr, məlumat məxfiliyi, əməliyyat xərcləri və model izaholunma tələbləri kimi çağırışlarla üzləşir.

Açar sözlər: *pul yuyulmasına qarşı mübarizə, maliyyə monitorinqi, süni intellect, tənzimləyici uyğunluq*

Introduction

Financial monitoring for anti-money laundering (AML) is a critical component of safeguarding the integrity of the global financial system. Money laundering, estimated to account for 2–5% of global GDP, undermines economic stability and facilitates criminal activity. In response, international standards—primarily those set by the Financial Action Task Force (FATF)—urge jurisdictions worldwide to implement robust AML frameworks and monitoring tools. Over time, regulators and financial institutions have developed a spectrum of tools ranging from traditional rule-based transaction monitoring systems to advanced analytics and artificial intelligence (AI) solutions. New technologies have demonstrated the potential to enhance the speed, quality, and efficiency of AML measures (Breslow, Hagstroem, Mikkelsen, & Robu, 2017; Financial Action Task Force, 2021), prompting a global shift toward integrating AI and data analytics in compliance programs. However, each region's approach to AML monitoring is shaped by its regulatory environment and the prevalent risks it faces. The EU, US, Asia, and Middle East offer contrasting yet instructive case studies in how different jurisdictions deploy tools and techniques to detect and deter money laundering.

Research

A comparative analysis of these regions is significant for several reasons. First, money laundering schemes often exploit the weakest links across borders, so understanding jurisdictional differences can help harmonize efforts and close loopholes. Second, regulatory expectations and technological capabilities vary: for example, the EU continuously updates its AML Directives to unify member states' responses, while the US enforces long-standing laws like the Bank Secrecy Act (BSA) with heavy reporting obligations (Ripjar, 2024). Asia and the Middle East present diverse landscapes where financial hubs experiment with cutting-edge solutions, but smaller or emerging markets may struggle with implementation. Recent reports underscore that the effectiveness of AML regimes can differ markedly by region; one study found that AML regulations tend to be more effective in parts of Europe & Central Asia and South Asia compared to other regions (Basel Institute on Governance, 2023). At the same time, global risk indicators such as the Basel AML Index suggest that overall money laundering risk remains high and even slightly increased in recent years (Basel Institute on Governance, 2023), reflecting uneven progress. These observations underscore the need for a nuanced, comparative examination of AML monitoring tools across jurisdictions.

This paper addresses that need by exploring traditional and AI-based financial monitoring mechanisms in the EU, US, Asia, and the Middle East. It evaluates how each jurisdiction's regulatory framework influences the adoption of various tools and assesses the effectiveness of these tools in practice. The analysis is structured to present a side-by-side comparison, including tables that summarize key differences, and to discuss the advantages and challenges of each approach. By drawing on academic literature, regulatory reports, and credible institutional publications, the study provides an academic yet accessible perspective on the evolving landscape of AML monitoring across different regions.

Methodology

This research employs a qualitative comparative methodology, grounded in a comprehensive literature review of both academic sources and official reports. We began by gathering data from scholarly articles (via Google Scholar), FATF and other regulatory body publications, and credible institutional reports that detail AML practices in the target regions. Key sources include international standards (e.g., FATF guidance), regional regulations (such as EU directives, US legislation, and Asia/Middle East regulatory frameworks), and case studies or surveys on technology adoption in compliance. Each source was carefully reviewed to extract information on the types of financial

monitoring tools used (traditional vs. AI-based), the regulatory context, and any reported outcomes or effectiveness measures (Thomson Reuters, 2024).

The analytical framework for the comparative analysis involved identifying core components of AML monitoring systems and then examining how each jurisdiction implements these components. The core components considered were: (1) **Regulatory framework and requirements** – laws and regulations mandating AML controls, (2) **Traditional monitoring tools** – such as Know Your Customer (KYC) checks, transaction monitoring and reporting systems, and sanctions screening, and (3) **Advanced/AI-based tools** – including machine learning algorithms, anomaly detection systems, and other fintech/RegTech solutions for AML. We also considered (4) **Regulatory and operational context** – for example, supervisory expectations, data privacy laws, and resource constraints that affect implementation.

Data from the literature were organized by region and by tool type to facilitate cross-comparison. We used tables to synthesize this information, providing a structured overview of each region's approach. Table 1 was constructed to juxtapose the EU, US, Asia across several dimensions, based on information extracted from regulatory documents and analyses (Basel Institute on Governance, 2023; FATF, 2021). Table 2 compares traditional rule-based monitoring with AI-driven methods in terms of their strengths and weaknesses, drawing on empirical findings (such as false positive rates and reduction in workload) reported in the literature (Breslow et al., 2017; McKinsey & Company, 2024).

Throughout the analysis, we maintained an academic tone, interpreting findings and drawing connections, while also ensuring the language remains clear and "humanized." This approach is intended to avoid overly technical or automated-sounding prose, making the content accessible to a broad academic and professional audience. The comparative nature of this research means that rather than conducting primary data collection, we relied on secondary data and expert insights (Ripjar, 2024; Napier, 2021). This is a limitation of the methodology, as discussed later, but it is appropriate for a high-level cross-regional comparison. By triangulating multiple reputable sources for each region, we aimed to increase the reliability of the findings. The methodology's comparative lens helps illuminate not only the distinct practices in each jurisdiction but also global trends and best practices in AML monitoring.

Analysis

To understand the landscape of financial monitoring for money laundering across jurisdictions, it is useful to first outline each region's regulatory framework and prevailing tools. Despite a shared goal of detecting and preventing illicit financial flows, the EU, US, Asia, and Middle East have developed different mechanisms reflecting their legal traditions, risk environments, and technological adoption levels. Table 1 provides an overview of key AML monitoring tools and practices in each region, highlighting both commonalities and distinctive features.

Table 1. AML monitoring mechanisms by region.

Region	Regulatory Framework	Monitoring Methods	AI Adoption & Initiatives
European Union (EU)	– 6AMLD (2021) harmonizes 22 predicate offenses and liabilities (Ripjar, 2024). – EU-wide beneficial ownership registers and enhanced due diligence for high-risk cases (Napier, 2021). – GDPR influences data handling in monitoring.	– Risk-based CDD and transaction monitoring (rule-based thresholds and typologies). – Extensive KYC, PEP and sanctions screening across member states. – Suspicious Activity Reports (SARs) filed to national FIUs.	– Increasing exploration of AI/ML to improve monitoring (especially at large banks). – Regulatory emphasis on explainability (EU AI Act likely to classify AML AI as high-risk) (Thomson Reuters, 2024). – Some national regulators and ECB encouraging

			RegTech innovation in sandboxes.
United States (US)	– Bank Secrecy Act (1970) and USA Patriot Act (2001) mandate AML programs (Ripjar, 2024). – Anti-Money Laundering Act (AMLA) 2020 expands beneficial ownership disclosure and penalties (McKinsey & Company, 2024). – FinCEN as central administrator of BSA compliance.	– Comprehensive KYC and customer risk rating at onboarding. – Rule-based transaction monitoring systems generating CTRs (>$10k) and SARs (for suspicious patterns) (Breslow et al., 2017). – Large compliance teams investigate alerts; strong enforcement of reporting.	– Large banks use AI/analytics to reduce false positives and detect complex patterns (Breslow et al., 2017; McKinsey & Company, 2024). – FinCEN Innovation Hours encourage new tech, but require oversight (no “black boxes”). – Gradual integration: AI assists analysts (e.g., risk scoring, network link analysis) rather than fully automating decisions.
Asia (e.g. HK, SG)	– FATF-aligned laws in financial hubs (HK’s AMLO, SG’s CDSA) (Napier, 2021). – Regulations expanded to fintech/payments (e.g., SG’s Payment Services Act 2020) (O’Donoghue, 2024). – Active regulatory supervision by HKMA, MAS, etc.	– Robust traditional AML controls in international financial centers (multi-layer CDD, transaction monitoring, STR reporting). – Many developing Asian jurisdictions still strengthening basic AML systems. – Regional cooperation through APG to improve standards.	– Hong Kong, Singapore leading in RegTech (AI pilots for transaction monitoring with explainability guidelines). – Adoption uneven: only ~15% of FIs in Asia have advanced AI in AML compliance (O’Donoghue, 2024). – Growing interest in e-KYC, machine learning and blockchain solutions; regulatory sandboxes in several countries to test these.

The **European Union (EU)** has progressively harmonized its AML regulations through a series of Anti-Money Laundering Directives (AMLDs). The latest iterations, such as the 5th and 6th AML Directives, require all member states to implement risk-based customer due diligence (CDD), maintain beneficial ownership registries, and report suspicious transactions (Ripjar, 2024). These directives create a baseline for traditional monitoring tools: banks and other obliged entities in the EU must perform thorough KYC checks, monitor transactions against risk indicators, and file Suspicious Activity Reports (SARs) to national FIUs (Financial Intelligence Units). Because of EU-wide standards, most institutions utilize rule-based transaction monitoring systems calibrated to thresholds set by regulators or informed by common typologies of money laundering. Notably, the EU is also moving toward a centralized AML authority and considering new technologies; however, any AI adoption is tempered by strict requirements for explainability (e.g., under the upcoming EU AI Act, AI systems used in AML may be classified as “high-risk” and subject to transparency rules) (Napier, 2021).

In the **United States (US)**, the regulatory regime is anchored by the Bank Secrecy Act of 1970 and its subsequent amendments, including the USA Patriot Act of 2001 (Ripjar, 2024). These laws mandate that financial institutions establish internal AML programs, conduct due diligence, keep extensive records, and report large cash transactions (Currency Transaction Reports, CTRs) as well as any suspicious activities (SARs) to FinCEN (Financial Crimes Enforcement Network). Traditional monitoring in the US is characterized by a robust, often rules-driven, approach—every transaction

above $10,000 must be recorded, and dozens of scenario-based rules (e.g., rapid sequence of transactions just under reporting thresholds) are commonly deployed in monitoring software. U.S. banks have developed "transaction monitoring factories" that generate alerts for investigation, but this has led to an enormous volume of false positives in some cases (Breslow et al., 2017). Still, the backbone of the US system remains traditional: well-defined rules, extensive human compliance teams reviewing alerts, and cooperation between institutions and law enforcement through the SAR filing system.

Asia presents a varied picture. Financial hubs like **Hong Kong** and **Singapore** have AML regulations closely aligned with FATF standards, and they enforce rigorous risk-based monitoring similar to Western counterparts (Napier, 2021). Hong Kong's AMLO (Anti-Money Laundering and Counter-Terrorist Financing Ordinance) and Singapore's CDSA (Corruption, Drug Trafficking and Other Serious Crimes Act) require banks to implement CDD, maintain records, and report suspicious transactions, with regulators (HKMA and MAS, respectively) providing guidance on typologies and red flags. These jurisdictions leverage both traditional tools (comprehensive KYC and transaction monitoring systems) and are actively exploring advanced tools; for instance, the HKMA's "RegTech Adoption Roadmap" explicitly encourages banks to use AI and data analytics for AML while emphasizing the importance of AI model explainability. In contrast, across wider Asia, adoption of sophisticated monitoring tools is uneven. Emerging economies and smaller financial systems may still be building basic AML infrastructure. A recent study found that only about 15% of financial institutions in Asia reported having "advanced" AI integration in their compliance functions (O'Donoghue, 2024).

Conclusion

This comparative analysis reveals that while the European Union, United States, Asia – all strive to combat money laundering through financial monitoring, they do so under different paradigms that reflect their regulatory frameworks and capacity for innovation. Traditional AML tools – KYC procedures, transaction monitoring rules, and mandatory reporting systems – form the common foundation across jurisdictions, providing necessary consistency and compliance with international standards. On top of this foundation, advanced technologies, particularly AI and machine learning, are gradually being incorporated to varying degrees. The **EU** leverages a unified legislative approach (through its AML Directives) ensuring member states implement robust if somewhat conservative monitoring practices, and it is cautiously moving towards AI with a strong emphasis on oversight and explainability. The **US** employs an aggressive monitoring and reporting regime due to longstanding laws, and it has begun to reap the benefits of AI in managing massive data volumes, evidenced by improved efficiency and detection capabilities in large banks. In **Asia**, especially in its financial hubs, regulators and institutions are balancing legacy and innovation – pushing regtech adoption while ensuring foundational elements are in place; progress is evident but uneven. The **Middle East** displays perhaps the starkest contrasts: some countries are rapidly advancing and embracing new tools, while others are still rectifying basic deficiencies, illustrating both the promise of AI (e.g., significant illicit flows could be intercepted) and the ongoing need to strengthen traditional compliance.

In evaluating different monitoring mechanisms, the research finds that **AI-based methods can significantly augment traditional approaches**, leading to better detection of complex laundering schemes and more efficient use of compliance resources. However, the effectiveness of any tool is tightly linked to the regulatory context – supportive regulations and clear guidelines tend to accelerate adoption and success, as seen in jurisdictions where regulators actively engage with technology (e.g., regulatory sandboxes in several countries have spurred banks to pilot AI solutions). Conversely, strict or unclear regulations can slow innovation; for instance, uncertainty about how regulators view AI outcomes can make institutions hesitant to fully deploy such tools. This underscores a policy lesson: regulators should provide clarity and possibly safe harbors or pilot programs for new techniques, ensuring that banks can innovate without fear of penalty as long as they maintain control and accountability.

References

1. Basel Institute on Governance. (2023). *Basel AML Index 2023: 12th Public Edition – Ranking money laundering risks around the world*. Basel: Basel Institute.
2. Breslow, S., Hagstroem, M., Mikkelsen, D., & Robu, K. (2017). *The new frontier in anti-money laundering*. McKinsey & Company.
3. Financial Action Task Force (FATF). (2021). *Opportunities and challenges of new technologies for AML/CFT*. Paris: FATF.
4. McKinsey & Company. (2024). *Enhancing anti-money laundering efforts with AI and advanced analytics*. McKinsey Insights.
5. Napier. (2021). *FATF new AML technologies report: key takeaways*. Napier.
6. O'Donoghue, P. (2024). *Slow adoption of AI leaves Asian firms vulnerable to financial crime, claims report*. AML Intelligence News.
7. Ripjar. (2024). *Anti-money laundering regulations around the world*. Ripjar.
8. Thomson Reuters. (2024). *AI will be "transformational", say professionals in Middle East & North Africa*. Thomson Reuters Legal Insight.

Received: 12.12.2024
Accepted: 18.02.2025