



Public Consultation on the draft Regulatory Technical Standards on Customer Due Diligence under Article 28(1) of Regulation (EU) 2024/1624

Fields marked with * are mandatory.

Public Consultation on the draft RTS on Customer Due Diligence under Article 28(1) AMLR

Objective of the consultation

AML A would like to receive feedback on provisions of the draft RTS under Article 28(1) of [Regulation \(EU\) 2024/1624](#) ('AMLR') and in particular on the specific questions set out below.

Comments are most helpful if they:

- respond to the question stated;
- indicate the specific point to which a comment relates;
- contain a clear rationale;
- provide evidence to support the views expressed/ rationale proposed; and
- describe any alternative regulatory choices AML A should consider.

Such comments should be sent by **8 May 2026, 23:59 (CET)**.

Personal data protection:

The protection of individuals with regard to the processing of personal data by the AML A is based on Regulation (EU) 2018/1725. Further information on the processing of the personal data is available in the Data Protection Notice.

All legal details can be found in our [Specific Privacy Statement \(SPS\)](#).

How to provide feedback

All the fields marked with an asterisk (*) are mandatory. If a question is not relevant for you, please answer with "NA".

We are using a survey format to help us analyse feedback effectively and efficiently. For this reason, document uploads are not enabled for this exercise, and we kindly invite you to share your comments directly within the survey.

Please note that by submitting your contribution, you acknowledge that it will be published on AMLA's website. Contributions will always be published. The name of organisations submitting their contribution will also always be published. The name of the natural person providing a contribution will be published unless they object to said publication. Please refrain from inserting further personal information beyond what we ask from you. In particular, please refrain from providing confidential information or special categories of personal data (that is "personal data revealing racial or ethnic origin, political opinions, religious or philosophical beliefs, or trade union membership, and the processing of genetic data, biometric data for the purpose of uniquely identifying a natural person, data concerning health or data concerning a natural person's sex life or sexual orientation"). Your email address will never be published.

Before publication, AMLA staff will perform a limited screening of all contributions provided for the sole purpose of filtering any inappropriate submissions. After this, the replies are made available to the public directly on AMLA's public consultations page.

Please note that your contribution may be subject to a request for access to documents under Regulation 2018 /1725 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 23 October 2018 on the protection of natural persons with regard to the processing of personal data by the Union institutions, bodies, offices and agencies and on the free movement of such data, and repealing Regulation (EC) No 45/2001 and Decision No 1247/2002/EC.

Language disclaimer

AMLA welcomes submissions in all official EU languages. You can change the displayed language of this public consultation using the language selector in the top right corner of the EU Survey platform. Please note that all language versions other than English have been produced using machine translation and may contain inaccuracies. When in doubt, please refer to the English version.

Should you encounter issues with submitting your responses, please contact us by email at public.consultations@amla.europa.eu no later than 48 hours before the deadline of the consultation period.

Section 1 - Respondent profile

* This contribution is made by:

An organisation

* Name of the organisation

200 character(s) maximum

AMF Italia - Associazione Intermediari Mercati Finanziari

* First name of individual (individual respondent or representative of organisation)

100 character(s) maximum

Miriam

* Surname of individual (individual respondent or representative of organisation)

100 character(s) maximum

Felici

* Email (note that your email address will not be published)

100 character(s) maximum

amfitalia@amfitalia.org

* Publication of your name and surname

- I agree to the publication of my name and surname (note that your email address will never be published).
- Contribution to be published without my name and surname (note that your email address will never be published).

* Which of the following best describes your activity or organisation? Obligated entities are those listed in Article 3 of [Regulation \(EU\) 2024/1624](#).

Maximum 1 selection(s)

- Obligated entity in the non-financial sector
- Obligated entity in the financial sector
- Self-regulatory body in the sense of Regulation (EU) 2024/1624 Article 2(1) point (47)
- Industry association representing non-financial sector obliged entities
- Industry association representing financial sector obliged entities
- Civil society organisation/non-governmental organisation
- Other

* Financial sector

Maximum 11 selection(s)

- Credit institution
- Consumer credit, factoring, payment services, guarantees, money market instrument, foreign exchange, electronic money
- Insurance
- Insurance intermediaries
- Investment firms

- Collective investment
- Central securities depositories
- Creditors
- Credit intermediaries
- Crypto assets service providers
- Cross-border branches of financial institutions

* Please select the country from which you or your organisation carry out your main activities:

IT - Italy

Section 2 - Substantive comments on the draft Regulatory Technical Standards

* 1. Do you agree that the proposals set out in these draft RTS can be applied across the range of products and services provided by your obliged entity?

If you do not agree, please:

- (i) explain why the current proposals do not provide sufficient flexibility; and
- (ii) provide concrete drafting proposals and explain why the specific measures you propose would be more appropriate.

Provisions that are clearly marked as applying only to a specific sector or service should not be taken into consideration if they do not impact your sector.

5000 character(s) maximum

Art. 3(1)(c): Without prejudice to the fact that, where electronic identification compliant with eIDAS 2 is used, the data referred to in point (c) will be included in the EUDI Wallet, we would appreciate clarification as to whether, in onboarding processes carried out through remote solutions (Article 7(2) et seq.), the “where available” requirement may be deemed satisfied by providing optional fields enabling customers to supply such information on a voluntary basis.

Arts. 6–7: We suggest merging, or at least more explicitly aligning, the provisions on electronic identification means set out in Articles 6 and 7 with those provided under Article 32.

We further recommend including an explicit reference to the provisions relating to the EUDI Wallet, which are currently only mentioned in a footnote to the Annex.

Art. 19: We propose excluding from the definition of PEP those individuals acting as legal representatives of public administrations or publicly owned companies, where they do not exercise effective political decision-making powers.

Art. 18: Considering that Article 25 of the AMLR requires obliged entities to understand the purpose and intended nature of the business relationship or transaction, and in order to give practical effect to the risk-based approach (Article 1 of the RTS) as well as to the wording “where necessary” in Article 18, we seek confirmation that it is consistent to collect such information as a general rule only for customers classified as presenting medium or high risk, excluding low-risk customers within the meaning of Article 33 AMLR. We also note that, in certain operating models, the collection of additional information on the purpose and nature of the relationship is technically feasible only after the formal establishment of the relationship. We therefore request confirmation that such information may be obtained immediately after onboarding, provided that no transactions are allowed until the information set is fully completed.

Art. 20(1)(b)(iv): We request clarification as to whether, in remote onboarding processes, the “where available” requirement may be fulfilled by including optional fields for the collection of information relating to “the registration number or tax identification number, or the legal entity identifier”.

- * 2. Do you agree that the proposals set out in these draft RTS allow for the effective application of a risk-based approach towards compliance with AML/CFT requirements?

If you do not agree, please:

(i) specify the provisions concerned; and

(ii) provide concrete drafting proposals and explain why the specific measures you propose would be more appropriate.

5000 character(s) maximum

NA

- * 3. Considering the nature of your business, including its size, risks, and complexity, are there any situations where the information to be collected for the purposes of customer due diligence as proposed in these draft RTS is routinely unavailable and the proposals in these draft RTS do not provide an alternative solution? If so, please provide concrete examples of such situations and your proposals for alternative solutions.

5000 character(s) maximum

Recital 3: We highlight the risk that reliance on customer declarations regarding nationalities may lead to strategic omissions aimed at circumventing operational restrictions. In this context, although obliged entities are required to verify only one nationality, they may nonetheless need to treat nationality as a relevant risk factor within the customer risk assessment process.

Art. 12: We seek clarification as to whether the presence of complex corporate structures automatically results in a high AML/CFT risk classification, also in light of the obligation to collect additional information (e.g. group structure charts), or whether such assessment should be performed on a case-by-case basis in accordance with a risk-based approach.

Art. 12(1)(b): We consider it appropriate to specify that the relevant jurisdictions for the purposes of this provision are those classified as high-risk jurisdictions.

Art. 23: We request clarification as to whether the wording of Article 33 AMLR, points (b) and (d), allows, on the basis of a duly justified assessment, for updates of customer information to be performed beyond the five-year period for customers subject to simplified due diligence.

Art. 30: Based on feedback collected from our members, we note that Switzerland currently requires, for the purposes of targeted financial sanctions screening, the screening also of intermediate entities in the chain between the customer and the beneficial owner—an obligation not provided for under Article 30. We stress the importance of AMLA engaging in a dialogue with the Swiss supervisory authority (FINMA) in order to foster greater regulatory alignment and avoid situations where Swiss intermediaries operating in the EU are subject to more stringent requirements than those set out in the EU framework.

Art. 33: With regard to existing customers, we request:

- replacing the reference to the “date of publication” with the “date of application”;
- explicitly clarifying, in line with what was indicated during the Open Hearing, that full alignment is not required as of the date of application, but should follow a risk-based approach, starting with high-risk customers and being completed within one year for such customers and within five years for all others (without prejudice to our comments on Article 23);
- assessing the possibility of allowing a longer timeframe for the updating/reassessment of beneficial ownership in complex structures.

- * 4. Considering AMLA’s legal mandate in Article 28(1) of Regulation (EU) 2024/1624, and taking into account your obliged entities’ products offered and service provided, what other simplified due diligence measures should be included in the draft RTS, for example because of the associated lower ML/TF risks of these products and services? Please provide concrete drafting proposals and rationale for the specific measures you would propose.

5000 character(s) maximum

Art. 13: We consider that the notion of “senior managing officials” is overly broad and may lead to divergent interpretations. We suggest limiting it to individuals vested with legal representation powers and/or members of the management body performing executive functions. We further note that requiring the same information to be collected for such individuals as for beneficial owners would impose a disproportionate burden. We therefore request explicit confirmation, in line with the Open Hearing clarifications, that collecting only the data necessary for identification purposes is sufficient.

Art. 21: In order for public registers to constitute an effective tool, we consider it essential to promote, including through AMLA’s role, greater harmonisation across jurisdictions as regards access modalities and timing for obtaining information, which are currently characterised by significant discrepancies.

- * 5. Additional observations: Do you have any additional comments relevant to the draft RTS that have not been covered above? Please ensure that comments refer to a specific article, are precise, and, where possible, supported by evidence. Where necessary, comments should also include a proposed solution.

5000 character(s) maximum

NA

Section 3 - Additional substantive input

Use this section to provide feedback on specific articles of the draft RTS, in case these were not already covered in your responses to the previous questions.

For each reply, please describe the issue identified, indicating, where relevant, whether it relates to legal certainty, proportionality, technical implementation or other factors. You are kindly asked to provide alternative drafting proposals and to explain why your proposal would be more appropriate.

Do you have any comments on a specific article in the draft RTS? There is no need to repeat comments made in the previous sections of this survey.

- Yes
 No

Do you have any comments on the recitals? The recitals are the statements at the start of the draft RTS and are numbered from (1) to (25).

- Yes
 No

Do you have any comments on the Annex in the draft RTS?

- Yes
 No

Section 4 - Overall assessment

* How would you rate the proposals set out in the draft RTS overall?

- Inadequate
- Somewhat inadequate
- Neutral
- Good
- Excellent

Would the implementation of the draft RTS generate any of the following additional costs beyond the adjustments that would be required to implement the rules set out in Chapter III of Regulation (EU) 2024/1624 (customer due diligence)?

This question is aimed at understanding the additional costs stemming from the implementation of these specific draft RTS, rather than the additional costs stemming from the provisions of Regulation (EU) 2024 /1624. We are interested in understanding the additional costs arising from the implementation of the draft RTS for your obliged entity. Please provide your responses with this context in mind.

For this survey, “costs” refer to the financial and resource implications your entity may face in implementing the draft RTS, including both initial setup efforts and ongoing operational commitments. Examples of one-off costs include amending policies and procedures, system upgrades, staff training or consultancy fees. Examples of recurring costs may include additional reporting, monitoring, software subscriptions, or allocation of additional full-time equivalent resources, etc.

Please describe and substantiate the specific costs you foresee when implementing the provisions of these draft RTS.

	Manageable impact	Disruptive impact	No significant additional costs	Not applicable/no information available
One-off implementation costs	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Recurrent costs	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Thank you very much for your feedback.

Contact

[Contact Form](#)

