THE AFC REVIEW

Seminar Paper Series — No. 3

When 100 Bank Accounts Go Unseen

Regulatory Failure in Multi-Branch Faith Charities and the Case for Automated Governance

Olushola Oke-Daniels

Barrister and Solicitor of the Supreme Court of Nigeria

Founder and Director, AFC Fintech Ltd (Company No. 16915302)

olushola@fintechafc.co.uk

April 2026

For academic and regulatory discussion. Published by The AFC Review.

Abstract

The Charity Commission's seven-year statutory inquiry into Mountain of Fire and Miracles Ministries International (MFM) — culminating in a finding of "serious misconduct and/or mismanagement" published on 20 October 2025 — exposes a structural inadequacy in how UK charity law regulates multi-branch faith organisations with overseas parent bodies. MFM operated over 100 bank accounts across more than 90 branches without central trustee oversight, filed late accounts for eight consecutive years, and subordinated its UK governance to a Nigerian General Overseer who could unilaterally appoint and remove trustees.

This paper analyses the MFM inquiry alongside four parallel Charity Commission investigations — KICC, Christ Embassy, Rhema Church London, and The Everlasting Arms Ministries — to identify five systemic governance pathologies that recur across the multi-branch faith charity sector: founder-leader dominance, branch financial opacity, connected party transaction failures, chronic late filing, and unmonitored overseas financial flows. It examines the Nigerian regulatory vacuum that compounds UK compliance failures, and argues that the current compliance infrastructure — annual returns, self-certified declarations, and reactive inquiry — is structurally incompatible with the operational reality of these organisations.

The paper concludes that only automated governance architecture — specifically real-time compliance orchestration technology — can bridge the structural gap between legal obligation and operational capacity. It proposes Vortex AgOS (Automated Governance Operating System), developed by AFC Fintech Ltd, as an instantiation of this architectural solution.

Keywords: *charity law; faith-based charities; Charities Act 2011; Charity Commission; multi-branch governance; Gift Aid; RegTech; automated compliance; MFM; Vortex AgOS*

Table of Contents

I. A Preliminary Note on Registration and Scope

A note of correction is warranted at the outset. The charity number 1077440, sometimes cited in connection with MFM, in fact belongs to The Foxhole Recreation Ground Charity in Cornwall. The correct registration for Mountain of Fire and Miracles Ministries International is Charity No. 1100416, registered on 30 October 2003 as an unincorporated association at 21 Queensway, Ponders End, London EN3 4SZ. A related entity, MFM Community Church (Charity No. 1199987), was registered separately in 2022. This paper focuses primarily on Charity No. 1100416 and the Charity Commission's statutory inquiry published in October 2025, while drawing comparative lessons from analogous investigations into other large multi-branch faith organisations.

The legal framework examined spans the Charities Act 2011 (as amended by the Charities Act 2022), the Trustee Act 2000, the Income Tax Act 2007 (Part 8, Chapter 2), the Small Charitable Donations Act 2012, the Charity SORP (FRS 102), UK GDPR as supplemented by the Data Protection Act 2018, the Proceeds of Crime Act 2002, and the Charity Governance Code (2025 edition). On the Nigerian side, the Companies and Allied Matters Act 2020 (CAMA), the Financial Reporting Council of Nigeria (FRCN) code, and the Special Control Unit against Money Laundering (SCUML) framework are considered.

II. The MFM Inquiry: Anatomy of Systemic Governance Failure

The Charity Commission opened a statutory inquiry into MFM International under section 46 of the Charities Act 2011 on 27 March 2018, following serious incident reports from former trustees alleging potential misappropriation of charitable funds and possible theft of Gift Aid. What the Commission discovered was not isolated misconduct but architectural collapse.

MFM had grown from a handful of UK branches to over 90 nationwide without any corresponding evolution in governance infrastructure. Branches operated autonomously: they opened bank accounts, purchased and leased properties, took out mortgages, and entered contracts — all without trustee knowledge or authorisation. A February 2018 inspection revealed at least 100 bank accounts with no demonstrated central oversight. The charity's 2014 and 2015 accounts were qualified by auditors, and accounts for financial years ending 2012 through 2019 were consistently filed late — 152, 163, and 151 days late for 2015, 2016, and 2017 respectively. Late filing of charity accounts constitutes a criminal offence under sections 163, 164, and 169 of the Charities Act 2011.

II.A The Governance Pathology

The governance pathology ran deeper than negligence. The charity's 2004 constitution stated that MFM UK was "an affiliate of MFM Worldwide and shall therefore operate under the guardianship and overall control of the founder and General Overseer of MFM Worldwide" — Dr Daniel Kolawole Olukoya, based in Lagos, Nigeria. Clause 8.2 granted the General Overseer sole power to appoint trustees and a secretary. The Commission found that one trustee "exercised too much authority over the charity and the other trustees," creating conditions where independent governance was impossible.

When three of the original trustees resigned in 2018, the dominant trustee appointed five replacements — three of whom were paid employees of the charity, breaching Clause 10 of the governing document and generating unresolvable conflicts of interest on employment matters.

II.B Unreported Fraud and the Recovery Failure

Two alleged incidents of fraud by former employees involving significant sums — including one case where £150,000 to £190,000 was allegedly stolen — were not reported to the Commission for years after discovery. In the latter case, the General Overseer personally met the former employee in Nigeria and entered a repayment agreement without any consultation with the former trustees, recovering only £6,000 to £8,000 of the stolen amount. The Commission stated explicitly that it did not have confidence in the General Overseer's dual role as chair of trustees.

II.C The Regulatory Escalation

The regulatory response escalated through virtually every power available under the Act. An Interim Manager was appointed on 1 August 2019 under section 76(3)(g) — Dr Adam Stephens of Smith & Williamson (later Evelyn Partners LLP). When trustees repeatedly failed to comply with Commission directions issued on 12 July 2018, 10 January 2020, 18 March 2021, 21 September 2021, 25 November 2021, and 27 April 2022, the Interim Manager was elevated to act to the exclusion of the trustees on 21 September 2021.

An asset freezing order under section 76(3)(d) followed on 2 February 2022 after discovery of substantial funds in a branch account with unclear purpose. The trustees appealed to the First-Tier Tribunal (Charity), which in its judgment of 27 January 2023 confirmed that misconduct and mismanagement justified the appointment but quashed the exclusionary aspect as disproportionate.

The Interim Manager ultimately served for over five years until discharge on 13 September 2024, at a cost to the charity of £1,018,926 plus VAT (from total time costs of £2,224,075, significantly discounted). A governance review by Stone King LLP completed in March 2024 recommended a "hub and spoke" incorporation model. The charity's constitution was finally amended on 4 July 2024 to remove the General Overseer's appointment powers.

Table 1: MFM Inquiry — Key Financial and Regulatory Data

Metric	Detail
Inquiry opened	27 March 2018 (s.46 Charities Act 2011)
Inquiry report published	20 October 2025
Duration	7 years, 7 months
Bank accounts discovered	100+ (no central oversight)
Interim Manager cost	£1,018,926 + VAT
Alleged theft (unreported)	£150,000–£190,000
Constitutional amendment	4 July 2024

III. The Nigerian Parent Body: Opacity and Regulatory Vacuum

MFM was founded in Lagos in 1989 by Dr D.K. Olukoya, a molecular biologist and prayer movement leader who built it into one of Nigeria's largest Pentecostal denominations, with over 10,000 branches in Nigeria and a presence in more than 100 countries. The governance model is centrally hierarchical: Olukoya serves as General Overseer with supreme authority, supported by five Assistant General Overseers, eight Senior Regional Overseers, and 41 Assistant Regional Overseers.

MFM Nigeria publishes no financial statements. Nigerian law does not require religious organisations registered as Incorporated Trustees under Part F of CAMA to publish audited accounts. The ministry's assets include Prayer City — a large camp on the Lagos–Ibadan Expressway with a 100,000 to 150,000 capacity auditorium — Mountain Top University (founded 2015), MFM TV (a 24-hour satellite station), a football club, and a publishing operation.

III.A CAMA 2020 and the Regulatory Standoff

The Companies and Allied Matters Act 2020 empowered the Corporate Affairs Commission to investigate and suspend trustees of incorporated organisations — including churches — under section 839 where there is reasonable belief of mismanagement. The Christian Association of Nigeria vigorously opposed these provisions, and filed suit at the Federal High Court. No specific enforcement action under CAMA 2020 against MFM has been publicly reported.

The Financial Reporting Council of Nigeria's 2016 corporate governance code, which would have required founders to hand over leadership after 20 years or at age 70, was suspended by President Buhari after RCCG's General Overseer Adeboye resigned in protest. SCUML registration is required for non-profit organisations under the Money Laundering (Prohibition) Act, but MFM's compliance status is unknown. No Nigerian regulatory body — CAC, EFCC, FRCN, or SCUML — has taken formal enforcement action against MFM.

The opacity of MFM Nigeria's governance and finances stands in stark contrast to the regulatory demands placed on its UK affiliate — a tension that lies at the heart of the compliance failure examined in this paper.

IV. Five Parallel Case Studies Reveal a Pattern, Not an Outlier

MFM's governance failures are not idiosyncratic. Analysis of Charity Commission inquiries into comparable organisations reveals remarkably consistent pathologies across the multi-branch faith charity sector.

Table 2: Comparative Analysis of Charity Commission Faith Charity Inquiries

Organisation	Charity No.	Key Findings	Financial Impact
KICC (Kingsway International)	1102114	£384k self-payments; £5m invested in Ponzi scheme via ex-trustee	£3.9m loss; £560k HMRC liability
Christ Embassy	1059247	£1.2m to trustee-owned company; £1.8m property given rent-free; 9 undisclosed accounts	£250k HMRC Gift Aid settlement
Rhema Church London	1075100	£300k in cheques to pastor personally; £225k charity-to-mortgage transfer	Wound down; 10-year trustee ban
The Everlasting Arms Ministries	N/A	£457k on business-class flights and five-star hotels after £8m property sale	All accounts frozen (Feb 2020)
MFM International	1100416	100+ unsupervised bank accounts; 8 years late filing; £150k–£190k unreported theft	£1.02m IM cost; asset freeze

IV.A The Five Systemic Patterns

Five systemic patterns emerge across these cases. First, founder-leader dominance: constitutions or practice grant a single religious leader — often based overseas — disproportionate power over trustee appointment, financial decisions, and strategic direction. Second, branch autonomy without oversight: rapid geographic expansion outpaces governance capacity, producing dozens or hundreds of semi-autonomous units with independent bank accounts and property arrangements.

Third, connected party transactions and conflicts of interest: payments to founders, their family members, their private companies, or affiliated overseas entities are approved without independent scrutiny. Fourth, chronic late filing: every case studied involved persistent late or non-filing of accounts — the most common trigger for Commission engagement. Fifth, overseas financial flows: funds move between UK charities and overseas parent bodies without adequate documentation, compliance checks, or clarity about whether expenditure serves UK charitable purposes.

V. The Legal Framework: Comprehensive in Principle, Inadequate in Execution

The UK charity law framework is, on paper, robust. The Charities Act 2011 imposes clear duties: trustees must act in the charity's best interests, manage resources responsibly, ensure accountability, and report serious incidents promptly. Section 4 removes the historic presumption of public benefit for religious purposes, requiring affirmative demonstration. The Commission's regulatory powers — section 46 inquiries, section 76 protective orders including interim managers and asset freezes, section 84 compliance directions, and section 79(4) trustee removal — are extensive.

The Trustee Act 2000 establishes a statutory duty of care (section 1) requiring trustees to exercise reasonable care and skill, with an upward adjustment for those holding themselves out as having special expertise. The Charity Governance Code (2025 revision) sets eight aspirational principles on an "apply or explain" basis, explicitly acknowledging that faith-based charities may require adapted approaches.

V.A Gift Aid and GASDS Complexity

Gift Aid under ITA 2007, sections 413–430, requires qualifying donations to meet six conditions (section 416), with declarations retained for six years. The Gift Aid Small Donations Scheme under the Small Charitable Donations Act 2012 allows claims of up to £8,000 per year on small donations under £30 without declarations — but connected charities must share this allowance (sections 8–9), creating particular complexity for multi-branch faith organisations where each branch may believe itself independently entitled to the full amount.

V.B The Structural Inadequacy

Yet the gap between legal framework and operational reality is vast. The compliance infrastructure is fundamentally reactive. The Commission monitors approximately 170,862 registered charities with resources that have been progressively constrained. Annual returns are self-certified. Serious incident reporting relies on trustees recognising and voluntarily disclosing problems — the very capacity that is compromised in organisations where a dominant founder controls the board.

The "double defaulter" trigger — failure to file accounts twice in five years — that initiates many inquiries means the Commission typically intervenes years after governance failure has taken root. The MFM inquiry took seven years from opening to final report. Christ Embassy's took six. Rhema Church's took eight. In each case, the Commission spent years using escalating powers to achieve what real-time compliance monitoring could have flagged within weeks.

The problem is compounded for organisations with overseas parent bodies. No provision in the Charities Act 2011 specifically addresses the governance risks created when a UK charity's constitution subordinates it to an overseas entity. The Commission can investigate the UK charity, but it has no jurisdiction over the parent body.

VI. Faith Charities Dominate Inquiry Statistics Despite Representing a Minority

The scale of the problem is quantifiable. Faith-based charities represent approximately 27% of all charities in England and Wales — roughly 43,000 active organisations receiving 23% (£16.3 billion) of total sector income. The Charity Commission opened 112 new statutory inquiries in 2024–25, up from 89 in 2023–24, alongside 4,619 regulatory concern cases.

Analysis by Penningtons Manches Cooper found that 50% of statutory inquiry reports published in the most recent year involved faith charities — nearly double their proportional representation on the Register. This overrepresentation has accelerated: in 2013–14, only 8% of compliance cases involved religious charities, well below their 20–27% share of the Register.

VI.A Academic Perspectives

Kerry O'Halloran's Religion, Charity and Human Rights (Cambridge University Press, 2014) identifies fundamental "culture wars" at the religion–charity interface across common law jurisdictions. Mary Synge's The "New" Public Benefit Requirement (Hart Publishing, 2015) analyses how the removal of the charitable presumption for religion has exposed faith organisations to closer scrutiny. Debra Morris's examination of the Charity Commission questions whether the regulator has the capacity to regulate effectively amid resource constraints. Haniffa et al.'s content analysis of faith-based charity accountability found that communicated accountability was "generally limited," with organisations focusing on descriptive rather than judgement-based information.

VII. The Architectural Solution: Automated Governance Through Vortex AgOS

The recurring pattern across MFM, KICC, Christ Embassy, Rhema Church, TEAM, and Winners Chapel reveals a structural problem requiring a structural solution. The failures are not primarily failures of law but failures of implementation capacity. The legal duties exist. The regulatory powers exist. What does not exist is infrastructure that enables real-time compliance verification, automated anomaly detection, and continuous governance assurance for organisations whose operational complexity exceeds the capacity of manual, paper-based, annual-return-driven compliance.

Vortex AgOS (Automated Governance Operating System) represents an architectural response to this implementation gap. Developed by AFC Fintech Ltd, it is a hardware-free, non-custodial governance orchestration platform that addresses each of the five systemic failure modes identified in this paper.

Table 3: Vortex AgOS — Failure Mode to Feature Mapping

Systemic Failure	Vortex AgOS Feature	Statutory Obligation Addressed
Branch financial opacity (100+ unsupervised accounts)	Real-time bank account aggregation; automated threshold alerts	Charities Act 2011, s.130; Trustee Act 2000, s.1 duty of care
Connected party transactions (£1.2m+ undisclosed payments)	Automated disclosure and flagging of related-party payments	Charity SORP (FRS 102); Charity Governance Code, Principle 6
Chronic late filing (8 consecutive years at MFM)	Charity Commission API integration; automated SORP preparation	Charities Act 2011, ss.163–169; CC17 Annual Return requirements
Unreported serious incidents (£150k–£190k theft hidden)	Pattern recognition and anomaly detection with auto-generated reports	Charities Act 2011, s.169; CC guidance on serious incident reporting
Constitutional non-compliance (remunerated employee-trustees)	Encoded governing document rules; automated violation alerts	Charities Act 2011, s.185; governing document clauses

VII.A Three Non-Negotiable Architectural Guardrails

Vortex AgOS enforces three architectural guardrails at database level. Zero Custody: AFC Fintech never holds client funds — all payments are initiated through Open Banking PISP (Payment Initiation Service Provider) connections, with funds moving directly between payer and charity bank accounts. Zero Branch Autonomy: the settlement inheritance function enforced at PostgreSQL trigger level prevents any branch from rerouting funds without hub authorisation — the precise control that MFM's trustees lacked. Zero Manual Input: all compliance metadata — Gift Aid declarations, GASDS eligibility flags, donor consent records, audit timestamps — is injected automatically at the point of transaction, eliminating the human error and selective omission that characterised every case studied.

VII.B The Broader RegTech Context

The Charity Commission's own Strategy 2024–2029 identifies technological innovation as a priority, with a £9.5 million Digital Transformation Programme announced for 2026–2029. The Charity Digital Skills Report 2024 found that 64% of small charities are at an early digital stage, only 28% of boards have good digital skills, and 58% of UK charities have no defined digital strategy. The global RegTech market is valued at $12.82 billion (2023), projected to reach $85.92 billion by 2032, yet the charity sector has virtually no equivalent ecosystem. This represents both a market failure and an opportunity.

VIII. Conclusion: From Reactive Enforcement to Preventive Architecture

The MFM inquiry is a landmark case. It documents, with granular specificity, how a faith charity can grow from a handful of branches to a £4.2 million-income national operation while its governance remains, in the Commission's characterisation, "ad hoc, ill-defined, and not subject to appropriate checks and controls." The £1 million-plus cost of the interim manager intervention — borne by the charity itself — represents a deadweight loss that preventive compliance infrastructure would render unnecessary.

Three conclusions follow. First, the current compliance model — annual returns, self-certified declarations, reactive inquiry — is structurally incompatible with the operational reality of multi-branch faith organisations. The Commission's own data shows faith charities generating 50% of inquiry reports despite comprising roughly a quarter of the register.

Second, the cross-jurisdictional governance gap — where UK charities are constitutionally subordinated to parent bodies in jurisdictions with minimal transparency requirements — cannot be resolved by UK regulatory powers alone. Constitutional reform (as achieved in MFM's July 2024 amendment) is necessary but insufficient without ongoing compliance assurance.

Third, automated governance technology is not a convenience but an architectural necessity. The five systemic failure modes identified across six major inquiries — branch financial opacity, connected party transactions, late filing, unreported incidents, and constitutional non-compliance — are all amenable to technological solution through real-time monitoring, automated reporting, and encoded governance rules.

The Charity Commission's £9.5 million digital transformation is a regulator-side response. What is missing is the charity-side equivalent: infrastructure that enables trustees of complex multi-branch organisations to discharge their duties under the Charities Act 2011 and the Trustee Act 2000's section 1 duty of care. Vortex AgOS fills this gap. If the law requires trustees to exercise "such care and skill as is reasonable in the circumstances," then in circumstances involving 100 bank accounts across 90 branches, reasonable care requires automated oversight. Manual governance at this scale is not governance at all — as seven years of MFM investigation conclusively demonstrate.

Table of Statutes

Charities Act 2011 (c.25), ss.4, 46, 76, 79, 84, 130, 163, 164, 169, 185

Charities Act 2022 (c.6)

Charities (Protection and Social Investment) Act 2016 (c.4)

Companies and Allied Matters Act 2020 (Nigeria), Part F, s.839

Data Protection Act 2018 (c.12)

Finance Act 1990 (c.29), s.25

Income Tax Act 2007 (c.3), Part 8, Chapter 2, ss.413–430

Money Laundering (Prohibition) Act 2011 (Nigeria)

Proceeds of Crime Act 2002 (c.29)

Small Charitable Donations Act 2012 (c.23), ss.8–9

Trustee Act 2000 (c.29), s.1

UK General Data Protection Regulation (Retained EU Law), Art.9

Table of Cases and Regulatory Actions

Charity Commission, Charity Inquiry: Mountain of Fire and Miracles Ministries International (20 October 2025)

Charity Commission, New Charity Investigation: MFM International (27 March 2018)

Charity Commission, Interim Manager Appointment: MFM International (1 August 2019)

First-Tier Tribunal (Charity): Trustees of MFM International v Charity Commission (27 January 2023)

Charity Commission, Charity Inquiry: Kingsway International Christian Centre (2002–2005; 2011–2016)

Charity Commission, Charity Inquiry: Christ Embassy (2013–2019)

Charity Commission, Charity Inquiry: Rhema Church London (2014–2022)

Charity Commission, Charity Inquiry: The Everlasting Arms Ministries (2020)

Charity Commission, Class Inquiry: RCCG New Life Assembly (House of Prayer for All Nations) (2013–2014)

Charity Commission, Regulatory Compliance Case: Winners Chapel International (2020–2021)

Bibliography

Charity Commission, Annual Report and Accounts 2024–2025 (GOV.UK, 2025)

Charity Commission, CC3: The Essential Trustee (GOV.UK, updated 2024)

Charity Commission, "How to Report a Serious Incident in Your Charity" (GOV.UK, 2024)

Charity Governance Code Steering Group, Charity Governance Code (3rd edn, 2025)

Charity SORP Committee, Charities SORP (FRS 102) (2nd edn, effective January 2026)

Haniffa R et al., "Communicated Accountability by Faith-Based Charity Organisations" (2012) Journal of Financial Reporting and Accounting

Morris D, "The Charity Commission for England and Wales: A Fine Example or Another Fine Mess?" (2016) 91 Chi-Kent L Rev 965

O'Halloran K, Religion, Charity and Human Rights (Cambridge University Press, 2014)

Penningtons Manches Cooper, "Strengthening Governance in Faith-Based Charities: Common Issues and How to Avoid Them" (2025)

Stewardship, "Charity Commission Inquiries: Some Learning Points" (2024)

Stone King LLP, "Charity Commission Inquiries: Themes from Recent Cases" (2024)

Synge M, The "New" Public Benefit Requirement: Making Sense of Charity Law? (Hart Publishing, 2015)

Charity Commission, "Shift to More Proportionate Accounting Regime for UK Charities" (GOV.UK, March 2025)

Charity Digital Skills Report 2024 (Charity Digital / Skills Platform)

About the Author

Olushola Oke-Daniels is a Barrister and Solicitor of the Supreme Court of Nigeria and the Founder and Director of AFC Fintech Ltd (Company No. 16915302), a UK-registered fintech company developing Vortex AgOS — a hardware-free, non-custodial payment and financial governance operating system — and the Sovereign Auditor — an Automated Compliance Engine for CASS 15 safeguarding reconciliation. He is the sole author of the FCA seminar paper "The Unfinished Law" and the AFC Review paper "The Governance Gap: Why UK Faith Organisations Are One Audit Away from Crisis." His work combines Nigerian legal qualification, technology entrepreneurship, and UK regulatory expertise.

Correspondence: olushola@fintechafc.co.uk

Web: fintechafc.co.uk

This paper is published by The AFC Review for academic and regulatory discussion purposes.