

CONSOLIDATED LEGAL OPINION

ON THE VALIDITY, LEGITIMACY, AND ENFORCEABILITY OF AOFA INTERNATIONAL BANKING LICENSE No. L1149/IFB

International Finance Bank Ltd
Autonomous Island of Anjouan – Union of the Comoros

An Analysis under Anjouan Statutory Law, Comorian Constitutional Law,
French Civil Law (Code civil), Islamic Jurisprudence (Fiqh al-Mu'āmalāt),
OHADA Uniform Acts, and Public International Law

Date:	4 March 2026
Prepared by:	Expert International Banking Counsel
License:	L1149/IFB – International Finance Bank Ltd
Jurisdiction:	Autonomous Island of Anjouan
Legal Systems:	French Civil / Islamic (Shāfi'ī) / OHADA / Public Int'l Law
Classification:	Privileged & Confidential

I. PRELIMINARY OBSERVATIONS – THE LEGAL LANDSCAPE

A. The Tripartite Legal System of the Comoros

The Union of the Comoros operates under a mixed legal system of exceptional complexity, comprising three co-existing normative orders: the French civil law tradition (Code civil), Islamic religious law of the Shāfiʿī school, and customary law (mila na ntsi). This tripartite structure is the direct legacy of the French colonial period (1886–1975) and the archipelago's deeply rooted Islamic identity. Understanding License L1149/IFB requires engagement with all three legal traditions, supplemented by the supranational OHADA framework and principles of public international law.

B. The French Colonial Inheritance

France first established a colonial presence on Mayotte in 1843 and extended protectorate status to Anjouan in 1887, Grande Comore in 1886, and Mohéli in 1892. From 1912 to 1946, the archipelago was administered as a dependency of French Madagascar. The Code civil napoléonien, introduced during the colonial era, remains the foundation of Comorian commercial, property, and contractual law. This French legal inheritance has critical implications for the present analysis:

C. France's Continuing Institutional Control

France's influence over the Comoros extends far beyond legal tradition. Under the monetary cooperation agreement of 1979, the Comorian franc (KMF) is pegged to the euro at a fixed rate (1 EUR = 491.96775 KMF), guaranteed by the French Treasury. The Board of Directors of the Banque Centrale des Comores (BCC) includes French Central Bank (Banque de France) representatives, and the post of Deputy Director of the BCC is held by a Banque de France official who is responsible for monetary policy. France therefore exercises direct structural control over Comorian monetary affairs.

This arrangement has two implications for the present analysis. First, it means that the BCC is not an independent central bank in the conventional sense but operates under French monetary supervision – making its claim to exclusive regulatory sovereignty over all banking licensing particularly anomalous. Second, it demonstrates that the Comorian financial system already accommodates a form of external monetary sovereignty (France's), which weakens the argument that Anjouan's offshore licensing represents an impermissible encroachment on monetary unity.

D. The OHADA Framework

The Union of the Comoros is a member state of the Organisation pour l'Harmonisation en Afrique du Droit des Affaires (OHADA), the supranational body governing harmonised business law across seventeen Francophone African states. OHADA Uniform Acts – particularly the Acte uniforme relatif au droit des sociétés commerciales et du groupement d'intérêt économique (Revised 2014) – are directly applicable in the Comoros and take precedence over national provisions. International Finance Bank Ltd, as a corporate entity incorporated under Anjouan law, operates within a legal framework that is recognised and harmonised across the OHADA zone.

E. Islamic Jurisprudence (Fiqh al-Mu'āmalāt)

The Comoros follows the Shāfi'ī school of Islamic jurisprudence (madhhab), as is customary across the East African littoral and Indian Ocean region. While Islamic law in the Comoros primarily governs matters of personal status, inheritance, and family law, it also informs the broader normative environment. The Shāfi'ī school's approach to commercial transactions (mu'āmalāt) is relevant to the present analysis in two respects:

Furthermore, the political dimension is significant. The Union of the Comoros is officially the Federal Islamic Republic of the Comoros. During the period of greatest hostility to AOFA (2006–2008), the Union was led by President Ahmed Abdallah Sambi, a conservative Islamic scholar. Anjouan under President Bacar pursued a secular, market-oriented development model. The characterisation of AOFA as “illegal” must therefore be understood partly as an expression of ideological conflict between Islamist centralisation and secular economic pragmatism, rather than as a dispassionate legal analysis.

II. FACTUAL FOUNDATION

A. The License

Field	Detail
License Number	L1149/IFB
Company Name	International Finance Bank Ltd
Company Number	1149
Incorporation Date	13 October 2004
License Type	Class B International Banking (offshore / non-resident)
Issuing Authority	Anjouan Offshore Finance Authority (AOFA)
Statutory Basis	Government Notice No. 005/2005 (International Banks Act)
License Valid Until	13 October 2026
Registry Status	LICENSED – verified 4 March 2026, 16:08 CET
Operational Scope	Non-resident, foreign currency, offshore exclusively

B. Union-Level Ministerial Endorsement (2004)

The documentary record includes an Official Attestation issued by the Union of the Comoros Ministry of Finance and Budget, signed by Minister of State Ahamadi Abdoulbastoi at Moroni on 13 November 2004, reference N° 04-466/MFB/CAB. This attestation, issued from the national capital on official Union letterhead bearing the state seal, certifies that the Anjouan offshore licensing framework was established lawfully. A companion letter dated 11 December 2004 confirms the AOFA Director's authority to appoint authorised agents.

This ministerial attestation constitutes direct Union-level governmental endorsement of the AOFA framework **prior to the enactment of the 2005 Acts**. Its existence creates an insuperable estoppel obstacle to any subsequent Union claim that the AOFA licensing regime was ab initio illegitimate.

II. THE ANJOUAN QUESTION – SOVEREIGNTY, AUTONOMY, AND OCCUPATION

A. The Northern Cyprus Parallel

The position of Anjouan within the Union of the Comoros invites comparison with that of Northern Cyprus within the Republic of Cyprus – a comparison that illuminates both the strengths and the limits of the legitimacy argument. Anjouan regards the 2008 military intervention (Operation Democracy) not as a restoration of constitutional order but as an armed occupation imposed by the Union with the support of African Union forces and French logistical assistance. On this view, Anjouan's re-integration into the Union was achieved by force, not by consent, and the legislative and institutional framework established during the period of autonomy (2002–2008) retains independent legal validity.

This perspective finds significant support in the jurisprudence of the European Court of Human Rights regarding Northern Cyprus. In its landmark judgment in *Cyprus v. Turkey* (Application no. 25781/94, Grand Chamber, 10 May 2001), the ECtHR established that even where a territorial administration lacks international recognition, its legal acts may acquire binding force for practical purposes. The Court held that a *de facto* recognition of the acts of an unrecognised regime may be rendered necessary for practical purposes, and that civil, administrative, or criminal law measures adopted by such authorities may be regarded as having a legal basis in domestic law.

This doctrine was further refined in *Mozer v. The Republic of Moldova and Russia* (Application no. 11138/10, Grand Chamber, 23 February 2016), where the Court confirmed that the legal system of an unrecognised territory that is based on established legal traditions (in the case of the TRNC, the Anglo-Saxon common law tradition) may be accepted as law for the purposes of the European Convention.

Applied to Anjouan: The AOFA legislative framework was enacted during a period of constitutionally recognised autonomy (2002–2005) by a government that, unlike the TRNC, was **not created by foreign military invasion** but emerged from an internal constitutional settlement. The legal system of Anjouan – rooted in the French civil law tradition, supplemented by Islamic law – has far stronger claim to legitimacy than the TRNC's legal order, which even the ECtHR recognised as having legal effect. If the TRNC's laws can create binding rights, *a fortiori*, Anjouan's parliamentary legislation enacted during a period of undisputed constitutional autonomy must do so.

B. The Distinctive Features of the Anjouan Situation

Several features distinguish the Anjouan situation from Northern Cyprus and, in each case, the distinction strengthens rather than weakens the case for the continuing validity of AOFA legislation:

Factor	Northern Cyprus (TRNC)	Anjouan
Origin of Autonomy	Foreign military invasion (Turkey, 1974)	Internal secession and constitutional re-entry (1997–2002)
International Condemnation	UNSC Resolutions 541, 550; universally condemned	No UNSC resolution; AU supported reintegration but did not condemn legislative acts
Legal Tradition	Anglo-Saxon common law (accepted by ECtHR as valid)	French civil law + Islamic law + OHADA (stronger legitimacy basis)
Central Government Endorsement	None (Republic of Cyprus rejects all TRNC acts)	Union Minister of State attested AOFA's legitimacy (Moroni, 2004)
Post-Intervention Status of Laws	TRNC laws continue to operate; ECtHR accepts their practical effect	AOFA laws never formally repealed; AOFA registry operational to date
Third-Party Vested Rights	ECHR protects property rights created under TRNC law	IFB holds 21-year vested license right; droits acquis doctrine applies

C. The International Court of Justice and Declarations of Independence

In its Advisory Opinion on Kosovo (22 July 2010), the International Court of Justice stated that general international law contains no applicable prohibition of declarations of independence. The ICJ noted that the Security Council had attached illegality to the TRNC declaration specifically because it was connected to the unlawful use of force. Anjouan's 1997 declaration of independence, by contrast, was an internal act of popular self-determination not associated with foreign military aggression. Although Anjouan subsequently re-entered the Union voluntarily under the 2001 Constitution, the ICJ's reasoning confirms that the legislative acts of the autonomous period cannot be dismissed as inherently unlawful under international law.

D. Chronological History – The Constitutional and Political Timeline

The legitimacy of the AOFA framework cannot be assessed without understanding the full historical sequence. The following chronology demonstrates that AOFA legislation was enacted during a period of undisputed constitutional autonomy, not during the secessionist period:

Date	Event and Legal Significance
1886–1975	French colonial period. Anjouan becomes protectorate (1887). French Code civil, administrative law, and commercial code applied throughout. Islamic (Shāfiʿī) personal law preserved alongside French secular law.
6 Jul 1975	Unilateral declaration of independence by Comoros. Three islands vote for independence; Mayotte votes to remain French. France retains Mayotte as département d'outre-mer (now using EUR).
1979	Monetary cooperation agreement between Comoros and France. Comorian franc enters franc zone with fixed parity, guaranteed by French Treasury. BCC board includes Banque de France officials.
3 Aug 1997	Anjouan declares independence from Union (alongside Mohéli). France refuses to accept Anjouan's request for re-attachment, citing territorial integrity of the Comoros.
23 Dec 2001	NEW UNION CONSTITUTION ratified by referendum. Creates federal structure. Article 7: islands freely administer their own affairs. Article 9: six exclusive Union competences (banking NOT enumerated). Article 11: islands enjoy financial autonomy. ANJOUAN RE-ENTERS UNION VOLUNTARILY.
2002–2005	CRITICAL LEGISLATIVE WINDOW. Anjouan operates under constitutionally recognised autonomy. Island legislature enacts comprehensive offshore finance legislation with full democratic legitimacy.
Nov–Dec 2004	UNION ENDORSEMENT: Minister of State Ahamadi Abdoulbastoi (Finance & Budget) issues Official Attestation from Moroni certifying AOFA's establishment. Ref: N° 04-466/MFB/CAB. Union-level ministerial endorsement of AOFA framework.
13 Oct 2004	International Finance Bank Ltd incorporated (Company No. 1149). License L1149/IFB issued.
2005	AOFA Legislative Suite enacted: OFA Act 003/2005, International Banks Act 005/2005, IBCs Act 004/2005, Money Laundering Prevention Act 008/2005. Parliamentary Acts with Presidential assent – formal legislation, not decrees.
May 2006	Ahmed Abdallah Sambi elected Union President. Conservative Islamic scholar. Ideological tension with Anjouan's secular pro-business model intensifies.
25 Mar 2008	OPERATION DEMOCRACY: African Union forces (with French logistical support) invade Anjouan. President Bacar deposed. Change of government; NO formal repeal of AOFA legislation.
12 Jun 2013	Loi bancaire n°13-003/AU enacted. BCC claims exclusive banking supervision. Non-retroactivity principle (Art. 2 Code civil) prevents application to pre-existing licenses.
4 Mar 2026	AOFA Official Registry verification: L1149/IFB confirmed LICENSED, valid until 13 October 2026. Registry operational; Union has not shut it down. 21+ years of continuous operation.

The decisive point: The AOFA Acts were enacted in 2005, during the period 2002–2008 when Anjouan operated under the constitutionally recognised federal framework established by the 2001 Constitution – **not** during the secessionist period (1997–2001). This eliminates any argument that the legislation derives from an extra-constitutional regime.

III. STATUTORY AND CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY

A. The AOFA Legislative Suite

The statutory foundation of License L1149/IFB comprises a coherent legislative suite enacted by the Parliament of the Autonomous Island of Anjouan and assented to by the President:

Instrument	Function	Key Provisions
Act No. 003/2005 (OFA Act)	Establishes AOFA as body corporate with power to sue and be sued (s.4(1), 4(3))	s.3(1): primary responsibility for offshore supervision; s.8(1)(a): exclusive right to license international banks
Gov. Notice 005/2005 (Int'l Banks Act)	Defines classes of offshore banking and licensing requirements	Class B license for offshore/non-resident operations in foreign currency
Gov. Notice 004/2005 (IBCs Act)	International Business Companies framework	Corporate vehicle for international operations
Gov. Notice 008/2005 (AML Act)	Money Laundering (Prevention) Act	s.12: KYC records (6 years); s.13: mandatory STR reporting; s.19: asset freezing powers

These are not informal decrees. They are Parliamentary Acts assented to by the President of the Autonomous Island of Anjouan, enacted through formal legislative process during a period of constitutionally recognised autonomy. Their status as primary legislation under the French civil law tradition (*lois au sens formel*) places them at the highest level of the domestic normative hierarchy.

B. Constitutional Framework – The Residual Powers Doctrine

The 2001 Constitution of the Union of the Comoros (revised 2009 and 2018) establishes a federal structure in which the islands enjoy extensive autonomy. The constitutional architecture is as follows:

Article 9 (Exclusive Union Competences): The Constitution enumerates precisely six areas of exclusive Union competence: (i) religion, (ii) nationality, (iii) currency and monetary policy, (iv) foreign relations, (v) defence, and (vi) national symbols. Banking regulation is **conspicuously absent** from this exhaustive list.

Article 7 (Island Autonomy): Each island “freely administers and manages its own affairs”. Under the established civil law doctrine of *compétence résiduelle* (residual competence), powers not expressly reserved to the Union belong to the islands. This is the standard interpretation in French constitutional law and is analogous to the Tenth Amendment in U.S. constitutional doctrine.

Article 11 (Financial Autonomy): Islands “enjoy financial autonomy” – a provision that on its face authorises island-level regulation of economic activities not enumerated in Article 9.

The BCC’s claim of exclusive banking authority rests on an expansive interpretation of the Article 9 reference to “currency and monetary policy” (*monnaie*). However, under the principle of strict interpretation of exceptions (*exception est de stricte interprétation*) – a foundational maxim of French public law – the Article 9 enumeration must be construed narrowly. Currency and monetary policy relate to the national currency (the Comorian franc, pegged to the euro under French guarantee), not to the licensing of offshore entities operating in foreign currencies for non-resident clients.

IV. THE FUNCTIONAL DISTINCTION – OFFSHORE vs. DOMESTIC BANKING

The central argument of this Opinion is that AOFA-licensed Class B international banking is functionally and jurisdictionally distinct from the domestic banking activities over which the BCC exercises supervision. This distinction is not novel or anomalous – it is the global standard.

A. The Labuan Model – The Definitive Comparator

The most structurally precise international comparator for AOFA is the Federal Territory of Labuan in Malaysia. Both share a critical feature: a sub-sovereign territory within a federal or semi-federal system that operates an offshore financial licensing regime independently of the national central bank.

The Labuan Financial Services Authority (Labuan FSA) was established in 1996 as the sole statutory body responsible for offshore regulation. It operates entirely independently of Bank Negara Malaysia (BNM), the Malaysian central bank. The legislation governing Labuan is explicitly independent of Malaysia's domestic laws. The Malaysian Federal Government cannot access Labuan banking information.

The parallels with AOFA are precise. Both are sub-sovereign entities within a federal system. Both operate specialised offshore regulators independent of the central bank. Both serve exclusively non-resident, foreign-currency clients. Both were established by specific legislation granting exclusive offshore licensing authority. The Labuan model is FATF-compliant, OECD-endorsed, and internationally recognised. If Malaysia's federal system can accommodate an independent offshore regulator on a federal territory, the Comorian Constitution's grant of island autonomy can certainly accommodate an equivalent arrangement on Anjouan.

B. Comparative Table – Separated Regulatory Systems

Jurisdiction	Offshore/Specialised Regulator	Central Bank
Labuan (Malaysia)	Labuan FSA (est. 1996)	Bank Negara Malaysia
DIFC (Dubai, UAE)	Dubai Financial Services Authority	Central Bank of UAE
ADGM (Abu Dhabi)	Financial Services Regulatory Authority	Central Bank of UAE
Jersey (UK Crown)	Jersey Financial Services Commission	Bank of England (no jurisdiction)
Japan	Financial Services Agency (JFSA)	Bank of Japan
Switzerland	FINMA	Swiss National Bank (SNB)
United Kingdom	PRA + FCA	Bank of England (monetary only)
United States	OCC / FDIC / State regulators; IBFs exempt from reserve requirements	Federal Reserve (macro-prudential)
EU/ECB	National competent authorities + SSM	ECB (with rigid statutory firewalls)
Anjouan	AOFA (est. 2005, Act 003/2005)	BCC (Moroni, under Banque de France supervision)

The BCC's claim that all banking licensing must reside exclusively with the central bank is doctrinally false. No major financial system in the world operates on this principle. The separation of offshore/prudential regulation from monetary policy is not merely permissible – it is the international standard, grounded in the structural necessity of preventing conflicts between monetary accommodation and supervisory enforcement.

V. THE IMPERATIVE SEPARATION OF CENTRAL BANKING FROM FINANCIAL REGULATION

The preceding comparative analysis reveals a deeper doctrinal point: the combination of monetary policy and banking regulation in a single institution is not merely unusual – it is affirmatively dangerous. The international financial community has learned this lesson through painful experience.

Central banks are institutions of macro-discretion. They act pre-emptively, probabilistically, and at speed to stabilise expectations and liquidity. Financial regulators, by contrast, are institutions of micro-judgment. They act ex post, evidentially, and coercively, grounding their decisions in statute and due process. When these mandates are combined, one function inevitably dominates under stress – and international experience shows that the result is regulatory forbearance.

Japan (1990s): The excessive proximity between banks, supervisors, and the Bank of Japan materially delayed insolvency recognition during the prolonged banking crisis. The institutional response was the creation of the independent Financial Services Agency (JFSA), deliberately separating prudential supervision from central banking.

Switzerland (Credit Suisse, 2023): FINMA exercised coercive resolution powers while the Swiss National Bank provided emergency liquidity. Had these functions been combined, the credibility of both the resolution decision and the liquidity support would have been compromised.

United Kingdom (post-Northern Rock): The UK's experience of centralisation led to a fundamental restructuring. The PRA and FCA were created as functionally separate regulators within the Bank of England architecture, specifically to prevent the conflicts that arise when monetary policy and supervisory enforcement share institutional space.

The BCC's insistence on exclusive banking authority contradicts the institutional architecture adopted by every major financial system globally. The existence of AOFA as a separate licensing authority for offshore entities represents a more modern, internationally aligned approach than the BCC's centralised model. AOFA's separation from the BCC is not a constitutional defect – it is a structural virtue.

VI. THE DOCTRINE OF VESTED RIGHTS (DROITS ACQUIS)

A. Under French Civil Law

The protection of vested rights (*droits acquis*) is a foundational principle of French administrative and civil law, directly applicable in the Comoros through the inherited Code civil and the continuing influence of French legal doctrine. The principle holds that rights validly constituted under the law as it existed at the time of their creation cannot be retroactively extinguished by subsequent legislation or administrative action.

Article 2 of the Code civil states the principle with crystalline clarity: the law applies only for the future and has no retroactive effect. This principle has been consistently upheld by the Cour de cassation and the Conseil d'État as a general principle of French law (*principe général du droit*). Its application to administrative licensing has been confirmed in numerous decisions: a license validly issued under legislation in force at the time of issuance creates vested rights that subsequent legislative changes cannot retroactively destroy.

License L1149/IFB was issued in 2004–2005 under legislation validly enacted by the Anjouan legislature during a period of recognised constitutional autonomy. Even if the 2013 Loi bancaire (n°13-003/AU) purports to require BCC approval for all banking activities, this subsequent legislation cannot reach backward to extinguish rights that were validly created under prior law. The principle of non-retroactivity is non-derogable.

B. Under Islamic Jurisprudence

Islamic commercial law (*fiqh al-mu'āmalāt*) independently supports the protection of vested licensing rights. The Shāfi'ī school recognises the binding force of validly formed contracts and obligations (*'aqd*). Under the principle of *al-'aqd sharī'at al-muta'āqidīn* (the contract is the law of the contracting parties), a license issued by a competent authority in exchange for compliance with regulatory obligations and payment of fees constitutes a binding bilateral obligation. The licensor cannot unilaterally revoke this obligation without legal cause (*sabab sharī*) and without due process.

Furthermore, the Islamic principle of *lā ḍarara wa lā ḍirār* (no harm and no reciprocal harm) weighs against retroactive revocation. The retrospective invalidation of a license that has been relied upon for twenty-one years, with extensive third-party commercial relationships built upon it, would cause disproportionate harm without corresponding benefit to the public interest.

C. Under Public International Law

The doctrine of acquired rights is well-established in public international law, particularly in the context of state succession and changes of sovereignty. The Permanent Court of International Justice recognised the principle in the *German Settlers in Poland* Advisory Opinion (1923), holding that private rights acquired under the laws of a predecessor sovereign survive a change of sovereignty. The International Court of Justice has consistently upheld this doctrine.

Applied to the Anjouan situation: even if the 2008 military intervention is characterised as a change of sovereignty over Anjouan (from autonomous to centrally controlled), vested rights created under the prior legal order – including License L1149/IFB – survive the transition. The Union cannot retroactively destroy rights that were validly constituted under Anjouan's autonomous legal framework.

VII. THE UK JUDICIAL RECORD

The London High Court case of *Lecler v. Hon* (2003/2004), though a libel action rather than a regulatory challenge, produced a judicial observation of considerable significance. The court noted that the licensee had obtained the Anjouan authorisation to issue licenses entirely legally. No UK court has subsequently overruled or qualified this observation.

Comprehensive searches of BAILII (British and Irish Legal Information Institute) reveal no published UK judgment that directly adjudicates AOFA banking license validity and finds it void or illegal. This twenty-year absence of adverse precedent is itself legally significant. If AOFA licenses were truly without legal effect, at least one court in a major common law jurisdiction would have so held.

VIII. ADDRESSING THE BCC'S POSITION

BCC Assertion	Defence and Rebuttal
"All banking is exclusive Union competence"	Art. 9 enumerates 6 exclusive competences; banking is absent. Under compétence résiduelle, unenumerated powers belong to the islands. The BCC's expansive interpretation of "currency" contradicts exception est de stricte interprétation.
"No licence has been delivered for offshore activities"	The BCC has not issued such licenses. AOFA has. The BCC statement is a claim of exclusive competence, not a denial of the existence of AOFA licenses. The AOFA registry verified L1149/IFB as LICENSED on 4 March 2026.
"The 2013 Loi bancaire requires BCC approval"	Art. 2 Code civil: la loi ne dispose que pour l'avenir. The 2013 law cannot retroactively invalidate rights created under 2005 legislation. Non-retroactivity is a general principle of French law, directly applicable in the Comoros.
"AOFA licenses are unauthorised"	The Union's own Minister of State (Finance & Budget) attested AOFA's legitimacy in writing from Moroni in 2004. The Union is estopped from contradicting its own prior ministerial conduct (non venire contra factum proprium / estoppel).
"AML/CTF concerns"	AOFA's framework includes the Money Laundering Prevention Act 008/2005 with mandatory KYC (s.12), STR reporting (s.13), and asset freezing (s.19). IFB has maintained 21 years of compliance. Comoros is not on FATF grey/black lists.
"The 2008 intervention invalidates Anjouan legislation"	No Union legislative act has formally repealed the 2005 Acts. Change of government does not automatically void prior legislation (ICJ German Settlers in Poland). ECtHR accepts legal effect of acts by unrecognised regimes (Cyprus v. Turkey). Droits acquis are protected under Art. 2 Code civil.

IX. RISK ASSESSMENT

Risk Category	Level	Analysis
Regulatory enforcement against L1149/IFB specifically	VERY LOW	No enforcement action in 21 years; no specific BCC order; no judicial proceedings against IFB; AOFA registry remains operational
Constitutional challenge to AOFA framework	LOW	Constitutional Court has never ruled; residual powers doctrine favours islands; Union Minister endorsed AOFA in 2004
International non-recognition in Tier 1 jurisdictions	MODERATE	EU/US/UK require separate local licensing; AOFA license effective for non-EU/non-US international operations
Correspondent banking access	MODERATE	Enhanced due diligence required; Tier 2 networks accessible; payment service provider integration active
License revocation by AOFA itself	VERY LOW	No AOFA history of arbitrary revocation; fees current; registry confirms good standing

X. COMOROS FATF/COMPLIANCE STATUS

A frequently raised concern in due diligence inquiries is the FATF status of the Comoros. As of 2025–2026, the Union of the Comoros is not listed on either the FATF “black list” (High-Risk Jurisdictions Subject to a Call for Action) or the FATF “grey list” (Jurisdictions Under Increased Monitoring). This eliminates any prima facie AML/CTF objection to dealings with Comorian-licensed institutions.

Furthermore, the AOFA’s own legislative framework includes dedicated anti-money laundering provisions under the Money Laundering (Prevention) Act 008/2005, which establishes mandatory know-your-customer record keeping (s.12, six-year retention), suspicious transaction reporting obligations (s.13), and asset freezing powers (s.19). License L1149/IFB has been subject to these requirements throughout its twenty-one-year operational history. No regulatory finding of non-compliance has been made.

It should also be noted that the Comoros is a member state of OHADA, which itself imposes harmonised corporate governance, commercial accounting, and insolvency standards across all member states. These OHADA Uniform Acts provide an additional layer of regulatory assurance beyond the AOFA-specific framework.

XI. PRACTICAL DEPLOYMENT GUIDANCE

The following guidance is provided for the commercial deployment of License L1149/IFB across various operational contexts:

A. Jurisdictional Scope

Full effectiveness: Non-EU, non-US jurisdictions where AOFA licensing is recognised or where no conflicting local licensing requirement applies. This includes significant markets across Asia, Africa, the Middle East, Latin America, and the Pacific.

Limited effectiveness: EU member states, United States, and certain OECD jurisdictions that require domestic licensing regardless of foreign authorisation. Separate licensing in these jurisdictions would be required for direct deposit-taking or lending.

Correspondent banking: Tier 2 international networks accessible with enhanced due diligence documentation. The onboarding package described below is designed to satisfy standard compliance requirements.

B. Standard Onboarding Package

1. Original AOFA License Certificate (License No. L1149/IFB)
2. AOFA Official Registry Verification (4 March 2026, 16:08 CET)
3. This Consolidated Legal Opinion
4. AML Compliance Officer Certification
5. Annual Fee Receipts (current year)
6. Union Minister of State Attestation (2004)
7. Certificate of Good Standing

XII. CONSTRUCTIVE RESOLUTION PATHWAYS

While this Opinion establishes the robust legal defence of License L1149/IFB, it also recognises that a constructive resolution of the broader AOFA question would serve all parties' interests. Four pathways are identified:

Federal regularisation: A Union statutory instrument retroactively validating island licensing under a federal supervisory umbrella. This would mirror the approach taken in Malaysia with the Labuan FSA, preserving licensing authority at the sub-sovereign level while establishing federal oversight standards.

Joint supervisory architecture: AOFA retains licensing authority; BCC assumes macro-prudential oversight. This reflects the Japanese (JFSA/BoJ), Swiss (FINMA/SNB), and UK (PRA-FCA/BoE) models of separated supervision.

Multilateral engagement: An IMF/World Bank Financial Sector Assessment Programme (FSAP) dialogue that reframes the issue from "illegality" to "harmonisation," creating a pathway for integration without retrospective invalidation.

Grandfathering: Pioneer institutions such as International Finance Bank Ltd, with over two decades of continuous operation, would be positioned for automatic recognition under any harmonised framework – a standard approach in financial regulatory transitions globally.

XIII. CONSOLIDATED CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATION

This Consolidated Legal Opinion establishes the comprehensive defence of License L1149/IFB through eight mutually reinforcing pillars:

1. Fresh registry verification (4 March 2026) confirms LICENSED status, eliminating staleness objections
2. Statutory authority under Section 8(1)(a) of OFA Act 003/2005, enacted as formal Parliamentary legislation during recognised constitutional autonomy
3. Constitutional framework: Articles 7, 9, and 11 of the 2001 Constitution support island competence over offshore licensing under the residual powers doctrine (compétence résiduelle)
4. Union-level ministerial endorsement: The 2004 Moroni attestation by the Minister of State for Finance creates an insuperable estoppel
5. Vested rights protection under French civil law (droits acquis, Art. 2 Code civil), Islamic jurisprudence ('aqd, prohibition of gharar), and public international law (German Settlers in Poland doctrine)
6. International comparative practice: The Labuan/BNM model and equivalent arrangements in 11+ jurisdictions confirm that separated offshore regulation is global standard
7. Structural regulatory doctrine: The imperative separation of central banking from financial supervision is endorsed by every major financial system
8. Twenty-one years of acquiescence: No judicial order, enforcement action, or legislative repeal directed at License L1149/IFB

Any challenge to the validity of License L1149/IFB must simultaneously overcome all eight pillars – a burden that no party has come close to discharging in over two decades.

Recommended Response Template

International Finance Bank Ltd holds International Banking License No. L1149/IFB, issued by the Anjouan Offshore Finance Authority under Government Notice No. 005 of 2005 of the Autonomous Island of Anjouan, Union of the Comoros. The License is valid until 13 October 2026 (annual activation). IFB has maintained continuous licensed status since its incorporation on 13 October 2004, representing over 21 years of uninterrupted regulatory compliance. Operations are conducted exclusively on an offshore/non-resident basis in foreign currencies, outside the territorial scope of the Banque Centrale des Comores. The regulatory framework includes comprehensive AML/CTF provisions under the Money Laundering (Prevention) Act 008/2005.

EXPERT INTERNATIONAL BANKING COUNSEL

4 March 2026

Reproduction authorised for regulatory, due diligence, commercial, and institutional onboarding purposes.

— END OF CONSOLIDATED LEGAL OPINION —

ANNEX A – KEY LEGISLATIVE AND CONSTITUTIONAL REFERENCES

Instrument	Jurisdiction/System	Relevance
Code civil, Art. 2	French civil law (applicable in Comoros)	Non-retroactivity of laws; foundation for droits acquis
Constitution of the Union (2001), Arts. 7, 9, 11	Comorian constitutional law	Island autonomy; exclusive Union competences; financial autonomy
OFA Act 003/2005	Anjouan statutory law	Establishes AOFA; grants exclusive licensing authority (s.8(1)(a))
Gov. Notice 005/2005 (Int'l Banks Act)	Anjouan statutory law	Defines Class B offshore banking; statutory basis for L1149/IFB
Gov. Notice 008/2005 (AML Act)	Anjouan statutory law	KYC, STR, asset freezing framework
Loi bancaire n°13-003/AU (2013)	Union law (post-AOFA)	BCC supervisory claim; non-retroactive under Art. 2 Code civil
OHADA Treaty (Port-Louis, 1993; revised Québec, 2008)	Supranational (17 African states incl. Comoros)	Harmonised business law; directly applicable Uniform Acts
Labuan FSA Act 1996	Malaysian federal law	Definitive comparator for sub-sovereign offshore licensing
Monetary Cooperation Agreement (1979)	France–Comoros bilateral	French control of Comorian monetary policy; BCC structure
Shāfi'ī fiqh al-mu'āmalāt	Islamic jurisprudence	Binding contracts ('aqd); prohibition of gharar; lā ḍarara wa lā ḍirār

ANNEX B – CONSOLIDATED EXHIBIT LIST

Exhibit	Description	Evidentiary Value
1	Original AOFA License Certificate – L1149/IFB	Primary licensing evidence
2	AOFA Official Registry Verification (4 March 2026, 16:08 CET)	Current status confirmation
3	"AOFA's Case for Legitimacy" – comprehensive legal analysis with primary sources	Legal and historical framework
4	"The Case for Legitimacy: Regulatory Framework of IFB Bank" – presentation	Institutional defence materials
5	Minister of State Attestation (Moroni, 13 Nov 2004, N° 04-466/MFB/CAB)	Union-level endorsement; estoppel basis
6	Companion Ministerial Letter (11 Dec 2004)	Agent appointment authority
7	OFA Act 003/2005 (full text)	Primary statutory authority
8	Government Notice 005/2005 – International Banks Act	Class B licensing authority
9	Government Notice 008/2005 – Money Laundering Prevention Act	AML/CTF compliance framework
10	Constitution of the Union of the Comoros (2001, as revised)	Constitutional basis; Arts. 7, 9, 11