To:

MONEYVAL Chair: Ms. Elżbieta Frankow-Jaśkiewicz

MONEYVAL Vice-Chair: Mr Alexey Petrenko MONEYVAL Vice-Chair: Mr Richard Walker

MONEYVAL Executive Secretary: Mr. Igor Nebyvaev

## Subject: Formalised Channels for Meaningful NPO Engagement

The Financial Action Task Force (FATF) has long recognised the vital importance of NPOs in providing crucial charitable services around the world, as well as the difficulties in providing that assistance to those in need. The FATF has engaged closely with NPOs over the years to refine the FATF Standards to provide flexibility to ensure that charitable donations and activity can proceed expeditiously through legitimate and transparent channels and without disruption. The FATF also <u>committed</u> itself a few years ago to engage in a more formalized dialogue with the NPO sector, which was welcomed by many NPOs. Moreover, the FATF has recently opened up various channels for NPO - among others, a direct option for NPOs and civil society organisations to provide input into FATF Mutual Evaluations. In addition, several NPO representatives participate as permanent members in the FATF Private Sector Consultative Forum, directly discussing relevant issues for the NPO sector. Finally, the FATF conducts additional ad hoc thematic meetings and briefings, both offline and online, with NPO sector representatives, to gain input on the topics of standard implementation, standard development and education.

Similarly, NPO sector wishes to engage with the FATF-style regional bodies, including Moneyval. Therefore, the undersigned NPO representatives urge the Moneyval to:

- 1. Commit, in a similar manner as the FATF, to a formalized regular dialogue and engagement with the NPO sector;
- 2. Provide avenues and protocols for the NPO sector to raise concerns over abuse and unintended consequences of the FATF standards in Moneyval member jurisdictions;
- 3. Conduct thematic briefings with the NPO sector to improve effective and risk-based implementation of Recommendation 8 in Moneyval member jurisdictions.

In order to facilitate concrete discussion about possible models of engagement, we are attaching below the proposed draft concept note for guidelines for engagement with the NPO sector. Such guidelines could be drawn based on practices that exist by other institutions, most notably the Council of Europe.<sup>1</sup>

We kindly ask the MONEYVAL to consider these proposals and organize a wider consultation meeting with the NPO sector to discuss feasible and meaningful options for future engagement.

Ί.	ľ	1	a	n	K	Ī	J	0	u	l.

\_

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> Examples of international practices and standards can be found in Annex 1.

# CONCEPT OUTLINE: GUIDELINES ON ENGAGEMENT FOR MONEYVAL AND NPOS

#### 1. Annual Consultation with NPO sector

- Organize annual dialogue with the NPO sector representatives, similar to the FATF Private Sector Consultative Forum.
- Include various NPO representatives to reflect the diversity of the sector and geographical coverage. Criteria to be considered include umbrella groups or coalitions that represent a large constituency, geographic balance, representatives from different types of NPOs affected by the FATF standards, etc. (specific criteria should be finalized in consultation with NPOs).
- Consider rotating NPO representatives on 2-yearly basis to allow for more diversity.
- Ensure timely (early) announcements regarding NPO meetings and details for NPOs on how to participate.
- Provide NPOs with the opportunity to contribute by organizing a session at the meeting, or by suggesting topics and speakers.
- Ensure timely distribution and publishing all relevant material and draft documents in their early form.
- Allow enough time for meaningful input and discussion at the meeting.
- Publish written NPO contributions online.
- Provide feedback from plenary discussion on the draft documents.

### 2. Ad hoc engagement on implementation and consequences issues

- Organize (online or live) meetings with the NPO sector on issues concerning effective implementation of the Recommendation 8, e.g. good practices of outreach, self-regulation and detecting TF abuse concerns.
- Circulate questions and share any draft documents for input with the NPO sector beyond the annual consultation.
- Provide a contact point and allow for online (written) contributions as one form of consulting to reach out to different NPOs and enable broad geographical representation. Online (written) contributions can be managed by providing a simple template with limited space to ensure streamlined input.
- Provide timely announcements of the process, steps, deadlines and how NPOs can participate.
- Provide feedback from any discussion on the draft documents.

# 3. Addressing over-regulation of NPOs and abuse of Recommendation 8

- Provide clear procedures and expectations for NPOs on how to raise concerns about over-regulation or abuse of Recommendation 8
- Integrate UN Security Council Resolution 2462 concepts and Council of Europe human rights principles and safeguards
- Potentially use the similar mechanism as the FATF for the NPO input into the Mutual Evaluation process (MER) since this process is an ongoing

cycle and NPO concerns and input could be used also during the follow up stages of the evaluation cycle. (see: <a href="https://www.fatf-gafi.org/faq/mutualevaluations/#d.en.448461">https://www.fatf-gafi.org/faq/mutualevaluations/#d.en.448461</a>). Such mechanism could also formalize points of intervention/submission from NPOs for specific time points in the regular follow up reviews.

- Establish an internal mechanism to deal with emergency situations of abuse of Recommendation 8 - e.g. an online "letterbox" with specific form and content requirements, where submissions can be made according to set guidelines.
- This would allow the Moneyval to have additional overview from the stakeholders on the implementation and compliance with the FATF standards, receive and review submissions, play an advisory function and offer technical assistance.

#### Annex 1

An illustrative list of best practices examples and standards for public participation in decision–making can be found in these documents:

- Council of Europe: <u>Guidelines for Civil Participation</u>
- Council of Europe: <u>Code of Good Practice for Civil Participation in the Decision–Making Process</u>
- UN Human Rights Council / OHCHR: Guidelines on public participation
- Open Government Partnership: <u>Civil Society Dialogue</u>

#### LIST OF SIGNATORY NPOs:

Institute for Democracy and Mediation (IDM), Albania Child Rights Centre Albania (CRCA/ECPAT) The Initiative Center to Support Social Action "Ednannia", Ukraine Civil Society Institute (Georgia) Transparency International Georgia (Georgia) Institute for Development of Freedom of Information (Georgia) Civic Initiatives, Serbia BIRODI, Serbia Crta, Serbia Youth Initiative for Human Rights, Serbia Independent Journalists' Association of Serbia, Serbia Libertarian Club Libek, Serbia CANVAS, Serbia Humanitarian Law Center, Serbia Belgrade Centre for Security Policy, Serbia Lawyers' Committee for Human Rights - YUCOM, Serbia Belgrade Centre for Human Rights, Serbia Balkan Investigative Reporting Network, regional National Coalition for Decentralization, Serbia

European Movement in Serbia

Institute Alternative, Montenegro

Novi Sad School of Journalism, Serbia

Partners Albania for Change and Development

Albanian Center for Population and Development

Social Contract Institute - Albania

Center for civil society development PROTECTA - Serbia

Gender Alliance for Development Centre, Albania

Centre for Democracy and Rule of Law (CEDEM), Ukraine

MG Consulting LLC, Azerbaijan

Entrepreneurship Development Foundation, Azerbaijan

Transparency International Anticorruption Center, Armenia

Catalyst Balkans, Serbia / Regional

Kosovar Civil Society Foundation (KCSF), Kosova

Trag Foundation, Serbia

Bulgarian Center for Not-for-Profit Law, Bulgaria

Youth Centre CK13, Serbia

Institute for Integration and Social Cohesion Policies (IPIKS), Albania

CIVIL SOCIETY ADVOCATES, CYPRUS

Center for Not for profit Law Romania

Expert Forum, Romania

Centrul de Resurse Juridice (CRJ), Romania

TERRA Mileniul III, Romania

Fundația Noi Orizonturi Lupeni (FNO), Romania

CeRe: Centrul de Resurse pentru participare publică, Romania

Funky Citizens, Romania

Fundatia Izvorul Alb, Romania

CNVOS - Centre for Information Service, Co-operation and Development of

NGOs, Slovenia

Expert-Grup, Moldova

Civil Society Development Foundation (CSDF), Romania

Macedonian Young Lawyers Association, N. Macedonia

Konekt, N. Macedonia

Center for Public Innovation, Romania

Asociatia Techsoup, Romania

Community Foundation Slagalica, Croatia

Youth for Youth Foundation, Romania

ECNL - European Center for Not-for-Profit Law, The Netherlands / Regional