

## Ronald F Pol

PhD, LLB (Hons), BCom (Econ)  
AMLAssurance.com

Policy, regulatory, compliance and enforcement effectiveness.



With more than 25 years' applied experience as a lawyer, legal consultant, writer and speaker in New Zealand, Australia, the UK, the US and elsewhere, Dr Pol's expertise is supplemented with academic rigour and practical, outcome-oriented critical thinking.

Experience with premier law firms in New Zealand, the UK and Hong Kong, and in-house roles, includes directing major litigation and systematically reducing the legal risk profile of New Zealand's largest public company. Acting general counsel appointments and management advisory work in many public and private sector organisations were similarly focused on meeting key organisational outcomes in complex environments. Dr Pol also led New Zealand's corporate lawyers' association, and was appointed to the governing council of the NZ Law Society.

Framed in policy effectiveness and outcomes, Dr Pol's thesis filled an evidence gap in an area with 'wicked' problems, seemingly impossible to resolve in the current paradigm. Anti-money laundering and counter-financing of terrorism (AML/CFT) measures are globally ubiquitous, yet arguably the most intractably least effective form of comprehensive policy, regulatory and enforcement endeavour anywhere, ever.

Dr Pol has also assessed the crime-control impact and effect of AML/CFT controls, globally and in selected jurisdictions, and undertook the first comprehensive independent assessment of the global AML/CFT 'effectiveness' methodology, which evaluates for specified outcomes. The uncomfortable conclusion of these projects indicates that the gap between crime prevention objectives and outcomes achieved may be too large for the standard model and its incremental extension of compliance obligations to bridge. A collaborative project is underway to develop and test potential solutions.

In broader areas of policy endeavour, consistent with governments drawing from evidence-based, outcome-oriented frameworks, Dr Pol's professional expertise is focused on policy,

regulatory, enforcement and compliance effectiveness. Not just whether rules exist, meet received standards, or are complied with; but whether they work. Do they achieve intended objectives? Despite enabling frameworks for demonstrably improved outcomes, this line of enquiry remains surprisingly rare.

A key feature of Dr Pol's practical application of this fundamental issue in public policy (the extent to which policies are effective in achieving intended objectives) is the distinction between input, activity and output measures, and outcomes. Meaningfully distinguishing these concepts is a defining feature of post 'new public management' policy, regulatory and enforcement leadership.

For example, more money spent on health budgets (inputs) or operation numbers (outputs) tells us little about meaningful, measurable public health improvements. Likewise, policy debate mired in argument about social housing unit numbers (outputs) tell us little about the health, educational and employment *outcomes* from safe, secure housing intended by policy initiatives. Similarly, in policing, education, welfare, workplace safety, resource management, and nearly every facet of central and local government endeavour and regulatory compliance.

'Outputs' are easy to measure, and often positively influence outcomes, yet policy initiatives, compliance obligations and enforcement activity from the outset focused on ultimate objectives have greater chance of success.

Dr Pol is currently developing a series of policy, regulatory and enforcement strategies for improving outcome effectiveness, beyond the rhetoric of activity and output measures often mislabeled 'outcomes'.

As well as helping enable better public-sector outcomes, policy, regulatory and enforcement effectiveness also forecasts the prospect of enhanced, less costly, compliance; potentially enabling renewed customer-oriented re-focus of private sector resources.