Regulatory Intelligence at Scale:

How Barinhall Built an AI-Powered Compliance Monitoring System for Financial Services

Frank Barilone
Principal, Barinhall Consulting
May 2026

Pilot Release

1. Executive Summary

Mid-size financial institutions operate at a structural disadvantage when it comes to regulatory monitoring. Large banks maintain dedicated regulatory affairs teams of 10 to 50 professionals whose primary job is to track, interpret, and respond to agency publications. A community bank, mortgage servicer, or credit union with a compliance staff of one or two simply cannot replicate that capacity through manual processes alone.

Barinhall Consulting built the Regulatory Change Impact Scorer (RIS) to close that gap. RIS is a continuously running NLP pipeline that ingests regulatory filings from more than 10 federal agencies, scores each change across 8 distinct impact categories using Claude Sonnet from Anthropic, and surfaces prioritized action items to compliance teams in near real time. The system is designed for the mid-market compliance professional who needs signal, not noise, and who has no time to read every bulletin that lands in their inbox.

The RIS ecosystem includes two delivery mechanisms. The Client Intelligence Portal, available at complianceportal.barinhall.com, gives compliance teams a live dashboard of their highest-priority items with days-to-deadline countdowns, full scoring rationale, and a practitioner Advisory Assessment on every record. The weekly newsletter, Barinhall Regulatory Signals, delivers curated briefings to subscribers on a free and Pro tier, covering why each development matters and what teams should do about it.

This system is live. The portal is in active pilot. The newsletter has paying subscribers. It was designed by a practitioner who has worked in financial services compliance, not by a software vendor optimizing a sales pitch. The target audience is the compliance officer, risk manager, or operations lead who knows the agencies, understands the stakes, and just needs a better tool to stay ahead of the volume.

2. The Regulatory Monitoring Problem

The volume of regulatory output from federal agencies has grown substantially since 2008. The post-financial-crisis reform wave brought the Dodd-Frank Act, CFPB rulemaking, and a sustained period of new mortgage servicing standards. That pace did not slow after 2020. COVID-era forbearance guidance, interagency statements on climate and operational resilience, and expanded supervisory priorities from the OCC and FDIC have added to an already heavy load. For a compliance team of one or two, reading and triaging every publication from every relevant agency is not a realistic expectation.

The resource disparity is real and persistent. A large bank or GSE will staff a regulatory affairs function with dedicated subject matter experts covering each agency relationship. They build internal tracking systems, maintain regulatory calendars, and have standing processes for assessing and responding to new guidance. A community bank with ten branches, or a mortgage servicer with a hundred employees, does not have that infrastructure. The compliance officer at that firm is also handling examinations, training, policy updates, complaints, and vendor oversight, all at once.

Manual monitoring workflows, the RSS feeds and email digests most mid-market compliance teams rely on, have two fundamental problems. First, they are inconsistent. Whether a particular bulletin gets read on the day it is published depends on whether the compliance officer had time that day, whether the email alert got flagged, and whether the title looked relevant enough to open. Second, they do not prioritize by impact. A major proposed rule that will require system changes arrives in the same inbox as a low-relevance interpretive letter. There is no triage built into the channel.

The cost of missing a high-priority item is significant. An examination finding tied to a missed compliance deadline can result in a matter requiring attention, a memorandum of understanding, or a civil money penalty. An enforcement action for a practice that was flagged in supervisory guidance the firm never processed can be existential for a small institution. The asymmetry between the cost of a monitoring gap and the cost of a better monitoring process is what motivated building this system.

Existing compliance technology vendors have not addressed the mid-market gap effectively. Most enterprise compliance platforms are priced, scoped, and structured for large institutions. They require implementation projects, dedicated administrator training, and long contract terms. The firms that most need an affordable, usable regulatory monitoring capability are often the least well-served by the available market options. RIS was built to be right-sized for that segment from the start.

3. How the System Works

The Regulatory Change Impact Scorer is a Python-based NLP pipeline that ingests, extracts, scores, and stores regulatory filings on a continuous basis. The system was designed to require no manual curation of the input stream. When an agency publishes a new final rule, guidance document, bulletin, or supervisory highlight, the pipeline picks it up, processes it, and produces a scored output record without human intervention.

The pipeline ingests from more than 10 regulatory and housing agency sources: the SEC, FINRA, OCC, CFPB, Federal Reserve, FHA, VA, Ginnie Mae, Fannie Mae, and Freddie Mac. This combination covers the full regulatory surface area for most financial services firms in the mortgage, banking, and broker-dealer segments. Agency publications arrive via RSS feeds and direct API calls, depending on what each source offers. The ingestion layer handles both formats and normalizes output into a staging queue.

Text extraction handles the two primary formats in which regulatory documents are published: HTML and PDF. HTML publications are processed with section-aware parsing tooling that isolates the substantive regulatory text from headers, footers, and navigation content. PDF documents are processed with extraction tooling that handles multi-column layouts and produces clean running text. The extracted content is then chunked and prepared for the scoring call.

Scoring is handled by Claude Sonnet from Anthropic. Each document is submitted to the model with a structured prompt that asks for a score of 1 to 5 across each of the 8 impact categories described in Section 4, along with a brief rationale for each score, an overall aggregate, an urgency tier designation, and a plain-language executive summary. The model output is validated against a structured output schema before being written to the output store. Structured output format ensures consistency across every scored record.

Scoring rationale is preserved in full and is surfaced to portal users on the item detail page. The system does not just return a number. It returns the model's reasoning for each category score, which gives compliance professionals the context they need to evaluate whether the system's assessment aligns with their specific institutional exposure. A mortgage servicer seeing a score of 4 on Operational Impact can read the rationale and determine in under two minutes whether the item applies to them.

The newsletter pipeline operates on top of the scoring output. Five specialized agents handle different aspects of newsletter production: a Regulatory Analyst agent frames the compliance significance of each scored item, an Industry Research agent adds sector context, an Editorial agent applies voice and structure, a Composer agent assembles the full issue, and a QA Validator agent checks accuracy, tone, and formatting before the issue is sent to Beehiiv for distribution. The multi-agent pipeline runs automatically each week against the current scoring output.

4. The 8-Category Scoring Framework

Every regulatory filing processed by RIS is scored across 8 distinct impact categories. Each category receives a score from 1 (minimal impact) to 5 (severe or urgent impact). The aggregate score is a weighted average across all 8 categories and is the primary input to the urgency tier designation. The 8-category structure was designed to give compliance teams a multidimensional view of a regulatory change, not just an overall severity rating.

4.1 Compliance Burden

Compliance Burden captures the degree to which a regulatory change creates new obligations, reporting requirements, certifications, or attestation processes that did not previously exist. This is the category most directly tied to what the compliance function has to build, operationalize, and maintain going forward.

A high score example: a CFPB final rule requiring mortgage lenders to implement a new data collection and reporting process within 60 days. The rule creates a net-new compliance obligation, carries a specific deadline, and requires policy documentation, system changes, and staff training before it can be satisfied.

4.2 Operational Impact

Operational Impact measures the extent to which a regulatory change requires modifications to existing processes, systems, workflows, or staffing arrangements. Where Compliance Burden focuses on what the firm must demonstrate to regulators, Operational Impact focuses on the internal machinery required to get there.

A high score example: an OCC bulletin requiring banks to update their model risk management frameworks. The guidance touches model validation practices, governance documentation, board-level oversight requirements, and the process for engaging third-party validators. The operational footprint of compliance is large, even if the compliance obligation itself is framed as guidance rather than a rule.

4.3 Capital / Financial Impact

Capital and Financial Impact covers regulatory changes that affect a firm's reserve requirements, fee structures, cost of doing business, or direct financial exposure. This category is particularly relevant for servicers, where changes to agency economics or guaranty fee structures can directly affect operating margins.

A high score example: a Ginnie Mae announcement changing guaranty fee structures for issuers. The change affects servicer cash flow models, requires repricing analysis, and may necessitate adjustments to hedging strategies or advance funding assumptions. The financial exposure is direct and near-term.

4.4 Data Governance

Data Governance scores the regulatory change's impact on data collection practices, retention requirements, privacy obligations, and information security controls. As regulatory data requirements have expanded across mortgage origination, servicing, and fair lending, this category has become a more consistent source of high-impact items.

A high score example: a CFPB final rule expanding the data fields required under the Home Mortgage Disclosure Act. The change requires updates to loan origination systems to capture new fields, changes to data retention and archiving policies, expanded quality control processes, and revisions to the annual HMDA submission workflow.

4.5 Third-Party / Vendor Risk

Third-Party and Vendor Risk measures whether a regulatory change imposes new requirements on the firms, servicers, or counterparties a financial institution works with, or whether it creates oversight obligations that the institution itself must fulfill with respect to its vendor relationships. Many institutions learn about vendor-facing regulatory requirements later than they should.

A high score example: FHA guidance requiring mortgage servicers to ensure their vendor networks meet new loss mitigation documentation standards. The guidance does not just apply to the servicer's internal team. It requires the servicer to assess, document, and certify vendor compliance, which means updating vendor oversight programs, revising service level agreements, and validating vendor capability.

4.6 Consumer Impact

Consumer Impact covers changes to disclosure requirements, borrower protections, consumer-facing processes, or the terms under which financial products are offered and serviced. This category is particularly important for institutions where examination risk is tied to consumer protection obligations under RESPA, TILA, the Fair Housing Act, or CFPB examination procedures.

A high score example: a CFPB final rule changing the required timing and format of adverse action notices. The change requires a review of existing notice templates, updates to workflow systems that trigger notice generation, and potentially revised scripting for call center staff handling adverse action inquiries. Consumer-facing processes tend to have a wide operational footprint.

4.7 Examination / Enforcement Risk

Examination and Enforcement Risk assesses the likelihood that a regulatory change will draw examiner scrutiny or form the basis of an enforcement action. This category is scored based on the agency's published supervisory priorities, the language of the guidance itself, and the history of enforcement in the relevant subject area.

A high score example: a CFPB supervisory highlights publication that specifically cites a loss mitigation documentation practice that many servicers currently use as a routine operational matter. A supervisory highlight is not a rule, but when the Bureau publishes it, it becomes an examination checklist item almost immediately. Firms that have not read the highlight are exposed in a way that firms that have read and acted on it are not.

4.8 Strategic / Business Model Risk

Strategic and Business Model Risk is reserved for regulatory changes that create existential or fundamental threats to specific business lines, product offerings, or the economics that make a particular activity viable. This is the highest-stakes category and tends to produce the clearest T1 items when it scores high.

A high score example: a proposed rule that would materially change the economics of a specific mortgage origination product or the servicing advance obligation structure for Ginnie Mae issuers. Changes at this level can make a business line unprofitable, require strategic exits, or force a reconsideration of the firm's product mix at the board level.

5. Urgency Tiers: From Signal to Action

The 8-category scores feed into an urgency tier designation that tells compliance teams what to do with each item. The tier system is designed to translate the scoring output into a concrete action posture. Every item gets a tier. Every T1 and T2 item gets actionable guidance. The goal is to remove the ambiguity that slows down the response to high-priority regulatory developments.

Days-to-action is calculated from the confirmed effective date where one is available. Where the regulatory text provides an estimated or proposed date, the system derives a working estimate and flags it as advisory. Where no date is determinable from the text, the item is treated as effective on date of publication for triage purposes.

Tier	Criteria	Action
T1	Aggregate score >= 4.0 OR hard deadline within 30 days	Immediate action required. Assign an owner, open a project, begin gap analysis.
T2	Aggregate score >= 3.0 OR deadline within 90 days	Plan and schedule action this quarter. Add to compliance project calendar.
T3	Aggregate score >= 2.0	Monitor and revisit at next compliance calendar review.
T4	Aggregate score < 2.0	Informational. Log and file for reference.

T1 items represent the highest-priority actions in a compliance program. An item scores T1 either because the aggregate impact score indicates a severe, multi-dimensional effect on the institution, or because the effective deadline is within 30 days and the window for preparation is closing. In practice, a T1 item should trigger an immediate conversation between the compliance officer and business line leaders. An owner should be assigned, a gap analysis should begin, and a project should be opened in the compliance tracking system the same week the item is identified.

T2 items are high-priority but allow more time to plan. They should appear on the quarterly compliance calendar and be assigned to a responsible party within two weeks of identification. A T2 item that receives no attention during its first quarter has a meaningful chance of becoming a T1 item in the next quarter, as deadlines approach and preparation time compresses.

T3 items are worth tracking but do not require immediate action. A compliance officer reviewing T3 items at their monthly or quarterly compliance calendar review is handling them appropriately. T3 items may warrant a brief note to the business line and a file entry, but they should not be consuming the same attention as T1 and T2 work.

T4 items are informational. The system has reviewed the filing and concluded that the impact is minimal for most financial institutions. Logging and filing is appropriate. If the firm has a specific business line or product exposure that would change that assessment, the compliance officer can review the scoring rationale and upgrade the item manually in the portal.

6. The Client Intelligence Portal

The Client Intelligence Portal, accessible at complianceportal.barinhall.com by invitation during the pilot, is the primary interface for compliance teams who want live access to the full scoring output. It is designed to surface the items that need attention without requiring the user to read every publication themselves. The portal is organized around the compliance professional's workflow, not around data completeness for its own sake.

The Dashboard is the first view a user sees after logging in. It shows all T1 and T2 items currently in the scored universe, sorted by aggregate impact score with days-to-deadline displayed for each item. A compliance officer can look at the dashboard at the start of their week and see immediately what is action-required and what the deadlines are. The dashboard is intentionally sparse. Items that do not require action in the near term are not on it.

The Intelligence Feed, sometimes called the Triage view, shows the full scored universe. Users can filter by tier, agency source, date range, and keyword. This is the view for compliance officers who want to check whether a specific agency or topic has had any recent activity, or who want to review the full pipeline to ensure nothing has slipped through. The filter set is designed to support both quick lookups and more systematic review workflows.

Each item in the portal has a detail page that shows the full output record from the scoring pipeline. The detail page includes a plain-language executive summary, all 8 category scores with the model's rationale for each, the derived or confirmed effective date, the urgency tier designation, and the Barinhall Advisory Assessment described below. It is written so that a compliance officer can take the scores and the assessment directly into a conversation with their business line counterparts.

The Advisory Assessment is the portal's practitioner layer. For every scored record, RIS generates a concise consultant-style assessment in four parts: Impact, Risk, Recommended Action, and Watch. Where the category scores tell a compliance officer how significant a change is, the Advisory Assessment tells them what it means for their institution and what to do first, written in the language a senior advisor would use in a client memo. It names the function most likely to be caught flat-footed, the first practical step the compliance team should take, and the developments worth monitoring. The assessment is generated from the structured scoring output and is presented as a starting point for analysis, not a substitute for professional judgment. It appears on every record, not only the highest-tier items, so that even lower-urgency developments arrive with a clear point of view.

Saved Items allows users to bookmark items they are actively working or want to return to. Bookmarked items persist across sessions and are visible in a dedicated view. The Archive shows items whose effective dates have passed, which provides an audit trail for compliance programs that want to document their monitoring process and demonstrate awareness of historical guidance.

The Coverage Log is a differentiating feature of the paid tier. Clients upload their existing regulatory change log directly through the portal using a CSV template, and the system maps their tracked document references against the pipeline records to surface items present in the pipeline but absent from the client's internal log. For firms preparing for examinations, the Coverage Log provides a structured way to assess whether the monitoring program is comprehensive.

Export to CSV and PDF is available on the paid tier. Exports support the compliance documentation workflow for firms that need to produce evidence of monitoring activities for examiners, audit committees, or board reporting. Access to the portal is by invitation during the current pilot phase.

7. The Weekly Newsletter: Barinhall Regulatory Signals

Barinhall Regulatory Signals is a weekly newsletter published through Beehiiv that delivers curated regulatory monitoring output to compliance professionals in a format designed to be read quickly and acted on directly. The newsletter is a standalone product for firms that want regular briefings without portal access, as well as a supplemental channel for portal clients who want a structured weekly summary alongside their live dashboard.

The free tier delivers a curated summary of the most significant items from the past week. Each item entry includes the agency source, a plain-language description of what was published, and a why-it-matters framing that explains the practical compliance significance. The free tier is suitable for compliance professionals who want a high-level awareness briefing without the operational depth of the Pro tier.

The Pro tier delivers the full scoring data for each featured item, including the aggregate score, each of the 8 category scores, the urgency tier designation, and the what-to-do-now guidance block. Pro subscribers receive the same action-oriented framing that portal users see in the item detail view, formatted for a newsletter context. Pro tier content is designed to be directly usable in compliance team meetings and board reporting.

The newsletter is generated by a multi-agent pipeline that runs automatically each week. The Regulatory Analyst agent reviews the current scoring output and selects items for inclusion based on tier and impact. The Industry Research agent adds sector-specific context that explains why a particular item is more or less relevant for mortgage servicers, community banks, or broker-dealers as distinct audiences. The Editorial agent shapes the prose for the Barinhall voice and audience. The Composer agent assembles the final issue structure. The QA Validator agent reviews the completed draft for accuracy, consistency, and format before it is submitted to Beehiiv.

The newsletter serves compliance professionals at different points in their workflow. Some use it as their primary weekly briefing and action trigger. Others use it as a cross-check against their internal monitoring process to catch items they may have missed or deprioritized. Both use cases are valid. The goal is to make it easy for a compliance professional to stay current without spending hours each week reading agency websites.

8. Design Principles

RIS was built around a set of design principles that were not derived from software product requirements. They were derived from working in financial services compliance and understanding what a compliance professional actually needs when a new regulation drops.

8.1 Transparency First

Clients see the scoring rationale for every item, not just the score. A system that returns a number without explanation is not useful in a compliance context. The compliance officer needs to be able to evaluate whether the system's assessment of Operational Impact aligns with their specific business model and product mix. The rationale makes that evaluation possible in under two minutes per item. It also creates an audit trail: the compliance officer can document not just that they reviewed the item, but what the impact assessment said and why they agreed or disagreed with it.

8.2 Practitioner-Authored

The scoring rubric was designed by a compliance professional who has sat in the role, not by a data scientist optimizing a benchmark. The 8 categories reflect the actual dimensions of compliance exposure that matter to mid-market financial institutions. The urgency tiers reflect how compliance programs actually respond to regulatory developments, not an abstract prioritization framework. The what-to-do-now guidance is written in the language that compliance officers use with their business line counterparts, because that is the language that moves action.

8.3 Action-Oriented

Every scored record carries a Barinhall Advisory Assessment, and the newsletter's Pro tier carries the same action-oriented framing. The system is not just a monitoring tool. It is designed to support the compliance officer in their first conversation about a new regulatory development. The assessment is not a substitute for legal advice or a full compliance analysis. It is a starting point: the first question to ask the business line, the first gap to look for in existing policies, the first stakeholder to loop in.

8.4 Right-Sized for Mid-Market

There is no implementation project required to access the portal. There is no enterprise contract, no dedicated customer success manager, and no onboarding process that takes months. A compliance officer at a mid-market institution can be reviewing scored items the same day they request access. The system is designed to be usable by a one-person compliance function without administrative overhead. Pricing and access terms reflect the mid-market context, not large-institution contract structures.

8.5 Full Agency Coverage, Including Housing

Most general compliance monitoring tools cover the primary banking regulators and the CFPB. They do not cover the mortgage and housing agency ecosystem: FHA, VA, Ginnie Mae, Fannie Mae, and Freddie Mac. For mortgage servicers, those agencies are often the primary source of operational compliance requirements. RIS covers all of them in the same scoring pipeline, treating a Ginnie Mae All Participant Memorandum with the same systematic rigor as an OCC bulletin or a CFPB final rule.

9. Pilot Program

The Regulatory Change Impact Scorer is live. The pipeline runs continuously, scoring new filings as they are published by each agency in the coverage set. The Client Intelligence Portal is deployed and in active pilot with invited users. The Barinhall Regulatory Signals newsletter is published weekly and has paying Pro tier subscribers.

Barinhall is currently seeking pilot clients in mortgage servicing, community banking, credit unions, and broker-dealer compliance functions. Pilot participants receive full access to the portal and the Pro newsletter tier during the pilot period. In exchange, participants provide structured feedback on scoring accuracy, portal usability, and the relevance of the what-to-do-now guidance to their specific institutional context. That feedback is used to refine the scoring rubric and expand the coverage set.

The pilot is designed for compliance teams that want to evaluate a new monitoring tool without committing to a multi-year contract or an implementation timeline. Access is by invitation. There is no enterprise sales process. If your institution monitors compliance from a small team and the monitoring problem described in Section 2 is one you recognize, this pilot is designed for you.

To request pilot access or ask questions about the system, contact Frank Barilone at frank.barilone.jr@outlook.com. Portal access requests are reviewed and responded to within two business days.

10. About the Author

Frank Barilone is the Principal of Barinhall Consulting, a boutique advisory firm focused on compliance and risk for financial services clients. His practice combines regulatory subject matter expertise with a hands-on approach to building systems that make compliance programs more efficient and defensible. He has worked in compliance and risk functions at financial institutions in the mortgage and banking sectors, and that practitioner experience informs every aspect of how RIS was designed.

Barinhall Regulatory Signals is his weekly newsletter covering high-impact regulatory changes for compliance professionals across mortgage servicing, community banking, credit unions, and broker-dealer compliance. The newsletter is published every week via Beehiiv and is available at both a free tier for general awareness and a Pro tier for teams that want full scoring data and operational guidance.

Frank can be reached at frank.barilone.jr@outlook.com for questions about the RIS system, pilot access requests, or advisory engagements.