T H E   A F C   R E V I E W
Regulatory Intelligence · AFC Fintech Ltd · Seminar Paper Series

WHEN THE STRUCTURE FAILS THE FAITHFUL

Multi-Branch Faith Charity Governance in England and Wales: Documented Failures, Systemic Causes, and the Case for Preventive Architecture

Olushola Oke-Daniels
Barrister · Founder, AFC Fintech Ltd (Company No. 16915302)

The AFC Review · Seminar Paper · April 2026
olushola@fintechafc.co.uk · fintechafc.co.uk
Target submission: Charity Law and Practice Review · Journal of Social Policy

C O N F L I C T   O F   I N T E R E S T   D E C L A R A T I O N

The author is the founder and sole director of AFC Fintech Ltd, a UK-registered technology company that has developed compliance infrastructure for the charitable and financial services sectors. Architectural principles described in Part V of this paper reflect, in part, the design considerations underlying that work. All references to technical specifications in this paper are presented as illustrative implementations of regulatory principles and are not intended as, and should not be read as, commercial recommendations. The author has received no funding for this research from any commercial or institutional source. This paper represents the author's independent academic and regulatory analysis.

A B S T R A C T

Faith-based charities constitute approximately twenty-seven per cent of the register maintained by the Charity Commission for England and Wales and generate roughly twenty-three per cent of total sector income. Yet they account for fifty per cent of all statutory inquiry reports published by the Commission. That disproportionality is not a statistical accident. It is the predictable product of a structural mismatch between the governance obligations imposed by UK charity law and the governance infrastructure that multi-branch faith organisations characteristically possess.

This paper analyses six published Charity Commission statutory inquiries involving large multi-branch faith charities to identify five systemic governance pathologies that recur across the sector with striking consistency: founder-leader dominance, branch financial opacity, connected party transaction failures, chronic late filing, and unmonitored overseas financial flows. It situates these pathologies within the legal framework established by the Charities Act 2011, the Trustee Act 2000, and the Gift Aid provisions of the Income Tax Act 2007, and argues that the existing compliance model — annual returns, self-certified declarations, and retrospective inquiry — is structurally incompatible with the operational reality of complex multi-branch organisations.

The paper proposes Legal Compliance by Design as the organising principle for the next generation of charity governance, and advances three concrete reforms: a tiered governance technology standard as a condition of Gift Aid registration; a compliance infrastructure safe harbour in Commission inquiry proceedings; and a statutory duty of governance infrastructure for charities of defined scale and complexity. A technical specification illustrates how each documented governance failure mode could be addressed by existing database-level compliance architecture without the need for new legislation.

Keywords: charity governance · faith-based charities · Charities Act 2011 · multi-branch oversight · technology-enforced compliance · RegTech · Gift Aid · Interim Manager · Legal Compliance by Design · governance architecture

Part I: A Sector Under Scrutiny

When the Charity Commission publishes a statutory inquiry report, it does so reluctantly. Inquiry is the Commission's most intensive regulatory tool. By the time an inquiry report is published, years of regulatory engagement — directions issued, orders made, appointments imposed — have typically preceded it. The volume of published inquiry reports involving faith-based charities is therefore not merely a statistic. It is a measure of how frequently ordinary regulatory interaction has proven insufficient in a sector that comprises approximately twenty-seven per cent of the register.

This paper examines six published inquiry reports involving large multi-branch faith charities. In each case, the Commission found governance failures that were structural in character: not the isolated failures of particular individuals, but the predictable consequences of governance architectures that had not kept pace with organisational complexity. The organisations examined are not presented as disreputable. In several cases they have taken significant and genuinely difficult steps to remedy their governance. They are presented as illustrations of a structural challenge that any faith organisation operating at scale may recognise in its own operations. The purpose of this analysis is not to condemn. It is to understand. The governance failures documented in these inquiries are failures of structure, not of faith. And if they are structural failures, they require structural solutions.

I.A A Note on Registration

A correction that has circulated in some commentary on the Mountain of Fire and Miracles Ministries International inquiry warrants attention at the outset. The charity registration number 1077440 belongs to The Foxhole Recreation Ground Charity, a small recreation ground 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 separately registered in 2022. This paper refers throughout to Charity No. 1100416.

I.B The Statistical Picture

Faith-based charities represent approximately twenty-seven per cent of all charities registered in England and Wales — roughly 43,000 active organisations receiving twenty-three per cent of total sector income, approximately £16.3 billion. The Charity Commission opened one hundred and twelve new statutory inquiries in 2024–25, up from eighty-nine in 2023–24, alongside 4,619 regulatory concern cases. Analysis of published inquiry reports indicates that approximately fifty per cent involve faith charities — nearly double their proportional representation on the Register. In 2013–14, only eight per cent of compliance cases involved religious charities, well below their twenty to twenty-seven per cent share of the Register. The direction of travel is clear, and its cause is the subject of this paper.

Part II: The Legal Framework — Comprehensive in Principle, Inadequate in Execution

The UK legal framework governing charity financial management is, on paper, comprehensive. The obligations are clearly stated, the enforcement powers are extensive, and the regulatory architecture has been progressively strengthened. The problem is not the legislation. The problem is the gap between what the legislation requires and what the governance infrastructure of many multi-branch faith organisations makes achievable in practice.

II.A Accounting, Reporting, and Annual Returns

Section 130 of the Charities Act 2011 requires charity trustees to ensure that accounting records are kept sufficient to show and explain all transactions, disclosing the charity's financial position at any time with reasonable accuracy. Section 131 requires preservation for six years. Sections 132 and 133 require annual statements of accounts; charities above relevant thresholds must have those accounts independently examined or audited. Section 169 requires all registered charities to file an Annual Return within ten months of the financial year end. Late or non-filing of accounts constitutes a criminal offence under sections 163, 164, and 169.

What the legislation does not specify is how those records must be kept. It does not require digital record-keeping. It does not mandate any particular system of internal financial controls. The Commission's CC8 guidance on Internal Financial Controls for Charities, substantially revised in April 2023, is comprehensive and well-designed — but carries no legal force. Failure to follow CC8 is not a breach of the Act. It is, however, evidence in inquiry proceedings of whether trustees have discharged their duty of prudent administration.

II.B The Trustee Duty of Care

The Trustee Act 2000 establishes a statutory duty of care at section 1: trustees must exercise such care and skill as is reasonable in the circumstances, with an upward adjustment for those holding themselves out as having special expertise. The Charity Governance Code (2025 revision) applies an 'apply or explain' basis, explicitly acknowledging that faith-based charities may require adapted approaches. Neither instrument specifies what operational infrastructure a trustee body must maintain to discharge these duties at scale. That specification gap is what this paper proposes to close.

II.C Gift Aid and GASDS Complexity

The Gift Aid regime under Part 8, Chapter 2 of the Income Tax Act 2007 (sections 413–430) requires qualifying donations to meet six statutory conditions and declarations to be retained for six years under the Donations to Charity (Gift Aid Declarations) Regulations 2016 (SI 2016/1195). HMRC's published statistics for the tax year ending April 2025 report Gift Aid repayments of £1.7 billion. HMRC Research Report 482 estimated that approximately £560 million in Gift Aid goes unclaimed annually — a figure that reflects, in substantial part, record-keeping infrastructure that is inadequate to the task of capturing and maintaining declarations at the point of donation.

The Gift Aid Small Donations Scheme, established by the Small Charitable Donations Act 2012 (c.23), allows claims on small contactless and cash donations of £30 or less up to £8,000 annually without individual declarations. Critically, connected charities — including branches of a parent charity — must share this allowance under sections 8 and 9. Each branch believing itself independently entitled to the full allowance is among the most consistently observed Gift Aid errors in faith charity audit findings.

II.D The Reactive Enforcement Architecture and Its Limitations

Julia Black's analysis of principles-based regulation identifies the 'trust paradox' as central to its limitations: principles-based regulation 'can help create trust, but the core elements of trust must already exist for it to operate effectively.'[1] Where the core elements — compliance knowledge, internal infrastructure, professional capacity — do not exist, the obligations imposed by principles-based legislation create the appearance of a regulated environment without its substance. This is precisely the condition that characterises the governance of many multi-branch faith organisations.

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 means the Commission typically intervenes years after governance failure has taken root. The inquiries examined in this paper took between two and eight years from opening to published report.

---

1. 1 Black, J, 'Forms and Paradoxes of Principles-Based Regulation' (2008) 3(4) Capital Markets Law Journal 425, 447.

Part III: Six Inquiries, Five Patterns — A Sectoral Analysis

The case studies that follow are drawn exclusively from published Charity Commission inquiry reports and regulatory actions. They are presented not as a catalogue of failure but as evidence of structure: the same five governance pathologies appear, in varying combinations, across organisations of different sizes, denominations, and leadership cultures. That consistency is the finding. These are not idiosyncratic failures. They are the predictable products of a structural mismatch between governance obligation and governance capacity.

III.A Comparative Overview

Organisation	Charity No.	Principal Findings	Financial Consequence
KICC (Kingsway International Christian Centre)	1102114	£384k self-payments; £5m invested in Ponzi scheme via former trustee; personal use of charitable funds	£3.9m total loss; £560k HMRC Gift Aid liability
Christ Embassy	1059247	£1.2m to trustee-owned company; £1.8m property given rent-free; nine undisclosed bank accounts	£250k HMRC Gift Aid settlement
Rhema Church London	1075100	£300k in cheques made to pastor personally; £225k charity-to-personal-mortgage transfer; unmanaged conflicts	Charity wound down; 10-year trustee disqualification
The Everlasting Arms Ministries	N/A	£457k on business-class travel and five-star accommodation following £8m property sale; IM appointed	All accounts frozen February 2020
Winners Chapel International	N/A	Connected party transactions; unmonitored overseas fund flows; inadequate serious incident reporting	Regulatory compliance case 2020–21
Mountain of Fire and Miracles Ministries International	1100416	100+ unsupervised branch bank accounts; deficient Annual Returns for eight consecutive financial years; unreported fraud; constitution vesting control in overseas principal	£1.02m Interim Manager net cost; income decline from £4.2m to £2.7m over inquiry period

III.B The Mountain of Fire and Miracles Ministries International Inquiry

The Charity Commission opened a statutory inquiry into Mountain of Fire and Miracles Ministries International (Charity No. 1100416) on 27 March 2018, following serious incident reports from former trustees. What the investigation found was not isolated misconduct but what the inquiry report characterises as governance that was ‘ad hoc, ill-defined, and not subject to appropriate checks and controls.’ The organisation had grown from a handful of UK branches to over ninety without any corresponding evolution in its governance infrastructure.

A February 2018 books-and-records visit identified at least one hundred branch bank accounts over which the trustees could demonstrate no central oversight. Branches had opened accounts, purchased and leased properties, taken out mortgages, and entered contracts without trustee knowledge or authorisation. Two separate incidents of employee fraud involving significant sums — including an alleged theft of £150,000 to £190,000 — were not reported to the Commission or to the police until years after discovery. Accounts for financial years ending 2015, 2016, and 2017 were filed 152, 163, and 151 days late respectively. Six separate Commission Directions and Orders were not complied with between July 2018 and April 2022.

A Statutory Interim Manager was appointed on 1 August 2019 under section 76(3)(g) of the Charities Act 2011. The appointment ran for five years and forty-four days before discharge on 13 September 2024. Total net cost to the charity: £1,018,926 plus VAT, charged against charitable funds. The charity’s constitution was amended on 4 July 2024 to remove provisions that had vested trustee appointment powers in the overseas General Overseer. Three new trustees were appointed on 7 December 2024. The inquiry was closed. The structural lesson belongs to the sector.

III.C The Cross-Jurisdictional Governance Gap

The MFM International case illustrates a governance problem that affects any UK charity constitutionally subordinated to an overseas parent body. MFM Worldwide, founded in Lagos in 1989 and operating in more than one hundred countries, publishes no financial statements. Nigerian law does not require religious organisations registered under the Companies and Allied Matters Act 2020 to publish audited accounts. The Financial Reporting Council of Nigeria’s 2016 governance code, which would have required founders to cede leadership after twenty years, was suspended following pressure from major denominations. The opacity of parent body finances stands in stark contrast to the obligations placed on the UK affiliate.

No provision of the Charities Act 2011 specifically addresses the governance risks created when a UK charity’s constitution subordinates its governance to an overseas entity. The Commission can investigate the UK charity. It has no jurisdiction over the parent. Constitutional reform — as achieved in MFM’s case after seven years of inquiry — is necessary. It is not sufficient. The framework for operational governance independence must exist before the failure, not be imposed after it.

III.D The Five Systemic Patterns

Across all six inquiries, five governance pathologies recur with sufficient consistency to constitute a sectoral pattern rather than an accumulation of individual failings.

Founder-leader dominance: constitutions or entrenched practice grant a single religious leader disproportionate power over trustee appointment, financial decisions, and strategic direction. The overlap between spiritual authority and charity trusteeship creates a governance culture in which independent challenge is experienced as a spiritual rather than a governance matter.

Branch financial opacity: rapid geographic expansion consistently outpaces governance capacity. Branches open bank accounts, enter property arrangements, and manage local finances with minimal or no headquarters oversight. The legal reality — that the branches are constituent parts of a single registered charity with a single set of trustees bearing collective fiduciary responsibility — is operationally invisible.

Connected party transactions: payments to founders, their family members, their private companies, or affiliated overseas entities are approved without independent scrutiny, or made without approval at all. Charity SORP disclosure requirements and Charity Governance Code conflict of interest provisions exist but are not operationally embedded in financial management processes.

Chronic late filing: every case studied involved persistent late or non-filing of accounts. In each case, the cause was not defiance of a known obligation but a record-keeping infrastructure that was inadequate to the task of assembling the required data within the statutory timeline.

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. The Commission’s enforcement jurisdiction does not follow the money across the border.

Part IV: Why the Current Compliance Model Cannot Solve This Problem

The Charity Commission is not an ineffective regulator. The MFM International inquiry demonstrates a Commission prepared to deploy its full statutory arsenal — inquiry, direction, Interim Manager appointment, asset freeze, Tribunal proceedings — sustained over seven years. The Commission’s 2024–25 Annual Report records a Digital Transformation Programme of £9.5 million for 2026–29. The regulatory will and the enforcement architecture both exist. The problem is that the compliance model they support is structurally oriented toward detection and retrospective remedy, and the governance failures documented in this paper are structural and prospective in their causes.

IV.A The Temporal Mismatch

The inquiries examined in this paper took between two and eight years from opening to final report. During those periods the governance failures continued, charitable assets remained at risk, and the organisation’s members — who had given in good faith — were in a charity whose leadership the regulator had determined could not be trusted to manage it responsibly. Real-time compliance monitoring would not eliminate governance failures. But it would detect them within days or weeks rather than years. An automated system that flags an unauthorised branch bank account on the day it is opened is categorically different from an annual return system that detects the same failure two years later, if it is filed, or not at all, if it is not.

IV.B The Capacity Mismatch

The compliance model assumes trustees who understand their obligations, have the capacity to discharge them, and can recognise when they are failing to do so. None of these assumptions reliably holds for multi-branch faith organisations governed by volunteer trustees drawn from communities of faith rather than communities of financial governance. The Charity Digital Skills Report 2024 found that sixty-four per cent of small charities are at an early digital stage, only twenty-eight per cent of boards have good digital skills, and fifty-eight per cent have no defined digital strategy. In the faith charity sector, these figures are likely to be more acute. A compliance model that depends on trustees making good decisions about record-keeping is a compliance model that is systematically less effective precisely where governance risk is highest.

IV.C The Jurisdictional Mismatch

For organisations with overseas parent bodies, the compliance mismatch acquires a third dimension. The Commission can investigate the UK charity. It cannot investigate the parent body in Lagos, Abuja, or elsewhere. It can require UK trustees to exercise independent governance. It cannot remove the constitutional architecture that subordinates UK governance to overseas authority. Technology cannot resolve this jurisdictional gap. But it can build the compliance infrastructure that ensures UK financial governance is operationally independent of the parent body’s preferences, regardless of what the constitution says — provided the technology is in place before the failure, not imposed after it.

Part V: Legal Compliance by Design — The Architecture of Prevention

Legal Compliance by Design — building legal requirements into system architecture from the outset, such that non-compliant transactions cannot be processed — is the organising principle this paper advances for the governance of multi-branch faith charities at scale. Its theoretical foundations are well established. Its institutional validation is recent and significant. What has not previously been proposed in the academic literature is its systematic application to the specific governance failure modes documented in Charity Commission inquiries into faith organisations.

V.A Theoretical Foundations

Lawrence Lessig's argument in Code and Other Laws of Cyberspace identifies four modalities of regulation: law, norms, markets, and architecture.[2] Architectural constraints operate without the need for ex-post monitoring or enforcement: 'once implemented, environmental controls mechanically regulate all who come in contact with them.'[3] Joel Reidenberg's earlier concept of Lex Informatica observed that technical standards and system configurations impose default rules on participants, creating regulatory norms that govern conduct regardless of individual intentions.[4] Roger Brownsword's analysis of Law 3.0 frames this as a shift from a regulatory environment in which law tells people what not to do to one in which technology makes certain things structurally unavailable.[5]

The Bank for International Settlements formalised this principle in its 2019 working paper on embedded supervision, arguing for regulatory frameworks in which compliance with regulatory goals is 'automatically monitored by reading the market's ledger, thus reducing the need for firms to collect, verify and deliver data.'[6] BIS Project Mandala, announced in October 2024, demonstrated compliance-by-design for cross-border payments, embedding regulatory checks within the payment protocol such that all necessary compliance conditions must be satisfied before a payment instruction is initiated.[7]

Casanovas and colleagues distinguish between Compliance by Design — where non-compliant transactions cannot be processed — and Compliance through Design — where design promotes compliance values without mechanically preventing non-compliance.[8] The governance pathologies identified in Part III of this paper are all amenable to Compliance by Design solutions. The database-level enforcement of settlement routing, Gift Aid classification, and audit record generation addresses each pathology at its structural source rather than its downstream consequence.

V.B Five Pathologies, Five Architectural Responses

Systemic Pathology	Legal Compliance by Design Response	Statutory Obligation Addressed
Branch financial opacity	Database-level settlement routing: a BEFORE INSERT/UPDATE trigger rejects any transaction routing funds to an account not	Charities Act 2011, s.130; Trustee Act 2000, s.1 duty of care

Systemic Pathology	Legal Compliance by Design Response	Statutory Obligation Addressed
	authorised by the parent trustee body. Non-authorised settlement is architecturally impossible, not merely prohibited.	
Connected party transactions	Automated identification and flagging of payments to related parties; mandatory multi-trustee digital authorisation gate above defined financial thresholds before any payment is initiated.	Charity SORP (FRS 102), related-party disclosures; Charity Governance Code, Principle 6
Chronic late filing	Nightly automated aggregation of transaction data across all branches; Annual Return pre-population from live records; data structured for direct submission via Charity Commission API within statutory deadlines.	Charities Act 2011, ss.163–169; CC17 Annual Return requirements
Unreported serious incidents	Pattern recognition across transaction data; automated generation of serious incident reports where financial anomalies exceed pre-defined thresholds; trustee notification requiring documented response.	Charities Act 2011, s.169; Charity Commission serious incident guidance
Gift Aid record-keeping failures	Gift Aid eligibility determined and declaration record generated automatically at the point of each donation; GASDS mutual exclusion enforced at database level to prevent double-claiming; all records preserved in tamper-proof append-only audit log with deletion revoked at database role level.	Income Tax Act 2007, ss.416, 428; Gift Aid Declarations Regulations 2016 (SI 2016/1195); Small Charitable Donations Act 2012, ss.8–9

V.C Technical Specification: The Minimum Compliant Architecture

The following constitutes a technical specification for a minimum compliant governance system for multi-branch faith charities above the threshold proposed in Part VI. It is framed as a regulatory standard — specifying what a compliant system must achieve — rather than prescribing how it must be built. Multiple technical implementations are possible. What follows describes the functional requirements that any compliant implementation must satisfy.

A compliant system must enforce settlement routing at the database layer, such that no application-layer instruction can redirect charitable funds to an account not registered to the parent organisation. This constraint must operate below and independently of any user interface, such that it cannot be overridden through legitimate user access. It must operate as a transactional constraint — rejecting non-compliant instructions rather than logging them for later review.

A compliant system must generate compliance metadata — Gift Aid eligibility classification, GASDS flag, donation category, fund designation, donor consent record, and audit timestamp — automatically at the point of each transaction, without requiring manual input by any user. These records must be preserved in an append-only audit store from which deletion is revoked at the database authorisation level for all application roles.

A compliant system must aggregate financial data across all branches on at least a daily basis, maintain running Annual Return calculations in the format required by the Charity Commission's CC17, and flag any connected party transaction above a defined financial threshold for mandatory trustee review and multi-signature digital authorisation before payment is initiated.

A compliant system must monitor transaction patterns across all branches and generate automated serious incident alerts where financial anomalies exceed pre-defined risk thresholds, with automatic trustee notification requiring documented resolution within a defined period.

These four functional requirements collectively address each of the five systemic governance pathologies identified in Part III of this paper. They are technically achievable using existing database technology, Open Banking payment initiation frameworks, and automated reporting infrastructure. They are not aspirational. They are deployable, at a cost that is, in every case studied, a small fraction of the cost of a single Charity Commission inquiry.

V.D The RegTech Context and the Sector Gap

The global RegTech market was valued at approximately $12.82 billion in 2023, projected to reach $85.92 billion by 2032. The financial services sector has led this development: the FCA's regulatory sandbox, digital regulatory reporting programmes, and Open Banking infrastructure demonstrate the practical feasibility of real-time, architecture-level compliance verification. The Charity Commission's 2024–2029 Strategy allocates £9.5 million to a Digital Transformation Programme focused on regulator-side capability. What is conspicuously absent is the charity-side equivalent: compliance technology built for the operational realities of multi-branch faith organisations. Singh and Lin's 2021 analysis coined the term 'CharityTech' to describe this emerging application of RegTech principles to the specific compliance challenges of the charitable sector.[9] The governance data from the Commission's published inquiries documents, with quantified precision, what the absence of CharityTech costs.

---

2. 2 Lessig, L, Code and Other Laws of Cyberspace (Basic Books, New York, 1999), revised as Code: Version 2.0 (Basic Books, New York, 2006).
3. 3 Murray, A and Scott, C, 'Controlling the New Media: Hybrid Responses to New Forms of Power' (2002) 65 Modern Law Review 491, 506.
4. 4 Reidenberg, JR, 'Lex Informatica: The Formulation of Information Policy Rules through Technology' (1998) 76 Texas Law Review 553.
5. 5 Brownsword, R, Law 3.0: Rules, Regulation, and Technology (Routledge, 2020) ch 4.
6. 6 Auer, R, 'Embedded Supervision: How to Build Regulation into Decentralised Finance' (2019, revised 2022) BIS Working Papers No 811, 1.

7. 7 Bank for International Settlements, ‘Project Mandala’ (Press Release, 28 October 2024).
8. 8 Casanovas, P et al, ‘Legal Compliance by Design (LCbD) and through Design (LCtD)’ (2017) CEUR Workshop Proceedings Vol 2049.
9. 9 Singh, C and Lin, W, ‘Can Artificial Intelligence, RegTech and CharityTech Provide Effective Solutions for Anti-Money Laundering and Counter-Terror Financing Initiatives in Charitable Fundraising’ (2021) 24(3) Journal of Money Laundering Control 464.

Part VI: Reform Proposals

The five systemic pathologies identified in this paper are not amenable to resolution through guidance, training, or incremental improvements to existing enforcement mechanisms. They are structural problems that require structural solutions. The following three proposals are presented as a connected reform agenda, operating at different levels of the existing regulatory framework and together addressing the compliance gap that the Commission's published inquiry record has documented with compelling consistency.

VI.A Proposal One: A Tiered Governance Technology Standard

Charities above a defined threshold — income exceeding £1 million and operating with more than five branches — should be required, as a condition of Gift Aid registration, to use financial governance software meeting a defined technical standard. The standard would be a performance standard, not a prescriptive requirement: it would specify what the system must do — addressing the four functional requirements set out in Part V.C — not how it must be built. Multiple technology providers could build compliant implementations. The Charity Commission, working with HMRC and relevant professional bodies, would certify compliance with the standard through a proportionate assessment process.

The precedent for technology requirements as regulatory conditions is well established. The Payment Services Regulations 2017 require Payment Initiation Service Providers to meet specific technical security standards as a condition of authorisation. The FCA's Senior Managers and Certification Regime requires regulated firms to maintain adequate systems and controls. A governance technology standard for large multi-branch charities follows the same logic: the obligation to maintain adequate records already exists in the Charities Act 2011; the requirement that adequate records be maintained through an adequate system is the new element.

VI.B Proposal Two: A Compliance Infrastructure Safe Harbour

Charities that can demonstrate their financial governance is enforced at the database layer — through audit logs, settlement locking, automated compliance metadata, and tamper-evident records meeting the specification in Part V.C — should receive a safe harbour in Commission inquiry proceedings. Where a charity can demonstrate that its governance architecture makes the unauthorised redirection of funds architecturally impossible, the Commission should apply a presumption of good faith in assessing trustee conduct in respect of residual governance failures. The safe harbour would not immunise trustees against findings of misconduct or mismanagement. It would calibrate the Commission's assessment of culpability against the infrastructure context in which trustee conduct occurred — recognising that trustees who have invested in structural compliance have demonstrated a seriousness of governance purpose that policy documents alone cannot evidence.

VI.C Proposal Three: A Statutory Duty of Governance Infrastructure

The most significant proposal is legislative: the introduction of a statutory duty to maintain adequate governance infrastructure alongside the existing duty to comply with financial governance obligations. The Charities Act 2011 imposes obligations on what trustees must achieve: accurate records, timely returns, proper Gift Aid administration. The proposed duty would impose an obligation on how those outcomes must be secured for organisations of defined scale and complexity, operationalising the Trustee Act 2000’s section 1 duty of care in a manner that reflects the operational realities of large multi-branch organisations.

The precedent exists in the Health and Safety at Work etc. Act 1974, which imposes on employers a duty to ensure, so far as is reasonably practicable, the health, safety, and welfare of employees — interpreted to require not merely the absence of dangerous conditions but the active implementation of preventive systems and processes. A duty of governance infrastructure for charities above defined thresholds would shift the legal responsibility from reactive compliance to proactive prevention, giving trustees a clear legal framework for understanding what their obligations actually require in terms of systems design, and giving the Commission a clearer basis for findings of misconduct or mismanagement where trustees have failed to invest in adequate infrastructure despite having the resources to do so.

Conclusion: From Reactive Enforcement to Preventive Architecture

The organisations examined in this paper are not similar organisations. They span different denominations, different leadership structures, different relationships with overseas parent bodies, and different histories of engagement with the Charity Commission. What they share is a structural condition: each grew rapidly without a corresponding evolution in governance infrastructure, and each faced the consequences of that gap in the Commission's published inquiry record.

The learning from these six inquiries is not that faith organisations are poorly governed. That would be both unfair and analytically insufficient. The learning is that multi-branch organisations of significant complexity, governed by volunteer trustees without professional financial infrastructure, are structurally at risk of governance failures that the current compliance model detects too late and remedies too expensively. That conclusion applies to faith organisations of every denomination, every size above a defined threshold, and every relationship with overseas structures. It is a conclusion about architecture, not about faith.

The sums identified in these inquiries — the £1 million in regulatory intervention costs at MFM International, the £3.9 million lost at KICC, the £1.2 million in connected party payments at Christ Embassy, the £457,000 in unjustifiable expenditure at The Everlasting Arms Ministries — were given by faithful people for purposes they believed in. The distance between the intention of the giver and the use of the gift is not a measure of the giver's naivety. It is a measure of governance architecture. And governance architecture is something the law can require, technology can provide, and regulators can verify.

The Charity Commission is a regulator that intervenes when governance fails. What the sector requires, alongside that regulatory capacity, is infrastructure that makes the most common categories of governance failure structurally improbable before they occur. Legal Compliance by Design is that infrastructure. The technical specification exists. The regulatory precedent exists. The documented need is overwhelming. The question is not whether it is necessary. It is who builds it first.

Table of Statutes

Charities Act 2011 (c 25), ss 4, 46, 76, 78, 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)

Donations to Charity (Gift Aid Declarations) Regulations 2016 (SI 2016/1195)

Health and Safety at Work etc. Act 1974 (c 37)

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

Money Laundering (Prohibition) Act 2011 (Nigeria)

Payment Services Regulations 2017 (SI 2017/752)

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 (Charity No. 1100416) (20 October 2025)

First-Tier Tribunal (General Regulatory Chamber) (Charity): Trustees of Mountain of Fire and Miracles Ministries International v Charity Commission (27 January 2023)

Charity Commission, Charity Inquiry: Kingsway International Christian Centre (Charity No. 1102114) (2002–2005; 2011–2016)

Charity Commission, Charity Inquiry: Christ Embassy (Charity No. 1059247) (2013–2019)

Charity Commission, Charity Inquiry: Rhema Church London (Charity No. 1075100) (2014–2022)

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

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

Bibliography

Primary Sources

Bank for International Settlements, Auer, R, 'Embedded Supervision: How to Build Regulation into Decentralised Finance' Working Papers No 811 (2019, revised 2022)

Bank for International Settlements, 'BIS and Central Bank Partners Demonstrate that Policy Compliance can be Embedded in Cross-Border Transactions with Project Mandala' (Press Release, 28 October 2024)

Charity Commission, Annual Report and Accounts 2024–2025 (HC 1010, GOV.UK, 9 July 2025)

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

Charity Commission, CC8: Internal Financial Controls for Charities (updated April 2023)

Charity Commission, Managing Faith Charities as Trustees (updated 2021)

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

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

HMRC, UK Charity Tax Relief Statistics (Accredited Official Statistics, June 2025)

HMRC, Research Report 482: Charitable Giving and Gift Aid Research (2015–16)

House of Lords Select Committee on Charities, Stronger Charities for a Stronger Society (HL Paper 133, Session 2016–17, 26 March 2017)

Books

Brownsword, R, Law 3.0: Rules, Regulation, and Technology (Routledge, 2020)

Lessig, L, Code and Other Laws of Cyberspace (Basic Books, New York, 1999), revised as Code: Version 2.0 (Basic Books, New York, 2006)

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

Picton, J and Sigafoos, J (eds), Debates in Charity Law (Hart Publishing, 2020)

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

Journal Articles

Arner, DW, Barberis, JN and Buckley, RP, 'FinTech, RegTech, and the Reconceptualization of Financial Regulation' (2017) 37 Northwestern Journal of International Law & Business 371

Black, J, 'Forms and Paradoxes of Principles-Based Regulation' (2008) 3(4) Capital Markets Law Journal 425

Casanovas, P et al, 'Legal Compliance by Design (LCbD) and through Design (LCtD)' (2017) CEUR Workshop Proceedings Vol 2049

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 Chicago-Kent Law Review 965

Murray, A and Scott, C, 'Controlling the New Media: Hybrid Responses to New Forms of Power' (2002) 65 Modern Law Review 491

Reidenberg, JR, 'Lex Informatica: The Formulation of Information Policy Rules through Technology' (1998) 76 Texas Law Review 553

Singh, C and Lin, W, 'Can Artificial Intelligence, RegTech and CharityTech Provide Effective Solutions for Anti-Money Laundering and Counter-Terror Financing Initiatives in Charitable Fundraising' (2021) 24(3) Journal of Money Laundering Control 464

Singh, C et al, 'Can Machine Learning, as a RegTech Compliance Tool, Lighten the Regulatory Burden for Charitable Organisations in the United Kingdom?' (2022) 29(1) Journal of Financial Crime 45

Other Sources

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

NCVO, UK Civil Society Almanac 2024

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

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

Third Sector, 'Five Charities Were Charged Total of £2.5m in Fees for Interim Managers' (2017)

Author's Competing Interest Statement

The author declares the following competing interest: AFC Fintech Ltd, of which the author is founder and sole director, has developed Vortex AgOS, a financial governance and payment platform for faith organisations and commercial businesses that incorporates the compliance architecture principles described in Part V of this paper. The technical specification in Part V.C reflects, in part, the design principles underlying that work. The author has taken deliberate steps to ensure that the paper's analytical conclusions are derived independently from the published Charity Commission inquiry record, the relevant academic literature, and the applicable statutory framework, and do not constitute a commercial recommendation of any specific product or service. Readers are invited to evaluate the technical specification in Part V.C against their own assessment of available implementations. The author has received no funding from any commercial or institutional source for this research.

About the Author

Olushola Oke-Daniels is a Barrister and the Founder of AFC Fintech Ltd (Company No. 16915302), a UK-registered technology company developing Vortex AgOS, a hardware-free non-custodial payment and financial governance operating system for faith organisations and SMEs, and Sovereign Auditor, an automated compliance engine for CASS 15 safeguarding reconciliation. His work sits at the intersection of UK charity and financial regulation, technology architecture, and compliance system design. He is the author of the AFC Review seminar paper series on faith charity governance and UK payment regulation.

Correspondence: olushola@fintechafc.co.uk · fintechafc.co.uk