



Observatoire ARGA

INTERNATIONAL ANALYTICAL REPORT

**D-16. FIU Information Exchange
and the Egmont Framework
Legal Limits and Practical Remedies**

Author:

Sergey Khrabrykh - President of ARGA, PhD

Organization: Observatoire ARGA

Correspondence: 21 rue de l'Aviation, 64600 Anglet, France

Contact: info@argaobservatory.org, +33 7 58 49 62 27

Website: www.argaobservatory.org

28 September 2026

Contents

Executive summary	3
1. FIUs, Egmont and the limits of institutional authority	4
2. From a banking transaction to an international communication	5
3. Request quality and the connection with the requested jurisdiction	6
4. Identification errors that travel between systems	7
5. Purpose limitation and consent to onward use	8
6. Financial intelligence and evidential use	9
7. Confidentiality and an effective opportunity to respond	10
8. France: TRACFIN, exchange and transaction opposition	11
9. United Kingdom: SARs, DAML and the significance of time periods	12
10. United States: SAR confidentiality and underlying transaction facts	13
11. European reform and the transitional period	14
12. Legal professional privilege: judicial guidance	14
13. Banking data and effective review: M.N. v. San Marino	15
14. Politically motivated use of financial information	16
15. Correcting information after it has been shared	17
16. Source of funds: preparing a substantive response	18
17. Choosing the recipient and defining the requested result	19
18. Organising work during the first weeks	20
19. Six hypothetical practical scenarios	20
20. Quality control and management of error	23
21. Proposals for improving practice	24
22. Conclusion	25
Sources and references	25

Source cut-off: 28 September 2026. Keywords: FIU; Egmont; TRACFIN; financial intelligence; evidence; data protection; judicial review.

Executive summary

International financial information exchange makes it possible to connect transactions that may appear ordinary when examined separately: a payment to a supplier, transfers between companies, repayment of a loan or a cash withdrawal. Financial intelligence units can bring together fragments held in different jurisdictions. The resulting analysis may nevertheless affect a person well before any criminal charge is brought. A bank may delay a payment, an investigator may request documents, or property may become subject to a provisional measure. The quality of the system therefore depends on more than the speed of cooperation. It also depends on preserving the provenance of information, the conditions governing its use and a workable opportunity to correct an error.

This report examines exchanges between financial intelligence units, or FIUs, through the Egmont framework and related European arrangements. Its central question is how to support effective cooperation without turning an initial suspicion into an enduring and effectively irreversible assessment of a person. The analysis covers the legal character of exchange, consent to onward dissemination, use in proceedings, banking restrictions, access to data, legal professional privilege and correction across borders. France, the United Kingdom and the United States are considered separately, alongside judicial authorities and six hypothetical practical scenarios.

The principal practical conclusion is that the precise object of a challenge must first be identified. A foreign FIU request, an analytical communication, a bank's decision and a court order restraining property are different acts. They may draw on the same underlying information, but their legal bases, responsible decision makers and available remedies can differ. A complaint directed solely at international exchange may leave a banking restriction untouched. Conversely, the removal of a restriction does not establish that the original record has been corrected for every recipient.

The report proposes five questions for analysing a case: what proposition about the person is being used; where it came from; for what purpose it was shared; which decision relies on it; and who has power to reconsider that decision. This approach assists both authorities assessing incoming information and representatives of affected persons. It turns a general objection to financial scrutiny into a proposition that can be checked against documents, legal powers and the reasons for a particular measure.

The source cut-off is 28 September 2026. Legal requirements are distinguished from the author's recommendations, and the hypothetical scenarios do not describe actual cases. Discussion of published judgments does not imply that those judgments directly resolve disputes under the Egmont rules. The limits of their relevance to financial intelligence are explained in each instance. The European reforms adopted in 2024 are assessed with their transitional arrangements in view; future mechanisms are not presented as already operating uniformly throughout the Union.

1. FIUs, Egmont and the limits of institutional authority

FATF Recommendation 29 identifies the FIU as a country's central agency for receiving, analysing and disseminating financial information. It accommodates different institutional models and requires operational independence. Recommendation 40 addresses international cooperation. These standards do not replace the domestic provisions that confer powers to obtain documents, disclose information or restrict the use of funds. [1]

For practical purposes, the actual powers of an institution matter more than its name or organisational location. An FIU situated within a police authority does not necessarily treat every incoming communication as evidence in a criminal file. Conversely, an administrative FIU may possess a specific power to suspend a transaction temporarily. Institutional affiliation alone cannot establish the evidential status of a communication or the procedure for challenging it. Those questions require a separate assessment of the particular act and the legislation governing it.

Egmont supports cooperation between FIUs; it is not an international court or an authority determining criminal guilt. The joint FATF, Egmont, INTERPOL and UNODC report published in 2025 distinguishes cooperation networks from investigations conducted by national authorities. [2] A letter to the Egmont Secretariat should therefore not be represented to a client as the equivalent of a judicial application capable of lifting a restraint order or compelling a bank to execute a transfer.

A further distinction concerns the binding character of membership standards and their effect in domestic proceedings. The Egmont Principles are binding on members within the organisation's compliance framework, whereas the Operational Guidance has a different, advisory status. [3; 4] This does not establish a universal private cause of action directly under Egmont rules. The documents may nevertheless help explain to a court or oversight body why a particular use of information calls for closer examination.

An institutional map of the case should identify, at a minimum, the sender, the receiving FIU, the eventual user and the authority responsible for the restrictive decision. All four functions may be performed by different institutions. A foreign FIU may send information to the domestic FIU, which passes analytical results to investigators; the bank may then receive a procedural order. The sequence is central to an effective response. A bank cannot sensibly be asked to correct a foreign analytical assessment it does not hold, and an FIU should not be assumed to have power to revoke a judicial order.

The first working document should therefore be a concise account of responsibilities. For each participant, it should record the known act, its apparent legal basis, the information available and the result that an application could potentially achieve. Where a power has not been established, that uncertainty should remain visible instead of being filled by assumption. This exercise reduces unproductive correspondence and helps protect the time limit for challenging the measure that actually exists.

2. From a banking transaction to an international communication

The information chain often begins with a fact that permits several explanations. A company receives a substantial transfer after a lengthy period of inactivity. To the bank, this may justify further enquiries. To the customer, it may be payment for a completed project, the proceeds of an asset sale or repayment of a debt. Analysis becomes more reliable when the hypothesis of wrongdoing is tested against alternative explanations and documents, rather than repeated at every subsequent stage as if repetition itself added support.

It is useful to distinguish raw transaction data, a suspicious transaction report, an analytical assessment and the conclusion reached by a competent authority. Raw data records the movement of money. A report explains why the activity appeared unusual. Analysis connects it with additional circumstances. A judicial or administrative decision applies a legal test to the material considered. Failure to maintain these distinctions produces language in which the existence of suspicion is made to look like proof of an offence.

Case 13 in Egmont's collection of financial analysis cases for 2021-2023 describes cooperation between the Italian and Hungarian FIUs concerning cash withdrawals in Italy using cards associated with Hungarian companies. The exercise connected information about cards, companies and incoming funds; the case heading refers to approximately EUR 37 million. This is an account of work by the authorities, not a general judicial finding about every comparable transaction. [5]

The author's conclusion from this example concerns the architecture of verification. If one participant knows the card number and the location of a transaction, while another can identify the account holder, combining the information may substantially improve accuracy. That benefit depends on a reliable match between identifiers. A matching error turns an additional source into an amplifier of the original mistake. For every material connection, it should therefore be possible to identify the factual link that supports it.

In a disputed case, a provenance table is useful. A statement that someone is “associated with a company” is too imprecise. The association may mean ownership, signing authority, employment, a limited power of attorney or merely a payment. The date of the association must also be checked. A person may have left office before the disputed transaction, while the current register may not show the historical position. When assessing an individual payment, the timing of a role can matter more than the person's present status.

The absence of charges does not establish that analytical enquiries lacked a legitimate basis. Equally, the existence of a suspicious transaction report does not establish that every subsequent restriction was justified. A strong legal position need not confuse these propositions. It can accept that an initial enquiry was permissible while challenging a factual error, an excessive collection of data or the disproportionate continuation of a measure after significant new information became available.

The same discipline should apply to language in submissions. A report, an investigation and a conviction describe different procedural facts. Replacing one with another may distort the position in either direction. Accurate descriptions make it easier to identify the real disagreement: whether the activity occurred, whether it was unusual, whether it justified further enquiry, or whether it was sufficient to support a particular adverse decision.

3. Request quality and the connection with the requested jurisdiction

The July 2025 Egmont Principles call for specific and proportionate requests, with an explanation of urgency and the connection to the requested jurisdiction. [3] The practical purpose is to allow the receiving FIU to understand the task rather than infer it. A reference to possible money laundering does not, by itself, explain which transactions are being examined, the relevant period or why information is expected to be held in the country receiving the request.

The author's model of a useful request addresses three groups of questions. The first concerns the object: a person, company, account, particular transfer or asset. The second concerns the connection: how the suspicion arose and what makes the foreign information relevant. The third concerns the intended result: confirmation that an account exists, identification of its holder, records of specified transactions or clarification of a fact already known. A precise task makes it easier to assess whether the response actually answers the question.

The requested period should have an intelligible relationship with the suspected activity. If the enquiry concerns two payments under one contract, seeking every transaction of an entire family over ten years requires additional justification. Wider collection may be warranted by further facts, but not simply by the convenience of obtaining a complete dataset. A useful proportionality question is whether a smaller set could test the hypothesis and which material issue would remain unresolved if the request were narrowed.

Urgency also needs content. An imminent payment, a specific risk that records will be lost and an approaching procedural deadline are different reasons for expedition. They may call for different responses. The first may make a domestic suspension power relevant; the second may require preservation of records; the third may require coordination of response dates. An “urgent” label does not create a power that the receiving institution does not possess, nor does it identify the measure that would address the problem.

The affected person's representatives will often be unable to inspect the original request. A practical alternative is to establish a mismatch between the known subject of the investigation and its consequences for the client. The enquiry may concern the receipts of one company while the personal funds of a relative with no operational role are restricted. Such a mismatch can justify asking the competent body to examine the scope of the request and the basis for including the third party, without insisting on immediate disclosure of the entire exchange.

An objection becomes more persuasive when it offers a concrete alternative. Instead of demanding that all enquiries cease, the applicant may ask for a defined account and period to be examined, unrelated counterparties to be separated, identifiers to be clarified, or one disputed payment to be checked. This is not an admission of wrongdoing. It shows that the objection to excessive scope rests on a factual distinction that the authority can evaluate.

There is also a practical benefit for the requesting authority. A focused request makes it easier for the recipient to identify missing particulars and provide a useful answer. Broad language may appear comprehensive while producing a response whose limits are difficult to understand. Precision at the start can therefore improve both the speed of legitimate cooperation and the quality of any later evidential assessment.

4. Identification errors that travel between systems

Shared names, different transliterations and changes in corporate names create risks of incorrect matching. The problem is not confined to names. A shared registered address may belong to a corporate service provider; a telephone number may belong to a representative acting for several clients; a payment intermediary may appear in many unrelated transactions. Each indicator has explanatory value only in its context. The existence of a connection is not the same as evidence of the legal relationship ultimately alleged.

For an individual, useful checks include date of birth, nationality at the relevant time, identity documents, residence and business role. For a company, the registration number, jurisdiction, history of names, management structure and period of the supposed owner's involvement are important. A match between names without a match between registration numbers should not be treated as equivalent to identity of the legal entity. At the same time, the absence of one identifier will not always exclude a connection; the available indicators must be assessed together.

Errors in the nature of the relationship can be particularly consequential. Holding office is not identical to ownership; ownership does not invariably establish practical authority over an account; a power of attorney may be confined to one transaction. If an analytical record compresses these roles into the word “control”, the response should identify the precise function demonstrated by the documents. Denying any relationship will be unconvincing where a genuine but narrower relationship did exist.

A correction dossier should set out the disputed statement, the accurate fact, supporting documentation and the effect of the distinction. For example, the communication may identify a person as a director when a payment was made, while a registry extract and shareholder decision show that the appointment ended a year earlier. The previous role cannot, without more, explain authority over the disputed payment. If the former director retained access to the account, however, that adverse fact must also be addressed. Correcting formal office alone would not resolve the substantive question.

The provenance of copies matters. A screenshot of a register without an extraction date may be insufficient to establish a historical position. An official extract, archived entry or document identifying when a change took effect is preferable. Translations should preserve distinctions between director, manager, trustee and beneficial owner. Rendering every role as “owner” may make a dossier superficially simple while making it materially inaccurate.

The requested correction should itself be specific. In some cases, incorrectly merged records need to be separated. In others, accurate information should remain but the role, period or degree of certainty should be amended. A demand to destroy the entire dataset may be excessive where part of it is lawful and necessary. A targeted correction is easier to assess and subsequently trace through the recipients who relied on the original information.

Where several identifiers conflict, the submission should explain their relative significance rather than merely count matches and mismatches. A shared surname may be weak evidence; a unique company number may be decisive. A changed passport number may be entirely consistent with the same person. Clear explanation of these distinctions helps prevent the correction process from generating a second, equally mechanical identification error.

5. Purpose limitation and consent to onward use

The Egmont Principles allow consent to dissemination to authorities identified in the request to be assumed unless the requested FIU expressly refuses it. Use beyond the originally approved purpose requires prior authorisation. This should not be reduced either to a claim that every onward transmission invariably needs a separate letter or to a claim that subsequent use is unrestricted. [3]

Within the EU, Article 55 of Directive 2015/849 makes onward dissemination and use for additional purposes subject to the prior consent of the providing FIU. Application must be assessed together with national implementing law. [6] The international standard and the applicable legal rules therefore need to be read together. An assumption made by participants in an exchange cannot override more specific legal conditions binding in the relevant jurisdiction.

The author's framework for examining consent has four elements: recipient, purpose, material and manner of use. Permission to communicate an analytical conclusion to investigators may not extend to publishing the entire communication in open court. Permission to examine specified payments may not cover a separate administrative proceeding. Conversely, an authorisation drafted at the outset may cover several stages. Restrictions should not be assumed merely because the information originated abroad.

The complete exchange should be considered where the reviewing authority can obtain it. A limitation may appear in the original response, an attachment, a later clarification or standard conditions incorporated into the communication. One sentence in a covering letter may not reveal the final scope of permission. A party alleging misuse should, where possible, identify the actual change of purpose or recipient rather than rely solely on not having seen a copy of consent.

A material issue might arise where information supplied to analyse possible laundering of business receipts is later used in an unrelated licensing dispute. That does not automatically establish unlawfulness: separate authorisation and a valid domestic basis may exist. The authority should nevertheless be able to demonstrate how the applicable conditions were met. The examination must address both the permission given by the provider and the legal competence of the eventual user.

For a sending FIU, vague conditions create avoidable uncertainty. If only analytical exchange is authorised, that should be clear. If dissemination to investigators and use in court are permitted, the scope should be identifiable. For the recipient, a change in purpose should be addressed before the new use occurs. A later explanation may resolve ambiguity, but it should not be assumed in advance that it can retrospectively cure every breach of domestic law.

The practical question is therefore not simply whether a document labelled “consent” exists. It is whether the permission relied on actually covers the act in dispute under the applicable rules. This requires attention to chronology as well as wording. A broad authorisation received after a contested disclosure may raise a different issue from the same authorisation received before it.

6. Financial intelligence and evidential use

Financial intelligence helps determine the direction of an enquiry. Evidence must satisfy the requirements of the particular proceedings in which it is used. The functions overlap, but they are not identical. An analytical note may explain why an investigation began while remaining insufficient to establish ownership of funds, intention or the origin of property. Its significance depends on its content, how it was obtained and the procedural context in which a decision maker relies on it.

Three situations should be distinguished. In the first, a communication is used only as a lead and primary records are then obtained through an independent lawful route. In the second, the communication itself is put before a court to support an interim measure. In the third, its conclusions are relied upon to prove substantive allegations. Each situation raises different questions about source verification, disclosure and the opportunity to respond. There is no adequate universal answer about the admissibility of “Egmont material” without this differentiation.

An evidential transition map is useful. For every significant proposition, it should identify the primary record, the route by which it was obtained, subsequent processing and the procedural document in which the proposition is used. If a note reports a transfer, the bank, date, currency, parties and basis for connecting it to the person should be ascertainable. If the note characterises a contract as fictitious, the facts supporting that assessment are needed; repetition of a foreign authority's legal description is not a substitute.

Independent acquisition of a bank statement improves the verifiability of the transaction, but it does not automatically establish the lawfulness of every earlier stage. The opposite proposition is also unsafe: a breach in the original exchange does not, in every legal system, automatically exclude all documents subsequently obtained. Consequences depend on domestic law, the nature of the breach, the connection between the materials and the remedies available. A submission needs to explain that connection rather than invoke a general formula about the consequences of unlawful exchange.

Negative information requires particular care. “No information found” may mean that a particular database contains no matching entry, not that the person has no account anywhere. “Connection not confirmed” may reflect a search confined to a particular period. These qualifications should survive when the response enters proceedings. Otherwise a cautious technical answer can be converted either into an unjustified exoneration or, through an equally mistaken interpretation, into a suggestion that information has been concealed.

Representatives should frame questions around individual disputed propositions. Which record establishes the person's involvement? How was the amount calculated? Were a returned payment and bank charges taken into account? Has one transaction been counted twice? This approach permits meaningful testing of an evidential conclusion even where the entire analytical dataset is not disclosed. It also helps the court select a proportionate means of verification.

A useful response should distinguish between disagreement about arithmetic and disagreement about inference. Two parties may agree on every transfer but disagree about whether the pattern establishes control, knowledge or unlawful origin. The documents needed to resolve those issues differ. Treating the entire dispute as a demand for more bank statements can obscure the actual evidential gap and generate volume without answering the decisive question.

7. Confidentiality and an effective opportunity to respond

Confidentiality protects sources, methods and ongoing enquiries. It does not, by itself, answer whether the material is sufficient to support a decision affecting rights. An authority may have lawful grounds for withholding particular information, but a separate assessment is still needed of what can be tested and which procedural safeguards address the resulting limitation. The justification for secrecy and the justification for the adverse measure are related questions, not the same question.

A practical challenge should distinguish the substance of the suspicion, the identity of its source, the technical route of receipt and the underlying transactions. Disclosure of a source may be impermissible while dates, amounts and the customer's alleged role can be communicated without revealing it. A request for that separable material is often more precise than a demand for all FIU correspondence. Whether disclosure is possible, and to what extent, is governed by the applicable procedural framework.

The author's approach to closed material asks a sequence of questions. Is there a specific reason for the restriction? Who examines that reason? Can the court inspect the complete material? Does the party receive enough of the substance to give a meaningful response? Could an open primary record replace the closed document for the issue in dispute? These questions do not assume that every country has the same procedure. They provide a way to assess whether the protection available in a particular system is practical rather than merely nominal.

Reference to a foreign source should not automatically be treated as sufficient to refuse every explanation. The source may object to disclosure of its methods while accepting disclosure of a payment the customer can already demonstrate through a statement. An application can therefore propose alternatives: anonymisation, removal of unrelated third-party details, restricted inspection or an account of the essential facts. The availability of each option must be determined by the court and domestic law.

At the same time, representatives should not promise that fair trial rights invariably provide access to the original suspicious transaction report. The stage, subject matter, role of the information and available alternatives all matter. If a restriction is supported by independent open evidence, the significance of the closed intelligence may be smaller. If a closed assessment is effectively its sole foundation, the need for an effective way to test that foundation becomes substantially greater.

It is useful to state exactly which response cannot be made without the missing information. The person may be unable to check the alleged period of control over a company or distinguish the beneficiary of a transfer from an intermediary. This identifies a causal link between restricted access and a disadvantage in the proceedings. An abstract complaint about opacity is generally less useful than an explanation of why the unavailable fact could change the result.

A well-framed request also avoids demanding information irrelevant to the defence. The objective is to obtain a sufficient opportunity to address the case actually made, not to inspect every operational detail. That focus can make it easier to preserve legitimate confidentiality while exposing a material error in the reasoning behind the measure.

8. France: TRACFIN, exchange and transaction opposition

Article L561-29 of the French Monetary and Financial Code governs TRACFIN's exchange with foreign FIUs. It sets conditions concerning reciprocity, confidentiality and protection of rights, while leaving the decision to communicate and restrict use to TRACFIN. Exchange may occur before the suspected predicate offence has been precisely identified. [7] The absence of a final legal classification therefore does not, by itself, make an international communication unlawful.

Article L561-24 provides a separate power to oppose a transaction that has not yet been executed. The statutory period is ten working days from issue of the opposition notice, with provision for judicial extension or provisional sequestration. [8] This mechanism must be distinguished from the bank's own enquiries, a sanctions freeze and a criminal restraint measure. Their practical effect may look similar to the customer, but the grounds for continuing them differ.

The practical assessment starts with a chronology. When did the bank receive the customer's instruction? When did it report the delay? Is there information establishing a formal opposition? Has a later court order been made? The customer may not know every date. Counsel should record established events separately and seek clarification, to the extent permitted, of the legal character of the restriction currently in force. The statutory period should not be calculated from an arbitrary date taken from the bank's first letter.

Expiry of the initial period does not necessarily show that a continuing restriction is unlawful: a new legal basis may have arisen. The task is to identify that basis. Continuation should be assessed under the authority now relied upon, rather than by a general reference to the original suspicion. The amount affected, the need to retain the whole sum and the impact on independent third parties may also be relevant to judicial scrutiny.

For access to personal data that TRACFIN may hold, the official explanation directs individuals to the CNIL. [9] That route should not be confused with an application to have a payment executed. Review of data processing and a dispute over the use of funds serve different purposes. An approach to the CNIL may be relevant to correction, but it does not replace timely procedural action against a property restriction.

When dealing with a French bank, it is useful to present transaction documents in a form that can be checked without disclosing confidential interagency communications: the contract, evidence of performance, the banking trail and an explanation of the economic purpose. At the same time, the legal basis for delay should remain a separate question. Documentary cooperation and a challenge to excessive restriction are compatible responses to different aspects of the same situation.

The desired remedy should reflect what is known. If a judicial measure exists, counsel should address its terms and the appropriate procedural route. If the only established act is a bank's refusal or delay, the analysis should not manufacture a TRACFIN decision. Precision about the source of the restriction is indispensable to selecting an effective remedy and calculating any relevant period.

9. United Kingdom: SARs, DAML and the significance of time periods

The United Kingdom's Defence Against Money Laundering procedure, or DAML, concerns protection against liability for a specified act involving suspected criminal property. NCA guidance emphasises that DAML is not a clearance of the funds. The standard framework includes a seven-working-day notice period and, following refusal, a 31-calendar-day moratorium period; any extension requires separate examination. [10]

These periods must not be applied to every banking delay. The first questions are whether a DAML request is involved at all and which act was the subject of it. An ordinary SAR, customer due diligence enquiries and a judicial restriction do not automatically become a single procedure. A bank may have several concurrent grounds for its position, and the end of one does not necessarily remove the others.

For the customer, an accurate description of the proposed transaction matters. An asset sale, repayment and transfer to another account may constitute different acts. A response concerning one should not be extended to later transactions without examining its scope. A change of recipient, amount or underlying purpose may require a fresh assessment of whether the earlier outcome remains applicable. The issue is compliance with the lawful procedure, not the identification of a different route for moving the money.

In a dispute about duration, counsel should maintain distinct timelines. One concerns the payment instruction and the banking relationship. Another concerns the known stages of DAML. A third concerns court orders, if any. A fourth concerns complaints or other remedies. Collapsing them into a single “review period” makes it harder to identify delay attributable to a particular actor and to determine the proper respondent.

Documents addressing lawful origin should answer the actual concern. If the issue relates to the supplier's transaction, the customer's tax returns alone may not resolve it. The connection between the payment and the supply, the reality of the obligation and the role of intermediaries may need explanation. The customer should not invent evidence that is unavailable. A gap should be acknowledged, together with an independent route by which the missing fact could potentially be checked.

The outcome may be partial. A bank may accept that a specified act can proceed while maintaining its decision to terminate the relationship. A court order may be discharged while contractual questions remain. The requested result should therefore be defined at the outset: execution of a particular payment, return of a balance, reconsideration of a restriction or correction of a factual assertion. A demand for an overall declaration that the customer's status is “clear” is too indefinite for most available procedures.

This separation is also important when communicating an outcome to other institutions. A favourable result in relation to one act should be described accurately, without implying that an authority has adjudicated every question about the person's assets. An overstated explanation may create new credibility problems when the next recipient examines the underlying document.

10. United States: SAR confidentiality and underlying transaction facts

The United States framework protects a SAR and information that would reveal its filing. FinCEN distinguishes that protected report from the underlying facts, transactions and ordinary business records. [11] The distinction matters where a bank invokes confidentiality while a customer seeks statements of its own account or attempts to explain a particular transfer. The category of information requested is as important as the general subject matter of the enquiry.

The joint statement issued by FinCEN and banking regulators on 2 September 2026 clarifies that SAR confidentiality does not preclude communication with customers about potentially fraudulent transactions, other suspicious activity or account closure. It does not alter existing BSA requirements. [12] It should accordingly be used as clarification of permissible communication, not as a new universal entitlement to obtain a SAR.

The author's recommendation is to separate the protected reporting process from the verifiable issue in the dispute. A customer can ask which documents about a particular sum remain outstanding, which instruction has not been executed and which account-holder details need updating. The customer should not require the bank to confirm or deny a SAR filing contrary to an applicable prohibition. Such a demand distracts from questions the bank may lawfully be able to address.

A document connected with an internal review does not necessarily become an ordinary business record merely because it contains transactions already known to the customer. Its content, purpose and capacity to reveal a report remain relevant. Access disputes therefore require an examination of document categories rather than reliance on the name of a folder. A bank statement, an internal analytical assessment and a copy of the SAR may be subject to different rules.

FinCEN's guidance on supporting documentation concerns production to authorised authorities; it does not create an equivalent right for the customer to obtain the entire package. [13] Representatives must therefore choose the appropriate procedural route. Documents already lawfully held by the customer can be used independently. Obtaining additional material depends on the applicable procedure, restrictions and subject of the proceedings.

The American example illustrates a broader practical risk: a prohibition on revealing a report can be mistakenly converted into a refusal to discuss any underlying fact. A useful request removes that ambiguity. It does not demand disclosure of the protected channel; it asks for specific data to be checked and established errors to be corrected. If the information is used abroad, the provider's restrictions and the rules governing the foreign decision maker require separate attention.

Correspondence should preserve that distinction throughout. A response that merely repeats a request for the SAR after a confidentiality objection may achieve little. A response identifying a wrong date, an uncredited repayment or an incorrect account-holder identifier gives the institution a concrete question that may be considered without confirming whether a protected report exists.

11. European reform and the transitional period

Directive (EU) 2024/1640 updates the organisation of anti-money laundering arrangements, including FIU functions. Implementation is phased, with 10 July 2027 as a central date. Regulation (EU) 2024/1624 also generally applies from that date. [14; 15] In a case considered in September 2026, citing a new instrument is not enough. The applicable domestic provision and the transitional rule relevant to the disputed act must be identified.

AMLA's Single Programming Document for 2026-2028 provides for preparations to transfer management of FIU.net from the European Commission to AMLA by July 2027. [16] A transition plan should not be described as proof that every function has already been transferred. Still less does it make AMLA the proper respondent to every individual dispute about information exchanged by national FIUs.

A temporal applicability table is useful in a practical dossier. It should record the transaction date, receipt of the communication, onward dissemination, the restrictive decision and the rule in force at each stage. Where events extend over several years, the governing framework may change. A new procedure may affect future steps without automatically changing the legal assessment of an earlier exchange. Retrospective effect must not be assumed without a specific basis.

The national and European levels must also be distinguished. A common cooperation standard does not eliminate the allocation of procedural powers. The court considering a restraint may be in one country, the data protection authority in another and the information provider in a third. Even where requirements are harmonised, practical protection depends on who made the disputed decision and the result the applicant seeks.

Directive (EU) 2019/1153 addresses the use of financial information by competent authorities and interaction with FIUs, subject to national procedural safeguards. [17] Its existence further illustrates why “the State has access” is an inadequate formulation. The access of a particular institution must be examined against its functions; it cannot be inferred simply from the country's participation in European arrangements against financial crime.

For banks and customer representatives, transition creates a risk of mixed terminology. Internal instructions may describe the future framework while a disputed act still rests on an earlier domestic provision. Written submissions should identify the instrument, version and date of application precisely. This is especially important where the dispute concerns a time limit, category of recipient or ground for refusing access. Those details may determine the result of the procedure.

12. Legal professional privilege: judicial guidance

In *Ordre des barreaux francophones et germanophone*, Case C-305/05, decided on 26 June 2007, the Court of Justice upheld the relevant AML obligations for lawyers against the fair trial challenge, taking account of their limits and the protection of legal advice and representation in proceedings. [18] The judgment does not establish that every document passing through a lawyer's hands is excluded from financial scrutiny.

In *Michaud v. France*, application no. 12323/11, decided on 6 December 2012, the European Court of Human Rights found no violation of Article 8. The limits of the French reporting duty and the

involvement of the head of the Bar as an intermediary were material safeguards. [19] The Court assessed a particular arrangement; its conclusion cannot simply be transferred to a procedure in which significant safeguards are absent or operate differently.

The author's practical conclusion is that documents should be classified before disclosure. A bank statement does not become privileged merely because it is attached to a letter to counsel. An opinion about defence strategy may require a different assessment. Correspondence about commercial performance and advice about an existing criminal risk may likewise attract different treatment. Content, function and applicable law matter more than a uniform label applied to an entire folder.

When a document demand is received, a category list can distinguish public corporate records, primary financial records, factual correspondence, legal advice and litigation materials. For disputed categories, the protected interest should be explained and any legally available independent review procedure identified. The description must be informative enough to assess the privilege claim without disclosing the substance of the protected advice itself.

A cross-border setting makes the exercise more complex. Protection recognised in the lawyer's jurisdiction may be defined differently in the receiving country. The issue should not be left until the document has entered a general dataset. Conditions of transfer, access restrictions and the mechanism for resolving disagreement should be examined in advance. A record acquired by an authority independently of counsel also needs a separate assessment; the existence of another copy in the lawyer's possession does not settle its status.

Privilege must not be used as a formal cover for unlawful activity. Equally, financial scrutiny should not deprive a person of confidential legal assistance merely because their transactions are under examination. A workable balance requires document-specific classification and independent scrutiny of contested material. General statements about the importance of professional secrecy offer less protection than an accurately prepared objection concerning identifiable records.

13. Banking data and effective review: M.N. v. San Marino

In *M.N. and Others v. San Marino*, application no. 28005/12, decided on 7 July 2015, the European Court of Human Rights found an Article 8 violation in respect of M.N. The case concerned seizure of banking and fiduciary documents in response to a request from Italian authorities; inadequate procedural safeguards available to that applicant were central. The other applicants' complaints were inadmissible. [20]

The case concerns mutual legal assistance and seizure of documents, rather than direct application of Egmont rules. Its relevance here is confined to the protection of banking data and the practical effectiveness of subsequent review. It does not establish that every interagency exchange requires advance notice to the customer or that all financial material obtained through such cooperation must automatically be excluded from proceedings.

The author's conclusion is that safeguards should be assessed by what they enable a person to do. Pointing to the existence of a court is insufficient if the affected person cannot bring a question about their own data before it. Providing a formal right to complain is insufficient if the person cannot learn of the act while that right remains practically exercisable. A case-specific assessment should identify the mechanism that can actually examine the necessity and scope of the interference.

This is particularly important for third parties. A counterparty, spouse or former director may appear in a dataset without being a suspect. Their interest is not exhausted by the outcome of another person's criminal case. Excessive collection, mistaken identity or onward disclosure may raise distinct issues. The chosen procedure must be checked for standing, including the applicant's status and the particular act that domestic law permits them to challenge.

A practical application can focus on the boundaries of the dataset. Which accounts were included? For what period? How do they relate to the enquiry? Which records concern independent transactions of third parties? Why would a narrower collection have been insufficient? These questions do not require denial of the State's legitimate interest in investigation. They invite scrutiny of whether the specific interference exceeds the limits justified by that interest.

Any international application requires a separate check of the current admissibility conditions and deadlines. An older judgment may describe procedural rules applicable when it was decided. Those rules must not be imported mechanically into a contemporary application. This report uses the case as a substantive point of reference; it does not substitute for examination of today's application procedure or the requirement to exhaust available domestic remedies.

14. Politically motivated use of financial information

The foreign origin of a request does not establish bad faith. Political conflict between countries likewise does not make every financial enquiry unlawful. Evidence of persecution, interference with institutions or disclosure of sensitive data may nevertheless require examination of a specific risk. A legal submission should connect those circumstances to the actual request, its purpose and the proposed recipient, rather than rely on a general description of the political environment.

FATF Recommendation 29 requires FIU independence and protection against improper influence. [1] This provides a basis for asking questions, not proof of a breach in every contested case. Relevant facts may include a mismatch with the stated investigation, reliance on allegations already disproved, demands concerning unrelated persons or indications that material will reach an institution unconnected with the declared task. The significance of each fact must be assessed in context.

A dossier should distinguish country conditions from the client's individual circumstances. A report about systemic problems provides context. A judgment concerning the applicant, a decision granting protection or a substantiated threat may demonstrate the individual connection. A politician's public statement may be relevant where it concerns the person and is consistent with subsequent conduct. Critical views of a government, however, do not replace analysis of the evidence and purpose of the financial request.

An asylum decision or refusal of extradition must be read for its actual grounds. It may concern risk of treatment, procedural quality or a particular allegation; it does not invariably establish that every financial assertion is false. The submission should explain which finding affects the proposed disclosure, such as exposure of the person's location, identification of relatives or a risk of use for a different purpose. This can support targeted conditions rather than an unsupported demand to prohibit all exchange.

The recipient should consider not only the sender's formal competence but also whether subsequent use can be adequately protected. A risk confined to a category of data may raise a question of exclusion or a supplementary condition. A problem affecting the purpose of the entire request calls for closer examination of its legal basis. The response should be connected to the established risk and the authority's domestic obligations.

Representatives should avoid giving false reassurance. Political context does not guarantee that a financial investigation will stop, and a dispute involving one institution does not extinguish the powers of others. The response should both address the facts concerning the funds and substantiate the risk of improper use. These strands can reinforce one another: a documented explanation of the transaction may strengthen the argument that the request is being pursued for a different purpose.

15. Correcting information after it has been shared

Correction at the original provider does not ensure that all derivative material is automatically updated. One recipient may retain the original communication, another may extract facts into its own database, and a third may incorporate a conclusion into a procedural document. Remediation should therefore be planned as a sequence involving several responsible actors, rather than as the acquisition of one reassuring letter.

The nature of the change comes first. A factual mistake requires correction of the inaccurate fact. A new event may require supplementation of a record that was accurate when created. An acquittal does not necessarily make it false that an investigation previously existed, but it materially changes the account of its outcome. The objective is not to rewrite history. It is to ensure that a current user sees the relevant developments and does not continue relying on an outdated conclusion.

The author's model notification identifies the disputed material, the exact correction, supporting document, effective date and requested review of conclusions previously disseminated. If the client does not know the international communication's reference, available case, transaction and personal identifiers may assist. Indiscriminate circulation of personal information to unknown recipients should be avoided. An attempt to correct excessive dissemination should not itself create another unnecessary distribution of data.

The next question is which recipients received the information and who has power to notify them. Direct applications by the customer to every foreign institution may be unavailable or ineffective. In some circumstances, correction needs to travel through the original authority. In others, a separate procedural application is necessary in the country where a measure remains in force. The choice depends on applicable law and what can be established about the dissemination chain.

Derivative decisions need their own analysis. A bank may have relied on several factors, so correction of one entry does not necessarily require reinstatement of the relationship. A restraint order may survive on another ground. The submission should show the role played by the inaccurate fact and why its correction calls for reconsideration. Without that causal explanation, a respondent may acknowledge the error while leaving the practical result unchanged.

Success has several components: correction of the source fact, notification of identifiable recipients, reassessment of dependent conclusions and review of the existing measure. Not every stage will be available to a single applicant. The result achieved and the uncertainty remaining should both be

recorded. A letter confirming that a review occurred must not be described as proof that no information exists anywhere in international systems.

16. Source of funds: preparing a substantive response

A response to financial suspicion should explain the particular sum, not merely the customer's general wealth. Ownership of a business or property, or a long history of income, does not automatically establish the origin of a specific transfer. A useful account provides a continuous chain: the entitlement to the money, the event generating it, receipt into an account and subsequent movement. Each step should be intelligible to someone who did not participate in the transaction.

For an asset sale, relevant material commonly includes ownership, the contract, performance, the price calculation and receipt through the banking system. For a loan, the reality of funding, repayment terms and the lender's capacity may matter. For dividends, the corporate decision, the recipient's entitlement and the connection to business results are useful. For services, the work, evidence of performance and the economic explanation for the price should be addressed. This is the author's preparation method, not a universal statutory checklist.

Discrepancies deserve particular attention. A difference between the contractual price and the amount received may reflect fees, partial payment, withholding tax or set-off. The explanation still needs support. Where documents contain different dates, distinguish signing, performance, value date and account credit. A small unexplained difference can undermine confidence in the whole dossier more than an openly identified complex issue for which the available evidence is carefully described.

The package should address adverse facts. An intermediary, third-party payment or related-party contract should not simply disappear from the narrative. Its basis and the relevant authority should be explained, with supporting records where available. Missing documentation should be identified together with a lawful means of filling the gap. Creating retrospective records or relabelling the transaction to suit the argument is unacceptable and can aggravate the risk rather than resolve it.

For large datasets, a concise explanation and an indexed set of exhibits are helpful. Each material proposition should point to a document and page. Repeated statements add little if the reader cannot see which movement of funds they establish. The summary must not replace the primary records; its purpose is to make verification easier while allowing every material calculation to be traced back to an original entry.

Finally, factual confirmation and legal assessment should remain distinct. An auditor may verify accounting treatment, a bank may confirm a transfer and a counterparty may confirm performance. None alone guarantees the absence of every AML concern. The strength of the dossier lies in consistent independent support and an accurate account of its limits. Such a package remains useful even if access to the original FIU communication cannot be obtained.

17. Choosing the recipient and defining the requested result

The proper recipient is determined by the power to change the situation, not by institutional prominence. If customer identifiers are wrong, the first recipient may be the organisation using them. If property is restrained by a court, a procedural route to review that order is required. If the issue is lawful processing, the oversight body's competence and the applicable access regime matter. The international exchange network does not combine those powers into a single remedy.

Object of the dispute	Question that matters in practice	Potential direction of action
Factual record	Which fact is inaccurate, and what proves it?	Correction by the responsible body; legally available processing review
Use of a communication	Do the recipient and purpose fall within the permitted scope?	Examination of provider restrictions and the user's legal basis
Delayed payment	Which ground presently prevents execution?	Banking complaint and, where necessary, the appropriate court procedure
Restraint of property	What measure was made, by whom and for what period?	Procedural challenge, variation of scope or conditions
Closed material	Which proposition cannot be answered without further information?	Application for permissible disclosure or another form of judicial scrutiny
Outdated assessment	Have users considered the new decision or document?	Updating the record and separately reviewing dependent decisions

The table does not assign universal jurisdiction across countries. It is intended to prevent substitution of one dispute for another. Before filing, check standing, any mandatory preliminary procedure, time limits, representation requirements and the remedy the body can grant. In particular, do not assume that acceptance of a complaint suspends the measure. Suspensive effect requires its own legal basis.

Parallel procedures may be appropriate in a cross-border case, but their factual content should be consistent. If the client states in one country that they did not control a company and in another that they acted on its behalf, the distinction should be explained through dates and the scope of authority. Unexplained contradictions may become an independent reason for concern. A common factual chronology helps reduce that risk across all representatives and translations.

The requested relief should be capable of implementation. A demand that the person be declared “clean” does not identify a legal act. Correction of a departure date, review of dissemination to a named authority or reconsideration of restraint over an identified account is much more precise. Where appropriate, principal and alternative outcomes can be formulated, such as discharge of the measure or restriction of its scope to an amount properly connected with the proceedings.

18. Organising work during the first weeks

The sequence proposed here is an author's working plan, not a set of legal deadlines. Any applicable procedural time limit takes priority. The initial tasks are to preserve records and establish the character of the restriction: a bank communication, an unexecuted instruction, a court order or a demand from an authority. Receipt dates, previous recipients of responses and available case references should be recorded. Oral explanations should, where possible, be confirmed in writing.

The next step is a common chronology and map of participants. It should include transactions, corporate changes, the start of enquiries, document submissions and new developments. Established events, facts reported by the client and hypotheses should remain separate. Mixing them makes later applications vulnerable. Where there is an urgent property risk, possible interim judicial protection should be considered immediately rather than postponed until the entire analytical dossier is complete.

The first substantive response should address the most important factual uncertainty while seeking permissible information about the current restriction. It need not recount the whole history of the business. An explanation of the disputed transaction, core supporting documents and a precise unresolved question will often be more useful. If the cause of the restriction is unknown, say so; do not invent an allegation that then becomes the focus of an unnecessary rebuttal.

After a response is received, assess whether the dispute has changed. The bank may identify missing documents, an authority may disclose a new basis, or a court may restrict access to part of the material. Strategy should then respond to what was actually said, rather than remain tied to the initial hypothesis. Resending the same large package without identifying a new fact rarely resolves the problem and makes it harder to track what has genuinely been considered.

Within the team, responsibility for a single document and deadline register is useful. Translators and foreign representatives should work from the same factual version. Every outgoing submission should be retained with its exact attachments and evidence of dispatch. This discipline can have evidential significance: it shows when an institution received corrective information and how long it continued to rely on an earlier assessment.

The initial phase should end with a concrete account of established grounds, unresolved gaps, applications made and the next decision required. If the source of an international communication remains unknown, that does not mean no progress has been achieved. The most valuable immediate result may be reconsideration of an existing restriction on independent evidence, while the fate of inaccurate information is pursued separately.

19. Six hypothetical practical scenarios

19.1. A namesake and an incorrect corporate association

A business owner learns that a foreign company's records associate their name with a former director of an entity involved in an investigation. The bank delays receipt of proceeds from a property sale and asks about the connection. International FIU exchange has not been established: the customer infers it from the questions asked. At this stage, the fact of a bank enquiry must already be separated from an assumption about its source.

The first task is identification. The customer supplies evidence of date of birth, residence history, professional activity and available registry information about the actual director. A separate source-of-funds chain is prepared for the property sale. The two packages answer different questions. Proof of mistaken identity does not automatically explain the transfer, and a lawful sale does not itself correct an erroneous association with the company.

The submission identifies the specific mismatch and asks the bank to reconsider the identification. If the restriction continues, the customer seeks a permissible explanation of which additional matters remain unresolved. Once use of inaccurate information is established, the appropriate correction procedure can be considered. Asking Egmont to delete an unidentified entry would be premature on these facts.

A successful outcome may be separation of the records and a fresh assessment of the payment. The bank may nevertheless continue enquiries on another ground. The correction document should describe the error resolved, not promise that no further questions can arise. The notification date, supporting evidence and response should be retained for any subsequent review.

19.2. Information is used for a different purpose

A foreign analytical note appears in domestic proceedings. The available covering letter indicates that it was supplied to examine a defined group of transfers. A different authority subsequently relies on it in a separate administrative case. The affected person's representatives do not possess any later authorisations and cannot confidently assert that none exists.

The application identifies the change in user and subject matter. It asks for examination of whether original or subsequent consent covers the new use and whether an independent domestic legal basis exists. Where possible, the exact passages supporting the adverse decision are identified. This makes it possible to assess whether the potential defect matters to the result instead of debating the entire exchange in the abstract.

The authority may establish that valid permission was given. The dispute then moves to accuracy and evidential sufficiency. If permission is missing or limited, the consequences depend on applicable law. Exclusion, a restriction on use, reconsideration or another remedy may become relevant, but none follows automatically from the foreign origin of the document.

The practical lesson is to examine two independent questions: whether the authority could lawfully use the information and whether it proves the conclusion drawn. Success on the first does not guarantee termination where independent evidence exists. Failure on the first does not remove the opportunity to challenge the content.

19.3. A French payment remains delayed beyond the expected period

A company instructs payment to a supplier and the bank reports that it cannot execute the transaction. Several weeks later, the customer continues invoking TRACFIN's ten-working-day period, although the opposition date and any subsequent decisions are unknown. That calculation does not establish the lawfulness or unlawfulness of the continuing delay.

The representative prepares a chronology of the instruction, notices and documents supplied. Clarification is sought, within permissible limits, of the present legal basis. In parallel, the contract, evidence of supply, supplier information and the economic need for payment are assembled. If a

judicial measure exists, the response must engage the relevant procedure. If no formal measure has been established, the bank's own conduct requires examination.

Urgency is supported by specific circumstances: an approaching contractual deadline, a risk of production stopping or obligations to independent employees. These facts do not override a lawful measure, but they may matter to its scope, conditions or an interim decision. A general statement that the restriction inconveniences the business is less informative.

A partial result is possible, such as permission for a specified act or variation of the amount affected while enquiries continue. The outcome is assessed against the ground actually in force. Expiry of an initial period and removal of every later restriction are separate events and should remain separate in correspondence and court documents.

19.4. DAML is mistaken for exoneration in the United Kingdom

A customer learns that DAML is available for a particular act and asks the bank to resume all services immediately. The bank maintains its decision to terminate the relationship and seeks documents about other receipts. The customer sees a contradiction because they mistakenly understand DAML as confirmation that their entire wealth is lawful.

The assessment begins with the scope of the particular act. The banking contract, other transactions and any external restrictions are then considered separately. If the bank relies on a factual error, a correction package is submitted. If closure of the account is disputed, the relevant remedy is selected instead of repeating a demand to extend DAML to an undefined set of future activities.

A receipt register with sources and exhibits may assist. One examined transaction does not explain all the others. Equally, questions about one sum do not relieve the bank of its applicable obligations. The application may be narrowed to return of an identified balance or execution of a particular instruction where that reflects the customer's legal position.

The result is a clear separation between a completed procedure and the remaining dispute. This avoids spending time on a demand based on an incorrect legal effect and directs the evidence towards a decision that can actually change.

19.5. Legal advice is included in a general document package

A company sends transaction documents to its bank, attaching an internal folder containing both the contract and counsel's opinion on defence strategy in a related dispute. A question later arises about transmission to authorities. Accidental inclusion does not determine in advance whether privilege survives; that depends on the applicable law and circumstances of disclosure.

The immediate task is to establish exactly what was sent and the known recipients. The original email and attachments should be preserved rather than the correspondence history altered. The protected character of the advice, the authority of the sender and available measures against further use are then assessed. Where the law provides a procedure, independent review of the disputed document is requested.

The contract and banking records should not automatically be claimed as privileged together with the opinion. The submission should isolate the protected material and explain its function. The legal effect of disclosure already made is distinct from a request to restrict further dissemination.

Precision improves the prospect of substantive consideration and reduces the risk of rejection of an overbroad claim.

To prevent recurrence, outgoing packages are checked and factual exhibits kept separate from legal advice. This is organisation of lawful representation, not a means of concealing primary records that must be produced under a valid legal requirement.

19.6. An outdated assessment survives closure of proceedings

Proceedings in one country are closed after the customer had been identified as a suspected organiser of transactions. In another country, the bank continues asking questions based on earlier public information. Whether FIUs exchanged information is unknown. The customer asks for every mention of the investigation to be deleted, regarding all such references as now false.

The grounds for closure must first be examined. The decision may establish non-involvement, insufficient evidence, a procedural obstacle or another outcome. These cannot all be described as complete exoneration. The operative result, legal effect and status of the decision are accurately summarised, with a translation and confirmation of finality where necessary.

The bank is asked to update its assessment. If an identifiable government record is inaccurate, a separate correction route is considered. A historically accurate statement that an investigation existed may remain, while reliance on it as proof of a current allegation requires reconsideration. For derivative decisions, the submission explains why the new outcome changes the particular conclusion on which they depend.

Success may consist of supplementing the record and removing a specific restriction, rather than erasing the entire history. That outcome should be described honestly. Retention of an archival fact and continuation of an adverse assessment are different questions requiring different arguments.

20. Quality control and management of error

The quality of financial intelligence cannot be measured solely by the number of communications sent. Extensive exchange may coexist with repeated circulation of untested assertions. A more informative assessment would also consider identification accuracy, the proportion of substantive responses, prompt correction and whether recipients can understand the limits of the information supplied. These are proposed indicators, not a claim that every FIU already operates such a reporting system.

The first control point precedes dispatch. An analyst should distinguish established facts from hypotheses, verify key identifiers and record the information's currency. At receipt, the authority should assess what the communication actually supports and what remains uncertain. Before further use, the purpose, recipient and restrictions require attention. When new facts emerge, the need to update conclusions already shared should be considered. Each stage addresses a different opportunity for error.

Circular corroboration deserves particular attention. One publication may enter a bank report, then an analytical note, and return to another institution as information from a foreign authority. There are now several documents, but the underlying assertion still has one source. Reliability requires examination of source independence rather than counting the number of records repeating the same

language. An official intermediary does not, merely by repeating an allegation, supply independent confirmation of it.

Automated matching can present a similar problem. A shared address, device or counterparty may be a useful signal, but its meaning depends on context. Common infrastructure provided by a service business does not necessarily establish common control. For decisions with substantial consequences, an intelligible explanation should be retained of the connection identified and its relevance. A technical score should not silently become a legal characterisation.

Management review should include completed matters in which the initial hypothesis was not substantiated. These cases reveal whether records are updated and obsolete conclusions cease to be used. Reviewing only successful investigations produces a one-sided picture. Correction should be treated as an ordinary system function rather than an exceptional admission that the institution as a whole has failed.

Internal controls should make it possible to reconstruct access, dissemination, the permission in force and receipt of later clarification. This supports both rights protection and investigative reliability. If the provenance and permitted use of material cannot be traced, the authority may struggle to justify relying on it even when its substantive content is accurate.

21. Proposals for improving practice

Observatoire ARGAs proposes improving the verifiability of exchange while preserving information whose disclosure could harm a lawful investigation. The first proposal is consistent identification of the status of assertions. A communication should distinguish documentary fact, third-party information and analytical hypothesis. This need not disclose a protected source, but it helps subsequent users avoid conclusions more categorical than the material warrants.

The second proposal concerns clarity about permitted use. A structured account of authorised recipients, purposes and any need for additional approval is preferable to ambiguous handling language. Its content must comply with applicable law. Better clarity reduces both improper dissemination and unnecessary delay caused by uncertainty over conditions of legitimate cooperation.

The third proposal is an updating procedure. Where source information is materially corrected, earlier dissemination should be reviewed alongside the authority's own record. It should be possible to establish which recipients received clarification and what prevented notification of any others. This does not mean that an applicant must always be given the complete network of exchanges. It means that a competent reviewing body should be able to assess the steps actually taken.

The fourth proposal is an accessible means of raising an alleged error. It may involve independent scrutiny without confirming to the applicant that a particular operational record exists. The response should nevertheless reflect the real scope of the review. A formal letter should not substitute for substantive examination. The precise model depends on domestic law and legitimate requirements of confidentiality.

The fifth proposal concerns third parties. Before a large dataset is distributed, the relevance of information about all included persons should be considered. Unrelated transactions may call for a narrower scope, separate attachments or another lawful form of minimisation. This also improves

analysis: unnecessary information not only affects rights but makes significant connections harder to identify.

Finally, public reporting could provide more anonymised information about data quality, categories of error, correction and independent oversight. Publication of successful cases is useful, but it does not show how the system responds when a hypothesis fails. Confidence in financial intelligence is strengthened when effective cooperation is accompanied by a demonstrated capacity to revise its conclusions.

22. Conclusion

International financial exchange is essential to understanding transactions that cannot be assessed within one jurisdiction. Its strength lies in combining dispersed information; its vulnerability lies in spreading mistaken identity, incomplete analysis or a conclusion detached from its original qualifications. A reliable system must therefore preserve not only the message, but also its provenance, purpose and limits.

For the affected person, the most useful strategy is specific. It starts by identifying the current measure and the competent decision maker, then connects a concrete objection with supporting documents and an achievable remedy. Access to the initial communication may remain limited. That does not prevent work on independent evidence, permitted use, identification errors or review of a derivative decision.

For authorities, good exchange means being able to explain which facts are established, which remain hypotheses and why the proposed action is justified. Confidentiality and international trust do not remove that need; they shape the form of the explanation and who can receive it. A clear structure also makes legitimate investigations more resilient to well-founded procedural objections.

The practical standard proposed here combines five tasks: accurate identification, a justified request, controlled use, verifiable evidence and timely correction. None replaces the others. Together, they preserve the operational value of financial intelligence while reducing the risk that a preliminary suspicion becomes a lasting restriction without a sufficient basis.

Sources and references

- [1] FATF. International Standards on Combating Money Laundering and the Financing of Terrorism & Proliferation. Recommendations 29 and 40 and their Interpretive Notes; consolidated text 2012-2025. <https://www.fatf-gafi.org/content/dam/fatf-gafi/recommendations/FATF%20Recommendations%202012.pdf>
- [2] FATF, Egmont Group, INTERPOL, UNODC. International Co-operation on Money Laundering Detection, Investigation and Prosecution. 2025; sections on operational networks, governance and information use. <https://egmontgroup.org/wp-content/uploads/2025/09/International-Cooperation-ML-Detection-Investigation-Prosecution-1.pdf>
- [3] Egmont Group. Principles for Information Exchange between Financial Intelligence Units. Approved July 2025; introduction and principles 20, 25, 32 and 38. <https://egmontgroup.org/wp-content/uploads/2022/07/EG-Principles-for-Information-Exchange-Revised-July-2025.pdf>
- [4] Egmont Group. Operational Guidance for FIU Activities and the Exchange of Information. Revised May 2024; status of the guidance and operational cooperation. <https://egmontgroup.org/wp-content/uploads/2013/07/EGMONT-Group-Operational-Guidance-for-FIU-Activities-and-the-Exchange-of-Information-%E2%80%93-Revised-May-2024.pdf>

- [5] Egmont Group. Best Egmont Cases: Financial Analysis Cases 2021-2023. Case 13, Italy UIF and Hungary FIU, printed pages 55-58. An operational case study, not a judicial decision.
https://egmontgroup.org/wp-content/uploads/2024/09/EGMONT_2021-2023-BECA-III_FINAL.pdf
- [6] European Union. Directive (EU) 2015/849, Article 55. Onward dissemination and use for additional purposes; read together with applicable national implementing law.
<https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/?uri=CELEX:32015L0849>
- [7] France. Code monétaire et financier, Article L561-29. International exchange, safeguards and control of dissemination; statutory text available in Title VI.
https://www.legifrance.gouv.fr/codes/section_lc/LEGITEXT000006072026/LEGISCTA000006140135/
- [8] France. Code monétaire et financier, Article L561-24. Version in force since 15 June 2025; opposition to a transaction and judicial measures. https://www.legifrance.gouv.fr/codes/article_lc/LEGIARTI000051752340
- [9] TRACFIN. FAQ. Official explanation concerning access requests for personal information potentially held by TRACFIN: referral to CNIL. Other procedural details must be checked against the current Code.
<https://www.economie.gouv.fr/tracfin/faq>
- [10] National Crime Agency. UKFIU SARs Best Practice, Chapter 3: Understanding DAMLs and DATFs. December 2025, version 1.1. Nature of a defence, notice period and moratorium period. <https://www.nationalcrimeagency.gov.uk/who-we-are/publications/776-ukfiu-chapter-3-understanding-daml-and-datfs/file>
- [11] FinCEN. Sharing Suspicious Activity Reports by Depository Institutions with Certain U.S. Affiliates. 2010; distinction between protected SAR material and underlying facts, transactions and documents. <https://www.fincen.gov/resources/statutes-regulations/guidance/sharing-suspicious-activity-reports-depository-institutions>
- [12] FinCEN and federal banking agencies. Joint Statement on Suspicious Activity Report Confidentiality Considerations Regarding Communications with Customers. 2 September 2026.
<https://www.fincen.gov/system/files/2026-09/Joint-Statement-on-SAR-Confidentiality.pdf>
- [13] FinCEN. Suspicious Activity Report Supporting Documentation. Guidance concerning records supporting a SAR and provision to authorised authorities. <https://www.fincen.gov/resources/statutes-regulations/guidance/suspicious-activity-report-supporting-documentation>
- [14] European Union. Directive (EU) 2024/1640. National AML mechanisms and FIU framework; phased transposition and transitional provisions. EUR-Lex official summary.
<https://eur-lex.europa.eu/summary/EN/4776462>
- [15] European Union. Regulation (EU) 2024/1624. Article 90: general application from 10 July 2027, with specified exceptions. <https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/?uri=CELEX:32024R1624>
- [16] AMLA. Single Programming Document 2026-2028. Page 63, DID-2: preparation for transfer of FIU.net management by July 2027. https://www.aml.europa.eu/document/download/27549516-d110-4e91-b1ed-d3552b8f9661_en?filename=AML+SPD+2026-2028.pdf
- [17] European Union. Directive (EU) 2019/1153. Use of financial information by competent authorities and cooperation with FIUs, including national procedural safeguards.
<https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/?uri=CELEX:32019L1153>
- [18] Court of Justice. *Ordre des barreaux francophones et germanophone and Others*, C-305/05. Judgment of 26 June 2007, ECLI:EU:C:2007:383; reporting obligations, professional secrecy and the right to a fair trial.
<https://curia.europa.eu/juris/document/document.jsf?docid=61675&doclang=EN>
- [19] European Court of Human Rights. *Michaud v. France*, no. 12323/11. Judgment of 6 December 2012, especially paragraphs 123-132 and the operative provisions: no violation of Article 8.
<https://hudoc.echr.coe.int/eng?i=001-115377>
- [20] European Court of Human Rights. *M.N. and Others v. San Marino*, no. 28005/12. Judgment of 7 July 2015. Registry press release ECHR 238 (2015): Article 8 violation in respect of M.N.; other applicants inadmissible. <https://hudoc.echr.coe.int/app/conversion/pdf/?library=ECHR&id=003-5127469-6327387&filename=003-5127469-6327387.pdf>