

Fraud has a price.

So does missing it. BankGuard quantifies both.

The business case for fraud intelligence is not speculative. Every transaction scored is a transaction with a measurable risk attached to it.

THE COST SIDE

Financial institutions carry fraud losses as a cost of business. Direct losses — charge-offs from account takeover, unauthorized ACH, wire fraud — are measurable. Indirect costs — staff time to work alerts, regulatory examination friction from unexplained fraud events, chargeback processing — are material but frequently untracked. BankGuard's POV establishes baseline metrics for all of these at the start, so the ROI calculation at the end is defensible.

THE RECOVERY SIDE

BankGuard improves fraud outcomes through two mechanisms: earlier detection — catching fraud before the loss is complete — and prioritization — directing investigation capacity to the highest-value alerts. The combination reduces loss severity and investigation cost without adding headcount.

Loss Avoidance

Fraud caught before clearing is not a loss. BankGuard's Hold for Review action enables funds to be held pending verification — converting would-be losses to near-misses.

Alert Quality

Fewer false positives means more investigation capacity directed at real fraud. Each analyst-hour directed at real fraud instead of a false positive is recovered productivity.

Examination Readiness

Explainable scores and audit trails reduce examination preparation time. Documented model governance means less time reconstructing decisions for examiners.

ROI ESTIMATION WORKSHEET

Monthly transaction volume: _____

Current fraud loss rate (bps of assets): _____

Monthly fraud alert volume: _____

Current false-positive rate: _____

Avg analyst hours per alert: _____

Analyst fully-loaded hourly cost: _____

Target detection improvement: _____

Target false-positive reduction: _____

AnswerPoint will complete this worksheet with you during the 30-day POV scoping call.

Start with the data, not the projections.

30-day POV establishes your baseline before any commercial commitment

[Schedule Scoping Call](#)

Quantifying the BankGuard Business Case: An Institution-Specific Framework

ROI frameworks for fraud intelligence platforms are often built on vendor-supplied benchmarks that may not reflect your institution's actual environment. This brief describes AnswerPoint's approach to institution-specific ROI measurement.

30 days

TO BASELINE METRICS — MEASURED BEFORE OPTIMIZATION BEGINS

2 drivers

EARLIER DETECTION AND IMPROVED ALERT PRIORITIZATION: THE TWO ROI MECHANISMS

Documented

EVERY SCORE, EVERY REASON, EVERY DECISION — AUDIT-READY FROM DAY ONE

Why Generic Benchmarks Fail

Industry benchmark studies on fraud detection ROI typically report results for large financial institutions with sophisticated pre-existing infrastructure. These benchmarks do not translate directly to community banks and credit unions, where fraud volumes are smaller, investigation teams are leaner, and the infrastructure starting point is different.

AnswerPoint does not use generic benchmarks to make the BankGuard business case. We use the institution's own data, measured over the 30-day POV period, to establish the baseline and project the improvement.

The Three ROI Drivers

Loss avoidance is the most direct ROI driver. Every fraud event caught before the loss is complete — and held for verification — is a recoverable loss. BankGuard's Hold for Review action is specifically designed for this: high-confidence fraud signals (score ≥ 85) trigger a hold recommendation, enabling the institution to verify before releasing funds.

Alert quality is the second driver. False positives consume investigation capacity without producing recoveries. Reducing the false-positive rate by half doubles the effective capacity of the fraud investigation team — without adding headcount.

Examination efficiency is the third driver. Institutions that can produce documented, explainable fraud scoring records for examiner requests spend less time reconstructing decision records — a real cost at institutions where compliance staff are stretched.

POV Measurement Protocol

AnswerPoint establishes three baseline metrics at the start of every BankGuard POV: current fraud loss rate (measured as a percentage of transaction volume), current alert volume and false-positive rate (from existing fraud tooling), and current investigation cost per alert (from analyst time tracking or estimates).

At the end of the 30-day POV, we measure the same metrics against BankGuard-scored output and produce a documented comparison. That comparison forms the basis of the commercial proposal. We do not negotiate the ROI projection after the

POV – the numbers are what the numbers are.

ANSWERPOINT INC.

solutions@answerpoint.com · [answerpoint.com](https://www.answerpoint.com) · © 2026 AnswerPoint Inc.