

Public consultation on an action plan for a comprehensive Union policy on preventing money laundering and terrorist financing

Fields marked with * are mandatory.

Introduction

This consultation is now available in 23 European Union official languages.

Please use the language selector at the top of this page to choose your language for this consultation.

As highlighted in President's von der Leyen guidelines for the new Commission, the complexity and sophistication of the Union's financial system has opened the door to new risks of money laundering and terrorist financing. The European Union needs to step up its regulatory framework and preventive architecture to ensure that no loopholes or weak links in the internal market allow criminals to use the EU to launder the proceeds of their illicit activities.

The Action Plan adopted on 7 May 2020 by the Commission sets out the steps to be taken to deliver on this ambitious agenda, from better enforcement of existing rules to revision of the anti-money laundering /countering the financing of terrorism rules, to an overhaul of the EU's supervisory and enforcement architecture.

While recent money laundering scandals have created a sense of urgency to act, the Commission is determined to ensure that such action is comprehensive and delivers a future-proof framework that will effectively protect the Union's financial and economic system from criminal money and that will strengthen the EU's role as a world leader in the fight against money laundering and terrorist financing.

This public consultation aims to gather stakeholder views on the actions that the Commission has identified as priority in its action plan and in view of preparing potential future initiatives to strengthen the EU's anti-money laundering / countering the financing of terrorism framework.

About this consultation

In line with Better Regulation principles, the Commission has decided to launch a public consultation to gather stakeholder views on the possible enhancements to the EU anti-money laundering/countering the financing of terrorism framework. This consultation contains separate sections. You can choose to answer only one, several or all sections, depending on your interest and knowledge.

The first section aims to collect stakeholder views regarding actions already undertaken at EU level to strengthen the application and enforcement of the EU anti-money laundering / countering the financing of terrorism framework, and how each of them could be strengthened.

The second section seeks views regarding the current EU legal framework, what areas should be further harmonised and what should be left to Member States to regulate. Feedback is also sought on the need to improve consistency with other related legislation is also raised for feedback.

The third section aims to capture views from all stakeholders on a revised supervisory architecture. Stakeholders are invited to react on scope, structure and powers that should be granted to an EU-level supervisor and how it should interact with national supervisors.

The fourth section looks for input from stakeholders on the actions that can help to strengthen the provision and relevance of financial intelligence, and in particular on the possibility to set up a support and coordination mechanism for financial intelligence units across the EU.

The fifth section seeks stakeholder views with regard to the enforcement actions and the development of partnerships between public authorities and the private sector to ensure that, when money laundering has not been prevented, it can at least be detected and suppressed.

The sixth section aims to receive views from the stakeholders on the actions that the EU should take at international level and with regard to non-EU countries to strengthen its global role in the fight against money laundering and terrorism financing.

Responding to the full questionnaire should take 25 minutes.

Important notice

Contributions received are intended for publication "as submitted" on the Commission's websites. In the next section, you have the possibility to indicate whether you agree to the publication of your individual responses under your name or anonymously. In addition to answering the questions, you may upload a brief document (e.g. a position paper) at the end of the questionnaire. The document can be in any official EU language.

Please note: In order to ensure a fair and transparent consultation process **only responses received through our online questionnaire will be taken into account** and included in the report summarising the responses. Should you have a problem completing this questionnaire or if you require particular assistance, please contact fisma-financial-crime@ec.europa.eu.

More information:

- [on this consultation](#)

- [on the consultation document](#)
- [on the protection of personal data regime for this consultation](#)

About you

* Language of my contribution

- Bulgarian
- Croatian
- Czech
- Danish
- Dutch
- English
- Estonian
- Finnish
- French
- Gaelic
- German
- Greek
- Hungarian
- Italian
- Latvian
- Lithuanian
- Maltese
- Polish
- Portuguese
- Romanian
- Slovak
- Slovenian
- Spanish
- Swedish

* I am giving my contribution as

- Academic/research institution

- Business association
- Company/business organisation
- Consumer organisation
- EU citizen
- Environmental organisation
- Non-EU citizen
- Non-governmental organisation (NGO)
- Public authority
- Trade union
- Other

* First name

Constantin

* Surname

Fabricius

* Email (this won't be published)

c.fabricius@kreditplattformen.de

* Organisation name

255 character(s) maximum

Association of German Lending Platforms (Verband deutscher Kreditplattformen)

* Organisation size

- Micro (1 to 9 employees)
- Small (10 to 49 employees)
- Medium (50 to 249 employees)
- Large (250 or more)

Transparency register number

255 character(s) maximum

Check if your organisation is on the [transparency register](#). It's a voluntary database for organisations seeking to influence EU decision-making.

* Country of origin

Please add your country of origin, or that of your organisation.

- | | | | |
|---|---|--|--|
| <input type="radio"/> Afghanistan | <input type="radio"/> Djibouti | <input type="radio"/> Libya | <input type="radio"/> Saint Martin |
| <input type="radio"/> Åland Islands | <input type="radio"/> Dominica | <input type="radio"/> Liechtenstein | <input type="radio"/> Saint Pierre and Miquelon |
| <input type="radio"/> Albania | <input type="radio"/> Dominican Republic | <input type="radio"/> Lithuania | <input type="radio"/> Saint Vincent and the Grenadines |
| <input type="radio"/> Algeria | <input type="radio"/> Ecuador | <input type="radio"/> Luxembourg | <input type="radio"/> Samoa |
| <input type="radio"/> American Samoa | <input type="radio"/> Egypt | <input type="radio"/> Macau | <input type="radio"/> San Marino |
| <input type="radio"/> Andorra | <input type="radio"/> El Salvador | <input type="radio"/> Madagascar | <input type="radio"/> São Tomé and Príncipe |
| <input type="radio"/> Angola | <input type="radio"/> Equatorial Guinea | <input type="radio"/> Malawi | <input type="radio"/> Saudi Arabia |
| <input type="radio"/> Anguilla | <input type="radio"/> Eritrea | <input type="radio"/> Malaysia | <input type="radio"/> Senegal |
| <input type="radio"/> Antarctica | <input type="radio"/> Estonia | <input type="radio"/> Maldives | <input type="radio"/> Serbia |
| <input type="radio"/> Antigua and Barbuda | <input type="radio"/> Eswatini | <input type="radio"/> Mali | <input type="radio"/> Seychelles |
| <input type="radio"/> Argentina | <input type="radio"/> Ethiopia | <input type="radio"/> Malta | <input type="radio"/> Sierra Leone |
| <input type="radio"/> Armenia | <input type="radio"/> Falkland Islands | <input type="radio"/> Marshall Islands | <input type="radio"/> Singapore |
| <input type="radio"/> Aruba | <input type="radio"/> Faroe Islands | <input type="radio"/> Martinique | <input type="radio"/> Sint Maarten |
| <input type="radio"/> Australia | <input type="radio"/> Fiji | <input type="radio"/> Mauritania | <input type="radio"/> Slovakia |
| <input type="radio"/> Austria | <input type="radio"/> Finland | <input type="radio"/> Mauritius | <input type="radio"/> Slovenia |
| <input type="radio"/> Azerbaijan | <input type="radio"/> France | <input type="radio"/> Mayotte | <input type="radio"/> Solomon Islands |
| <input type="radio"/> Bahamas | <input type="radio"/> French Guiana | <input type="radio"/> Mexico | <input type="radio"/> Somalia |
| <input type="radio"/> Bahrain | <input type="radio"/> French Polynesia | <input type="radio"/> Micronesia | <input type="radio"/> South Africa |
| <input type="radio"/> Bangladesh | <input type="radio"/> French Southern and Antarctic Lands | <input type="radio"/> Moldova | <input type="radio"/> South Georgia and the South Sandwich Islands |
| <input type="radio"/> Barbados | <input type="radio"/> Gabon | <input type="radio"/> Monaco | <input type="radio"/> South Korea |
| <input type="radio"/> Belarus | <input type="radio"/> Georgia | <input type="radio"/> Mongolia | <input type="radio"/> South Sudan |

- | | | | |
|--|---|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|
| Belgium | Germany | Montenegro | Spain |
| Belize | Ghana | Montserrat | Sri Lanka |
| Benin | Gibraltar | Morocco | Sudan |
| Bermuda | Greece | Mozambique | Suriname |
| Bhutan | Greenland | Myanmar
/Burma | Svalbard and
Jan Mayen |
| Bolivia | Grenada | Namibia | Sweden |
| Bonaire Saint
Eustatius and
Saba | Guadeloupe | Nauru | Switzerland |
| Bosnia and
Herzegovina | Guam | Nepal | Syria |
| Botswana | Guatemala | Netherlands | Taiwan |
| Bouvet Island | Guernsey | New Caledonia | Tajikistan |
| Brazil | Guinea | New Zealand | Tanzania |
| British Indian
Ocean Territory | Guinea-Bissau | Nicaragua | Thailand |
| British Virgin
Islands | Guyana | Niger | The Gambia |
| Brunei | Haiti | Nigeria | Timor-Leste |
| Bulgaria | Heard Island
and McDonald
Islands | Niue | Togo |
| Burkina Faso | Honduras | Norfolk Island | Tokelau |
| Burundi | Hong Kong | Northern
Mariana Islands | Tonga |
| Cambodia | Hungary | North Korea | Trinidad and
Tobago |
| Cameroon | Iceland | North
Macedonia | Tunisia |
| Canada | India | Norway | Turkey |
| Cape Verde | Indonesia | Oman | Turkmenistan |
| Cayman Islands | Iran | Pakistan | Turks and
Caicos Islands |
| | Iraq | Palau | Tuvalu |

Central African

Republic

- | | | | |
|--|-----------------------------------|--|--|
| <input type="radio"/> Chad | <input type="radio"/> Ireland | <input type="radio"/> Palestine | <input type="radio"/> Uganda |
| <input type="radio"/> Chile | <input type="radio"/> Isle of Man | <input type="radio"/> Panama | <input type="radio"/> Ukraine |
| <input type="radio"/> China | <input type="radio"/> Israel | <input type="radio"/> Papua New Guinea | <input type="radio"/> United Arab Emirates |
| <input type="radio"/> Christmas Island | <input type="radio"/> Italy | <input type="radio"/> Paraguay | <input type="radio"/> United Kingdom |
| <input type="radio"/> Clipperton | <input type="radio"/> Jamaica | <input type="radio"/> Peru | <input type="radio"/> United States |
| <input type="radio"/> Cocos (Keeling) Islands | <input type="radio"/> Japan | <input type="radio"/> Philippines | <input type="radio"/> United States Minor Outlying Islands |
| <input type="radio"/> Colombia | <input type="radio"/> Jersey | <input type="radio"/> Pitcairn Islands | <input type="radio"/> Uruguay |
| <input type="radio"/> Comoros | <input type="radio"/> Jordan | <input type="radio"/> Poland | <input type="radio"/> US Virgin Islands |
| <input type="radio"/> Congo | <input type="radio"/> Kazakhstan | <input type="radio"/> Portugal | <input type="radio"/> Uzbekistan |
| <input type="radio"/> Cook Islands | <input type="radio"/> Kenya | <input type="radio"/> Puerto Rico | <input type="radio"/> Vanuatu |
| <input type="radio"/> Costa Rica | <input type="radio"/> Kiribati | <input type="radio"/> Qatar | <input type="radio"/> Vatican City |
| <input type="radio"/> Côte d'Ivoire | <input type="radio"/> Kosovo | <input type="radio"/> Réunion | <input type="radio"/> Venezuela |
| <input type="radio"/> Croatia | <input type="radio"/> Kuwait | <input type="radio"/> Romania | <input type="radio"/> Vietnam |
| <input type="radio"/> Cuba | <input type="radio"/> Kyrgyzstan | <input type="radio"/> Russia | <input type="radio"/> Wallis and Futuna |
| <input type="radio"/> Curaçao | <input type="radio"/> Laos | <input type="radio"/> Rwanda | <input type="radio"/> Western Sahara |
| <input type="radio"/> Cyprus | <input type="radio"/> Latvia | <input type="radio"/> Saint Barthélemy | <input type="radio"/> Yemen |
| <input type="radio"/> Czechia | <input type="radio"/> Lebanon | <input type="radio"/> Saint Helena, Ascension and Tristan da Cunha | <input type="radio"/> Zambia |
| <input type="radio"/> Democratic Republic of the Congo | <input type="radio"/> Lesotho | <input type="radio"/> Saint Kitts and Nevis | <input type="radio"/> Zimbabwe |
| <input type="radio"/> Denmark | <input type="radio"/> Liberia | <input type="radio"/> Saint Lucia | |

* Field of activity or sector (if applicable):

at least 1 choice(s)

- Accounting
- Art dealing
- Auditing
- Banking
- Company and trust creation and management
- Consulting
- Gambling
- Insurance
- Investment management (e.g. assets, securities)
- Other company and trust services
- Other financial services
- Notary services
- Legal services
- Pension provision
- Real estate
- Tax advice
- Think tank
- Trading in goods
- Virtual assets
- Other
- Not applicable

* Publication privacy settings

The Commission will publish the responses to this public consultation. You can choose whether you would like your details to be made public or to remain anonymous.

 **Anonymous**

Only your type of respondent, country of origin and contribution will be published. All other personal details (name, organisation name and size, transparency register number) will not be published.

 **Public**

Your personal details (name, organisation name and size, transparency register number, country of origin) will be published with your contribution.

I agree with the [personal data protection provisions](#)

Ensuring effective implementation of the existing rules

Ensuring correct transposition and application of the EU anti-money laundering / countering the financing of terrorism rules is a priority for the Commission. The Commission adopted a tough approach in relation to the transposition of both the 4th and 5th Anti-Money Laundering Directives and launched or will soon launch infringement proceedings against Member States for failure to fully transpose these provisions.

The Commission monitors the effectiveness of Member States' anti-money laundering / countering the financing of terrorism frameworks in the context of the European Semester cycle. In 2020, 11 countries have seen their frameworks assessed.

The European Banking Authority has seen its mandate recently strengthened, and is now responsible to lead, coordinate and monitor AML/CFT efforts in the financial sector. Among its new powers are the performance of risk assessments on competent authorities, the right to request national authorities to investigate individual institutions and adopt measures when breaches are detected. These new powers complement existing powers to investigate potential breaches of Union law.

This section aims to collect stakeholder views regarding the effectiveness of these measures and on whether other measures could contribute to strengthening the enforcement of anti-money laundering / countering the financing of terrorism rules.

How effective are the following existing EU tools to ensure application and enforcement of anti-money laundering / countering the financing of terrorism rules?

	Very effective	Rather effective	Neutral	Rather ineffective	Not effective at all	Don't know
Infringement proceedings for failure to transpose EU law or incomplete /incorrect transposition	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Country-specific recommendations in the context of the European Semester	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Action following complaint by the public	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Breach of Union law investigations by the European Banking Authority	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
New powers granted to the European Banking Authority	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

How effective would more action at each of the following levels be to fight money laundering and terrorist financing?

	Very effective	Rather effective	Neutral	Rather ineffective	Not effective at all	Don't know
At national level only	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
At national level with financial support and guidance from the European Union	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
At the level of the European Union (oversight and coordination of national action)	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
At international level	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
No additional action at any level	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Should other tools be used by the EU to ensure effective implementation of the rules?

5000 character(s) maximum

including spaces and line breaks, i.e. stricter than the MS Word characters counting method.

In the first instance, EBA's recently extended mandate should exert full appliance and be assessed first with all relevant stakeholders before starting a discussion about new tools. From our point of view the current set-up meets very much the challenges stemming from member states interpreting EU AML/TF law different.

Additional comments

5000 character(s) maximum

including spaces and line breaks, i.e. stricter than the MS Word characters counting method.

Delivering a reinforced rulebook

While the current EU legal framework is far-reaching, its minimum harmonisation approach results in diverging implementation among Member States and the imposition of additional rules at national level (e.g. list of entities subject to anti-money laundering obligations, ceilings for large cash payments). This fragmented legislative landscape affects the provision of cross-border services and limits cooperation among competent authorities. To remedy these weaknesses, some parts of the existing legal framework might be further harmonised and become part of a future Regulation. Other Union rules might also need to be amended or clarified to create better synergies with the AML/CFT framework.

As criminals continuously look for new channels to launder the proceeds of their illicit activities, new businesses might become exposed to money laundering / terrorist financing risks. In order to align with international standards, virtual asset service providers might need to be added among the entities subject to anti-money laundering / countering the financing of terrorism rules (the 'obliged entities'). Other sectors might also need to be included among the obliged entities to ensure that they take adequate preventive measures against money laundering and terrorism financing (e.g. crowdfunding platforms).

This section aims to gather stakeholder views regarding a) what provisions would need to be further harmonised, b) what other EU rules would need to be reviewed or clarified and c) whether the list of entities subject to preventive obligations should be expanded.

The Commission has identified a number of provisions that could be further harmonised through a future Regulation. Do you agree with the selection?

	Yes	No	Don't know
List of obliged entities	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Structure and tasks of supervision	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Tasks of financial intelligence units	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Customer due diligence	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Electronic identification and verification	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Record keeping	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Internal controls	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Reporting obligations	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Beneficial ownership registers	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Central bank account registers	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Ceiling for large cash payments	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Freezing powers for financial intelligence units	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Sanctions	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

What other provisions should be harmonised through a Regulation?

5000 character(s) maximum

including spaces and line breaks, i.e. stricter than the MS Word characters counting method.

Generally, reality shows that the transposition of EU AML/TF law has been different in the EU member states as national leeway have been scooped out. In contrast, harmonizing rules will certainly foster competition and, hence, strengthen the internal European market.

It is our expectation that any harmonization must contribute to a lucid and simplified number of rules as well as the acceleration of procedures. At the end, the reduction of (transnational) compliance costs will certainly set free the necessary financial power for the further development of the transnational FinTech business. A bad example of how things can go wrong though is the German transparency register where the national

legislator heaped up more and more obligations for the industry. On the other side it takes between 3 and 4 days till one gets an information from the register authority. This does not go together and is the opposite of agility and user-friendliness which should be the key aspects for any European approach.

What provisions should remain in the Directive due to EU Treaty provisions?

5000 character(s) maximum

including spaces and line breaks, i.e. stricter than the MS Word characters counting method.

We encourage the European legislator to examine the adoption of an AML/TF regulation where ever possible rather than a directive. Reality (latest scandals) has demonstrated that AML supervision and prosecution in the EU member states have been designed differently despite the clear goals defined in the AML/TF directive. This hampers the development of a level playing field in the area of security and justice. Furthermore, different AML/TF practice in the EU member states is an impediment for the realisation of the capital market union.

What areas where Member States have adopted additional rules should continue to be regulated at national level?

5000 character(s) maximum

including spaces and line breaks, i.e. stricter than the MS Word characters counting method.

As far as Germany is concerned major areas of the AMLD have been neatly transposed into German law. Beyond, there do not exist any relevant rules which would have to be conserved at national level.

Should new economic operators (e.g. crowdfunding platforms) be added to the list of obliged entities?

5000 character(s) maximum

including spaces and line breaks, i.e. stricter than the MS Word characters counting method.

Generally, only operators who are involved in the payment streams should be added to such list. All German crowdlending platforms, however, are not involved at all as the operating license as mere brokers for loans as well as investments do not allow this. That's the reason why necessarily a fronting/partner bank is involved into the disbursement of the loan and in the repayment respectively if not performed via money transfer business or directly between debtors and creditors via their bank accounts. As in this relationship customers on the one side and banks or money transfer servicers on the other side have a direct proximity to the payment streams rather the latter than the crowdlending platforms belong to the list of obliged entities. Everything else would create a complex mixture of responsibilities as well as difficult liability and data protection questions.

In this respect, we would like to point to EBA's consultation on the revised guidelines on AML/TF risk factors which for the first time will address the crowdfunding sector. Draft guideline 17.8 clearly stresses that it is rather a low risk if the money transactions between project owners and investors flow via regulated credit or financial institutions. Beyond, crowd lending projects typically are long term investments and cover a large number of small/very small investment amounts which are irrelevant from an AML/TF perspective. In a nutshell, there is a good reasoning to keep crowd-lending platforms completely off the list of obliged entities. This is all the more true as drawing crowd-lending platforms completely into the scope of EU AML/TF law would lay an expensive compliance burden onto a young branch of the financial industry.

In your opinion, are there any FinTech activities that currently pose money laundering / terrorism financing risks and are not captured by the existing EU framework? Please explain

5000 character(s) maximum

including spaces and line breaks, i.e. stricter than the MS Word characters counting method.

As regards the German crowdlending industry there do not exist any of such activities.

The Commission has identified that the consistency of a number of other EU rules with anti-money laundering / countering the financing of terrorism rules might need to be further enhanced or clarified through guidance or legislative changes. Do you agree?

	Yes	No	Don't know
Obligation for prudential supervisors to share information with anti-money laundering supervisors	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Bank Recovery and Resolution Directive (Directive 2014/59/EU) or normal insolvency proceedings: whether and under what circumstances anti-money laundering grounds can provide valid grounds to trigger the resolution or winding up of a credit institution	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>
Deposit Guarantee Schemes Directive (Directive 2014/49/EU): customer assessment prior to pay-out	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Payment Accounts Directive (Directive 2014/92/EU): need to ensure the general right to basic account without weakening anti-money laundering rules in suspicious cases	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Categories of payment service providers subject to anti-money laundering rules	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Integration of strict anti-money laundering requirements in fit&proper tests	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Are there other EU rules that should be aligned with anti-money laundering / countering the financing of terrorism rules?

5000 character(s) maximum

including spaces and line breaks, i.e. stricter than the MS Word characters counting method.

Additional comments

5000 character(s) maximum

including spaces and line breaks, i.e. stricter than the MS Word characters counting method.

Bringing about EU-level supervision

Supervision is the cornerstone of an effective anti-money laundering / countering the financing of terrorism framework. Recent money laundering cases in the EU point to significant shortcomings in the supervision of both financial and non-financial entities. A clear weakness is the current design of the supervisory framework, which is Member-State based. However, supervisory quality and effectiveness are uneven across the EU, and no effective mechanisms exist to deal with cross-border situations.

A more integrated supervisory system would continue to build on the work of national supervisors, which could be complement, coordinated and supervised by an EU-level supervisor. The definition of such integrated system will require addressing issues linked to the scope and powers of such EU-level supervisor, and to the body that should be entrusted with such supervisory powers.

Effective EU level-supervision should include all obliged entities (both financial and non-financial ones), either gradually or from the outset. Other options would rest on the current level of harmonisation and provide for a narrower scope, i.e. oversight of the financial sector or of credit institutions only. These options would however leave weak links in the EU supervisory system.

Linked to the issue of the scope is that of the powers that such EU-level supervisor would have. These may range from direct powers (e.g. inspection of obliged entities) to indirect powers (e.g. review of national supervisors' activities) only, either on all or some entities. Alternatively, the EU-level supervisor could be granted both direct and indirect supervisory powers. The entities to be directly supervised by the EU-level supervisor could be predefined or regularly reviewed, based on risk criteria.

Finally, these supervisory tasks might be exercised by the European Banking Authority or by a new centralised agency. A third option might be to set-up a hybrid structure with decisions taken at the central level and applied by EU inspectors present in the Member States.

What entities/sectors should fall within the scope of EU supervision for compliance with anti-money laundering / countering the financing of terrorism rules?

- All obliged entities/sectors
- All obliged entities/sectors, but through a gradual process
- Financial institutions
- Credit institutions

What powers should the EU supervisor have?

at most 1 choice(s)

- Indirect powers over all obliged entities, with the possibility to directly intervene in justified cases
- Indirect powers over some obliged entities, with the possibility to directly intervene in justified cases
- Direct powers over all obliged entities
- Direct powers only over some obliged entities
- A mix of direct and indirect powers, depending on the sector/entities

Which body should exercise these supervisory powers?

at most 1 choice(s)

- The European Banking Authority
- A new EU centralised agency
- A body with a hybrid structure (central decision-making and decentralised implementation)
- Other

Additional comments

5000 character(s) maximum

including spaces and line breaks, i.e. stricter than the MS Word characters counting method.

Establishing a coordination and support mechanism for financial intelligence units

Financial intelligence units (FIUs) play a key role in the detection of money laundering and identification of new trends. They receive and analyse suspicious transaction and activities reports submitted by obliged entities, produce analyses and disseminate them to competent authorities.

While financial intelligence units generally function well, recent analyses have shown several weaknesses. Feedback to obliged entities remains limited, particularly in cross-border cases, which leaves the private sector without indications on the quality of their reporting system. The cross-border nature of much money laundering cases also calls for closer information exchanges, joint analyses and for a revamping of the FIU.net – the EU system for information exchange among financial intelligence units. Concerns regarding data protection issues also prevent Europol, under its current mandate, to continue hosting this system.

An FIU coordination and support mechanism at EU level would remedy the above weaknesses. Currently, the only forum available at EU level to coordinate the work of FIUs is an informal Commission expert group, the

FIU

Platform.

This section aims to obtain stakeholder feedback on a) what activities could be entrusted to such EU coordination and support mechanism and b) which body should be responsible for providing such coordination and support mechanism.

Which of the following tasks should be given to the coordination and support mechanism?

- Developing draft common templates to report suspicious transactions
- Issuing guidance
- Developing manuals
- Assessing trends in money laundering and terrorist financing across the EU and identify common elements
- Facilitating joint analyses of cross-border cases
- Building capacity through new IT tools
- Hosting the FIU.net

Which body should host this coordination and support mechanism?

at most 1 choice(s)

- The FIU Platform, turned into a formal committee involved in adopting Commission binding acts
- Europol, based on a revised mandate
- A new dedicated EU body
- The future EU AML/CFT supervisor
- A formal Network of financial intelligence units

Additional comments

5000 character(s) maximum

including spaces and line breaks, i.e. stricter than the MS Word characters counting method.

We agree with the Commission's view that the European FIU units generally work well. However, it is a fact that especially the German FIU sitting with the customs duty is facing an already overwhelming but still

increasing number of reported suspicions of money laundering. It regularly takes months until one will have heard back from them. From our perspective this is mainly driven by the uncertainty with obliged entities about the interpretation of EU law and its German transposition acts. It is obvious that the industry does have problems with its proper application despite EBA and BaFin guidelines and therefore rather tends to report all assumed suspicions of money laundering than abstaining from it – simply to avoid any liability to prosecution. One of the options to milder this problem could be to further build up staff. This would not solve the core problem though which obviously are the laws on AML/TF inviting to interpretation and leading to an overwhelming number of suspicion reports. Our proposal therefore is to strengthen the FIUs' work by simplifying the European AML/TF legislation.

Enforcement of EU criminal law provisions and information exchange

Recent actions have increased the tools available to law enforcement authorities to investigate and prosecute money laundering and terrorist financing. Common definitions and sanctioning of money laundering facilitate judicial and police cooperation, while direct access to central bank account mechanisms and closer cooperation between law enforcement authorities, financial intelligence units and Europol speed up criminal investigations and make fighting cross-border crime more effective. Structures set up within Europol such as the Anti-Money Laundering Operational Network and the upcoming European Financial and Economic Crime Centre are also expected to facilitate operational cooperation and cross-border investigations.

Public-private partnerships are also gaining momentum as a means to make better use of financial intelligence. The current EU framework already requires financial intelligence units to provide feedback on typologies and trends in money laundering and terrorist financing to the private sector. Other forms of partnerships involving the exchange of operational information on intelligence suspects have proven effective but raise concerns as regards the application of EU fundamental rights and data protection rules.

This section aims to gather feedback from stakeholder on what actions are needed to help public-private partnership develop within the boundaries of EU fundamental rights.

What actions are needed to facilitate the development of public-private partnerships?

- Put in place more specific rules on the obligation for financial intelligence units to provide feedback to obliged entities
- Regulate the functioning of public-private partnerships
- Issue guidance on the application of rules with respect to public-private partnerships (e.g. antitrust)
- Promote sharing of good practices

Additional comments

5000 character(s) maximum

including spaces and line breaks, i.e. stricter than the MS Word characters counting method.

Strengthening the EU's global role

Money laundering and terrorism financing are global threats. The Commission and EU Member States actively contribute to the development of international standards to prevent these crimes through the Financial Action Task Force (FATF), an international cooperation mechanism that aims to fight money laundering and terrorism financing. To strengthen the EU's role globally, and given the fact that the EU generally translates FATF standards into binding provisions, it is necessary that the Commission and Member States speak with one voice and that the supranational nature of the EU is adequately taken into account when Member States undergo assessment of their national frameworks.

While FATF remains the international reference as regards the identification of high-risk jurisdictions, the Union also needs to strengthen its autonomous policy towards third countries that might pose a specific threat to the EU financial system. This policy involves early dialogue with these countries, close cooperation with Member States throughout the process and the identification of remedial actions to be implemented. Technical assistance might be provided to help these countries overcome their weaknesses and contribute to raising global standards.

This section seeks stakeholder views on what actions are needed to secure a stronger role for the EU globally.

How effective are the following actions to raise the EU's global role in fighting money laundering and terrorist financing?

	Very effective	Rather effective	Neutral	Rather ineffective	Not effective at all	Don't know
Give the Commission the task of representing the European Union in the FATF	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>				
Push for FATF standards to align to EU ones whenever the	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

EU is more advanced (e.g.
information on beneficial
ownership)

Additional comments

5000 character(s) maximum

including spaces and line breaks, i.e. stricter than the MS Word characters counting method.

Additional information

Should you wish to provide additional information (for example a position paper) or raise specific points not covered by the questionnaire, you can upload your additional document here.

Please note that the uploaded document will be published alongside your response to the questionnaire which is the essential input to this open public consultation. The document is an optional complement and serves as additional background reading to better understand your position.

The maximum file size is 1 MB.

You can upload several files.

Only files of the type pdf,txt,doc,docx,odt,rtf are allowed

Useful links

[More on this consultation](https://ec.europa.eu/info/publications/finance-consultations-2020-anti-money-laundering-action-plan_en) (https://ec.europa.eu/info/publications/finance-consultations-2020-anti-money-laundering-action-plan_en)

[Consultation document](https://ec.europa.eu/info/files/2020-anti-money-laundering-action-plan-consultation-document_en) (https://ec.europa.eu/info/files/2020-anti-money-laundering-action-plan-consultation-document_en)

[Specific privacy statement](https://ec.europa.eu/info/law/better-regulation/specific-privacy-statement_en) (https://ec.europa.eu/info/law/better-regulation/specific-privacy-statement_en)

[More on anti-money-laundering](https://ec.europa.eu/info/business-economy-euro/banking-and-finance/financial-supervision-and-risk-management/anti-money-laundering-and-counter-terrorist-financing_en) (https://ec.europa.eu/info/business-economy-euro/banking-and-finance/financial-supervision-and-risk-management/anti-money-laundering-and-counter-terrorist-financing_en)

[More on the Transparency register](http://ec.europa.eu/transparencyregister/public/homePage.do?locale=en) (<http://ec.europa.eu/transparencyregister/public/homePage.do?locale=en>)

Contact

fisma-financial-crime@ec.europa.eu