ICAEW REPRESENTATION 84/25



SENIOR MANAGERS AND CERTIFICATION REGIME REVIEW (CP25/21)

Issued 7 October 2025

ICAEW welcomes the opportunity to comment on the Senior Managers and Certification Regime review (CP25/21) published by FCA on 15 July 2025, a copy of which is available from this link.

This response of 7 October 2025 has been prepared by the ICAEW Corporate Finance Faculty. The Corporate Finance Faculty is ICAEW's centre of professional expertise in corporate finance. It contributes to policy development and responds to consultations by international organisations, governments, regulators and other professional bodies. It provides a wide range of services, information, guidance, events and media to its members, including its highly regarded magazine Corporate Financier and its popular series of best-practice guidelines. The faculty's international network includes member organisations and individuals from major professional services groups, specialist advisory firms, companies, banks and alternative lenders, private equity, venture capital, law firms, brokers, consultants, policymakers and academic experts. More than 40 per cent of the faculty's membership are from beyond ICAEW.

This response of 7 October 2025 has been prepared by the ICAEW Financial Services Faculty. As a leading centre for thought leadership on financial services, the faculty brings together different interests and is responsible for representations on behalf of ICAEW on governance, regulation, risk, auditing and reporting issues facing the financial services sector. The faculty draws on the expertise of its members and more than 25,000 ICAEW members involved in financial services.

ICAEW is a world-leading professional body established under a Royal Charter to serve the public interest. In pursuit of its vision of a world of sustainable economies, ICAEW works with governments, regulators and businesses and it leads, connects, supports and regulates more than 172,000 chartered accountant members in over 150 countries. ICAEW members work in all types of private and public organisations, including public practice firms, and are trained to provide clarity and rigour and apply the highest professional, technical and ethical standards.

© ICAEW 2025

All rights reserved.

This document may be reproduced without specific permission, in whole or part, free of charge and in any format or medium, subject to the conditions that:

Where third-party copyright material has been identified application for permission must be made to the copyright holder. For more information, please contact: Corporate Finance – CFF@icaew.com

© ICAEW 2025 2

[•] it is appropriately attributed, replicated accurately and is not used in a misleading context;

[•] the source of the extract or document is acknowledged and the title and ICAEW reference number are quoted.

ANSWERS TO SPECIFIC QUESTIONS

Question 1: To what extent do you support the further changes we are considering in phase 2 of the reform (summarised in paragraph 1.11). Are there any other changes you suggest? We would welcome views on the impact (positive or negative) of each potential change and on any suggested additional improvements.

- 1. While we agree with the direction of the reforms, we are not in a position to judge the cumulative financial impact and implications for oversight. Our comments relate to individual changes proposed in phase 2.
- 2. It is not likely that reducing the number of SMF approvals will have a material financial effect on our members. Regulated activity typically forms a small part of their total activity and their structures are relatively simple with few SMF roles. There may be some savings, but these are not expected to be significant. If reforms necessitate major changes to these firms' systems and methodologies, the associated costs could negate savings in the period of change.
- 3. We would support more flexibility around the appointment of interim SMFs this clearly would help in unforeseen situations such as long-term illness.

Question 2b: On which priority areas would firms welcome more information, guidance, or changes to forms?

4. We support the intention to make improvements.

Question 3: Do you agree to our proposals for changes to criminal record checks and disclosures?

5. We agree.

Question 4: Do you agree with our proposed changes to the 12-week rule?

6. We agree.

Question 7: Do you agree with our proposals on Prescribed Responsibilities?

7. We agree with the proposed approach.

Question 8: Do you agree with our proposals on raising the thresholds for becoming an Enhanced SM&CR firm?

8. We have no comment on this proposal.

Question 9: Do you agree with our proposals on SoRs and MRMs?

9. We agree.

Question 10: Do you agree with our proposal to align with the PRA on SoR submission requirements for dual-regulated firms?

10. The proposal is reasonable.

Question 11: Do you agree with our proposals on certification?

- 11. We agree with the proposals and streamlining of certification and re-certification. However, regarding the proposal to remove duplicate certifications, can the FCA confirm if this means that an employee holding two or more functions would now only be required to register for one?
- 12. Also, would the FCA consider confirming that a proportionate approach to recertification will apply when there are no changes?

Question 12: Do you agree with our proposal to change the timescales for updating the Directory?

13. We agree.

Question 13: Do you agree with our proposals on regulatory references?

14. We broadly agree.

Question 14: Do you agree with the proposed guidance on the Conduct Rules?

15. We agree.

© ICAEW 2025