



Transforming Compliance Monitoring: Innovation Meets Regulation



Introduction

In a rapidly evolving regulatory environment, financial institutions face increasing scrutiny over their compliance frameworks. The need for agile, proactive, and data informed compliance monitoring has never been more pressing.

Regulatory bodies particularly the UK's Financial Conduct Authority (FCA), have highlighted repeated weaknesses across financial institutions, ranging from ineffective financial crime controls in challenger banks to poor root cause analysis and weak governance.

This paper explores how firms can improve compliance monitoring through smarter tooling, cultural change and risk-based prioritisation.

1. Why Compliance Monitoring Must Evolve

Ensuring compliance with regulatory standards is not only about avoiding penalties but also about protecting your consumers, maintaining your reputation and strengthening market integrity. Recent high-profile failures show how critical it is:

- **UK:** HSBC fined £57.4 million by the Prudential Regulatory Authority (PRA) for depositor misreporting
- **EU:** Danske bank fined €1.82 million for failing to meet anti-money laundering standards
- **USA:** Wells Fargo fined US\$3.7 billion penalty for consumer protection failures.

These cases highlight the financial and reputational damage that can occur when compliance is not rigorously monitored. With regulators like the FCA, European Securities & Market Association (ESMA), and Securities and Exchange Commission (SEC) tightening their oversight, it is vital to stay ahead of the game.





There are three key drivers of change:

- Regulatory expectations
- Complexity of risks
- Stakeholder trust

Regulators world-wide are stressing that cultural accountability and real-time monitoring are key to prevent compliance monitoring becoming a box ticking exercise.

Additionally, digital transformation, ESG obligations and third party dependencies add layers of complexity and risk that firms must manage and monitor continuously.

Another key message that we continue to hear is the need to build trust. Failing to detect early warning signals can erode both customer and investor confidence.

Where should firms focus valuable resources?

2. Current Gaps in Compliance Monitoring:

There are some common pitfalls that firms often face when conducting monitoring activities which include:

Reactive compliance monitoring

Reactive rather than proactive monitoring means firms wait for issues to arise instead of actively identifying and mitigating risks early. Risk-based monitoring should be ahead of the game, not playing catch up.

Inconsistent documentation and reporting can lead to gaps in compliance and failure to meet your obligations through lack of consistency.

Failing to implement robust oversight of third party vendors who handle critical client data, can lead to significant risks as highlighted by recent FCA findings.

Inconsistent documentation and reporting

Weak third party oversight

Overreliance on manual processes

FCA audits reveal that inconsistent documentation is a major weakness.

Whilst manual processes may be necessary at times, they are more prone to errors, inefficiencies and reporting delays, or notifications to the regulators.

The FCA often indicates that the inability to track real-time compliance leads to difficulty in detecting and addressing issues before they become major problems. A key concern for those firms falling within the Consumer Duty regime.

Common pitfalls for firms:



Lack of clear compliance policies

Failing to establish & maintain compliance policies leads to difficulty in monitoring compliance effectively. As a standard has not been set, there is nothing for employees to follow as a guide.



Infrequent or inconsistent monitoring

Monitoring should be a continuous activity, but many firms perform it sporadically, leading to gaps and unaddressed risks.



Over-reliance on manual processes

Relying solely upon manual monitoring processes increases the risk of human error, inefficiency and inconsistency. Automated tools can enhance accuracy & efficiency.



Failure to address emerging risks

Regulations and risks evolve, but many organisations fail to update their monitoring processes, leaving them exposed to new compliance threats.



Ignoring data quality issues

Poor data collection and analysis can result in inaccurate compliance assessments, making it difficult to detect violations or areas for improvement.



Weak internal controls

Insufficient internal controls, such as inadequate segregation of duties or poor oversight, can lead to non-compliance and fraud.



Lack employee training and awareness

Raising employee awareness of regulatory matters helps to avoid unintentional violations of regulatory obligations. Ongoing training is essential.



Failure to follow up on findings

Identifying non-compliance issues is not enough. Organisations often fail to take corrective action or enforce disciplinary measures.



Poor documentation and reporting

Without proper record-keeping, organisations may struggle to demonstrate compliance, especially during audits or regulatory inspections.



Reactive vs proactive approach

Many organisations wait for issues to arise before addressing compliance gaps instead of proactively identifying and mitigating risks.



Lack of senior management involvement

When leadership is not actively involved in compliance efforts, it sends a message that compliance is not a priority, leading to a weak environment.



Not leveraging technology

Monitoring can be significantly improved with data analytics and automation... yet some organisations fail to integrate these tools.

To improve monitoring activities, firms should adopt a proactive approach, leveraging technology where possible, to ensure regular training and establish a culture of compliance from the top down.

Many regulators have identified some common weaknesses across regulated firms including:

- Static or checklist-based reviews that miss behavioural or root cause indicators
- Limited data integration, causing blind spots between functions (e.g. compliance and audit)
- Infrequent testing and lagging issue escalation
- Over-reliance on self-reporting and reactive audits

For example, the FCA's [Financial Crime Thematic Review](#) revealed poor governance and data protection practices, including unencrypted portable devices and unmonitored USB access, despite firms claiming to have policies in place.

In its review of UK challenger banks, the FCA found that some firms launched products without [adequate financial crime controls](#), highlighting a gap in pre-launch compliance involvement as well as post-launch monitoring activities.

3. A New Model for Compliance Monitoring

Today's compliance monitoring practices need to evolve far beyond static checklists and periodic audits. In response to growing regulatory expectations, rising operational complexity, and heightened stakeholder scrutiny, firms are shifting towards dynamic, data-driven, and real-time compliance systems.

These modern approaches leverage technologies such as AI powered surveillance, machine learning algorithms, integrated regulatory reporting tools and behavioural analytics to detect anomalies, monitor conduct, and predict potential compliance breaches before they escalate.

Regulatory bodies, including the FCA, SEC, ASIC and ESMA, are consistently reinforcing the need for proactive monitoring, effective risk governance, and continuous outcome testing. Today successful compliance monitoring is not just about meeting minimum standards. It is about embedding a culture of transparency, agility, and accountability across business, supported by technology and board-level oversight.



To evolve from reactive to proactive monitoring, firms should embrace the following activities:

Dynamic risk-based monitoring

- This requires firms to prioritise high-risk business areas, customer segments and jurisdictions appropriately. Firms also need to adopt review cycles and deep dives into high-exposure processes.

Technology-enabled surveillance

- The use of machine learning can detect anomalies and trends with speed and enable compliance and audit teams to pinpoint areas for investigation. Automation can help firms to log issues and flag them to enable earlier intervention. Coupled with dashboards of real-time metrics and alerts that provide visibility and enable oversight of where a firm’s current risks may lie.

Cross-functional Ownership

- Involves the first line business units in continuous compliance checks. Embedding compliance champions in product teams, customer services and risk.

Root Cause Analysis (RCA) Integration

- Firms need to pinpoint and analyse emerging trends
- Additionally, RCA findings should feed into control reviews and training where required.
- Analysing patterns across complaints, incidents, and audit findings
- Tie RCA findings to control updates and training.

In this way the intelligence garnered from compliance monitoring can feed into an integrated risk management framework.

4. Case Studies: Learning from failures

Firms can learn a great deal from the past. Reviewing enforcement cases provide a powerful lens through which to examine real-world compliance challenges, regulatory responses, and the practical application of risk frameworks in financial services.

Two recent examples of enforcement in the UK:

Challenger Bank (UK)		Wirecard (Germany)	
Issue	Launched services with minimal KYC and onboarding checks	Issue	Systemic fraud overlooked due to lack of independent oversight and compliance testing.
Outcome	Regulatory scrutiny, reputational damage	Outcome	Massive losses, global reputational damage
Lessons	Pre-launch compliance testing and cross-functional risk reviews were lacking	Lessons	Regular external validation and whistleblower engagement could have mitigated the issue

By analysing both successful and failed approaches, firms can extract valuable lessons around governance, culture, monitoring and the use of technology in mitigating risk.

These insights not only highlight how compliance issues manifest under pressure but also reveal patterns in root

cause failures, whether related to conduct, systems, or oversight. Importantly, case studies enable firms to benchmark their own practices, anticipate regulatory expectations, and develop more resilient compliance strategies.

5. Principles of Effective Compliance Monitoring

Effective monitoring is built upon a foundation of clear principles that ensure risks are identified, managed, and escalated in a timely manner.

Pillar	Description
Timeliness	Continuous monitoring, not just annual reviews
Integration	Unified view across legal, audit, compliance, risk
Escalation	Clear thresholds for management involvement
Evidence	Documented logs of issues, actions, and follow ups
Feedback loop	RCA feeding into training, controls, and product development



Timeliness is crucial. Continuous monitoring practices can provide early detection of potential issues. Firms can address concerns before they escalate into regulatory breaches or reputational harm. Equally important is integration, a unified view across legal, audit, compliance and risks functions allows for consistent oversight, reduces duplication, and ensures that decision-makers see the full risk picture rather than fragmented insights.

A strong compliance monitoring framework also relies on structured processes for escalation and evidence. Clear thresholds must define when issues require management involvement, ensuring accountability and timely remediation. At the same time, maintaining comprehensive logs of issues, corrective actions, and follow-ups provide both transparency and defence in the face of regulatory scrutiny.

Finally, a robust feedback loop ensures that monitoring is not a static exercise but a driver of continuous improvement. Root cause analysis of issues should feed directly into enhanced training, stronger controls, and even product or service development, creating a cycle where compliance monitoring actively strengthens the organisations resilience and culture of accountability.

6. Regulatory Recommendations for Stronger Compliance Monitoring

Globally, regulators are sharpening their expectations. The UK's FCA emphasises the need for data-driven monitoring, strong governance oversight and a culture that prioritises root cause analysis and proactive issue resolution.



In Australia, the ASIC has reinforced the importance of ongoing monitoring under the Design and Distribution Obligations (DDO), including clear audit trails for product changes and distribution assessments.

Meanwhile, the SEC continues to expand surveillance expectations under Regulation Best Interest (Reg BI), requiring firms to improve suitability tracking, disclosure practices, and supervisory procedures. Together, these regulatory trends point toward a global shift toward more continuous, intelligence-led compliance oversight that demand both technological sophistication and culture commitment from firms.

Regulators' view of monitoring

UK: FCA	Emphasises data-driven monitoring, governance and root cause culture
Australia: ASIC	Focus on monitoring product distribution under DDO, and clear audit trails for any changes
USA: SEC	Enhanced surveillance obligations under Reg BI
EU: ESMA	Under MiFID II and Retail Investment Strategy (RIS), promotes suitability testing and value assessments

7. The Way Forward

To improve monitoring practices, firms should take immediate steps to adopt a proactive, risk-based approach to oversight. This involves enhancing real-time data collection across business lines, integrating technology such as RegTech solutions and AI-driven analytics for pattern recognition and anomaly detection, and embedding risk indicators into key business processes.

Firms should ensure that their monitoring frameworks are dynamic, regularly tested and adjusted based on emerging risks or regulatory expectations, such as those outlined in the FCA's Consumer Duty, which requires firms to monitor outcomes and act swiftly to address poor performance.

Embedding MI dashboards, reviewing thematic reviews and fostering a culture of escalation and transparency are also essential. Furthermore, senior management should be actively involved in interpreting findings and overseeing remediation, demonstrating accountability as required under the SM&CR and other international accountability regimes.

There are five crucial steps that firms can take now to improve their monitoring programmes and increase their overall effectiveness which include:

1. Benchmark against peer firms

Firms can use regulatory feedback statements to identify weaknesses within the industry and to assess the effectiveness of their own controls.

2. Embed RegTech

Various tools allow firms to data map, detect anomalies, and automate workflows. Providing key intelligence to the compliance teams will enable them to be more effective and help the firm manage risks proactively.

3. Run maturity assessments

Assessments are usually set over five levels. This helps firms to track their performance over time to identify improvements or weaknesses and to implement changes where necessary.

4. Establish escalation matrices

Escalation matrices should link to accountability frameworks such as SM&CR in the UK and helps to demonstrate governance.

5. Develop culture and training programmes

To embed proactive compliance behaviours, firms need to raise awareness and encourage active engagement.

Modern compliance monitoring must be continuous, intelligent and embedded within a firm. Firms that rely on traditional, siloed approaches risk missing systemic weaknesses until it's too late. By integrating analytics, streamlining governance, and fostering a culture of curiosity and accountability, firms can turn compliance into a driver of resilience and trust.

Ruleguard's Compliance Monitoring Solution:

Ruleguard's Compliance Monitoring software provides robust oversight of business activities, embedding a culture of continuous compliance and risk management across your firm. Take a pre-emptive approach to minimise risks, protect your consumers and adhere to regulatory requirements.



Why Ruleguard?

Ruleguard is an industry-leading software platform designed to help regulated firms manage the burden of evidencing and monitoring compliance. It has a range of tools to help firms fulfil their obligations across the UK, Europe and APAC regions.

Ruleguard is designed to help regulated firms manage the burden of evidencing and monitoring compliance. The solution is made up of several core modules which can be deployed to provide:

- automation and reduction of compliance risk at different points in the compliance journey
- a holistic platform which delivers end-to-end benefits at every level of a regulated financial services firm.

With Ruleguard, key areas of compliance can be automated and put under direct review by appropriate

individuals across the business. This means that monitoring can be embedded directly into business-as-usual processes, vastly simplifying the process and significantly reducing the overhead required to carry it out.

Evidence and approvals are gathered in real time, with responsible individuals signing off attestations within a framework designed for your firm. Documentation reviews and updates are managed automatically. Key compliance workflows can be designed directly within the solution, ensuring that MI outputs are available which directly provide stakeholders with an up-to-the minute overview of compliance results.

About Ruleguard:

Ruleguard started out in 2013 as a software 'design and build' agency that specialised in financial services projects, particularly those with a unique requirement for data and functionality that was far from being available 'off the shelf'.

Fast-forward to 2025 and we have established Ruleguard as one of the foremost offerings in the RegTech space, providing genuine compliance oversight to some of the largest and most complex financial institutions globally.

Ruleguard now serves over 50 clients, with recurring revenues over £2.7M and high double-digit growth year-on-year. Our client list includes leading asset managers, wealth managers, brokers, insurance firms and banks such as Computershare, FNZ, Link Fund Solutions, Quilter Cheviot, True Potential, Rathbones and Royal London.

Most importantly, we continue to work closely with our clients to identify the most painful aspects of compliance oversight and strive to build our platform to improve that governance with increased efficiency and reduced cost.

Why not get in touch?

Contact the Ruleguard team on

 **0800 408 3845**

 **hello@ruleguard.com**

Discover how Ruleguard's Compliance Monitoring Software helps you streamline oversight, close compliance gaps, giving regulators and your board complete confidence.

Visit our website to find out more about how Ruleguard can help:

 **ruleguard.com/solutions/compliance-monitoring-software**

Key Points of Contact:

Priscilla Gaudoin (Author)

Head of Risk & Compliance

Priscilla.Gaudoin@ruleguard.com

Ed Buckman

Chief Commercial Officer

Ed.Buckman@ruleguard.com

Matthew Bruce

Platform Director

Matthew.Bruce@ruleguard.com

Disclaimer

This document is intended for general information purposes only and does not take into account the reader's specific circumstances and may not reflect the most current developments.

Ruleguard disclaims, to the fullest extent permitted by applicable law, any and all liability for the accuracy and completeness of the information in this document and for any acts or omissions made based on such information. Ruleguard does not provide legal, regulatory, audit or tax advice. Readers are responsible for obtaining such advice from their own legal counsel or other licensed professionals.

Copyright © 2025 Ruleguard. All Rights Reserved. Ruleguard is the trading style of Strategic Software Applications Ltd which is incorporated and registered in England and Wales with company number 08423947 whose registered office is at Riverbank House, 2 Swan Lane, London EC4R 3TT. Ruleguard and the Ruleguard logo are registered trademarks owned by Strategic Software Applications Ltd.

