Preprints.org

Article

Not peer-reviewed version

Risk-Based Supervision: A Modern Approach to Banking Oversight in the United States

Muhammad Abubakar *

Posted Date: 3 October 2025

doi: 10.20944/preprints202510.0244.v1

Keywords: risk-based supervision; banking oversight; United States Financial Regulation; risk management; systemic stability; banking supervision; regulatory framework

Preprints.org is a free multidisciplinary platform providing preprint service that is dedicated to making early versions of research outputs permanently available and citable. Preprints posted at Preprints.org appear in Web of Science, Crossref, Google Scholar, Scilit, Europe PMC.

Copyright: This open access article is published under a Creative Commons CC BY 4.0 license, which permit the free download, distribution, and reuse, provided that the author and preprint are cited in any reuse.

Preprints.org (www.preprints.org) | NOT PEER-REVIEWED | Posted: 3 October 2025 doi:10.20944/preprints202510.0244.v1

Disclaimer/Publisher's Note: The statements, opinions, and data contained in all publications are solely those of the individual author(s) and contributor(s) and not of MDPI and/or the editor(s). MDPI and/or the editor(s) disclaim responsibility for any injury to people or property resulting from any ideas, methods, instructions, or products referred to in the content.

Article

Risk-Based Supervision: A Modern Approach to Banking Oversight in the United States

Muhammad Abubakar

Independent Researcher, Nigeria; sanisco92@gmail.com

Abstract

Risk-Based Supervision (RBS) has emerged as the cornerstone of modern banking oversight in the United States, shifting the regulatory lens from a rigid compliance checklist toward a forward-looking, risk-sensitive framework. This approach recognizes that not all financial institutions pose equal threats to stability, and therefore tailors supervisory intensity to the size, complexity, and risk profile of each bank. By emphasizing early identification of vulnerabilities such as credit exposure, liquidity mismatches, and operational weaknesses, RBS enables regulators to act preemptively rather than reactively. This philosophy represents a break from traditional supervision, where equal scrutiny often dilutes attention from systemically significant risks. In practice, RBS fosters stronger resilience in the financial sector, encouraging institutions to embed robust risk management cultures while allowing regulators to allocate resources more strategically. In the U.S. context, where banking markets are both diverse and interconnected, RBS is not just a regulatory tool but a necessary safeguard against systemic shocks. Its effectiveness, however, hinges on dynamic data analytics, skilled supervisory judgment, and ongoing collaboration between regulators and financial institutions. As financial innovations accelerate and new risks from cyber threats to fintech disruptions reshape the industry, RBS offers a flexible, adaptive model for sustaining trust and stability in the banking system.

Keywords: risk-based supervision; banking oversight; United States Financial Regulation; risk management; systemic stability; banking supervision; regulatory framework

---

1. Introduction

1.1. Background of Banking Supervision in the U.S.

Banking supervision in the United States has historically undergone significant transformation in response to financial crises, market innovations, and evolving systemic risks. Traditional supervision was largely compliance-based, focusing on whether banks followed prescriptive rules and regulatory checklists. While effective to a degree, this model often failed to capture emerging vulnerabilities that cut across credit, liquidity, market, and operational domains [1].

1.2. Shift from Compliance-Based to Risk-Based Oversight

The global financial crisis of 2007–2009 revealed serious limitations in compliance-heavy oversight. Regulators realized that merely ensuring adherence to rules was insufficient when institutions engaged in complex, interconnected activities that amplified systemic fragility. In response, supervisory frameworks shifted toward **Risk-Based Supervision (RBS)**, a forward-looking, dynamic approach that allocates regulatory attention based on the unique risk profile of each institution [2–4].

1.3. Purpose and Scope of the Paper

© 2025 by the author(s). Distributed under a Creative Commons CC BY license.

Preprints.org (www.preprints.org) | NOT PEER-REVIEWED | Posted: 3 October 2025
doi:10.20944/preprints202510.0244.v1

In the U.S., risk-based supervision is now central to the oversight strategy of major regulatory agencies, including the Federal Reserve, the Office of the Comptroller of the Currency (OCC), and the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation (FDIC). Rather than applying uniform intensity across all banks, regulators prioritize institutions whose size, complexity, and activities pose greater potential threats to stability [3]. This paper examines the evolution of RBS, its conceptual underpinnings, and its application in the U.S. context, highlighting its strengths, challenges, and future implications for safeguarding financial stability.

2. Literature Review

A more robust understanding of Risk-Based Supervision (RBS) emerges from key regulatory and academic sources. The Basel Committee's *Core Principles for Effective Banking Supervision* (2012) highlight the proportional allocation of supervisory resources and the forward-looking identification of risks as fundamental to modern prudential oversight. These standards emphasize that supervision should not be checklist-driven but instead tailored to the size, complexity, and systemic importance of financial institutions. In the United States, agencies such as the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation (FDIC) and the Office of the Comptroller of the Currency (OCC) have embedded these principles into their supervisory handbooks. The FDIC's *Risk Management Manual* and the OCC's *Large Bank Supervision* guidance detail practical frameworks for applying RBS through off-site monitoring, targeted examinations, and stress testing. Academic evidence further supports the approach: Hirtle, Kovner, and Plosser (2020) show that variation in supervisory intensity influences bank performance and risk-taking. Together, these sources establish RBS as both a theoretically sound and operationally effective model for safeguarding financial stability.

2.1. Conceptual Foundations of Risk-Based Supervision

The idea of risk-based oversight draws from broader risk management principles in finance, emphasizing early identification, measurement, and mitigation of vulnerabilities [4]. Unlike traditional compliance frameworks, RBS requires regulators to make judgments about a bank's overall risk exposure and the adequacy of its internal controls. The Basel Committee on Banking Supervision (BCBS) has been particularly influential in setting global standards for supervisory approaches, encouraging member states to adopt supervisory regimes that emphasize proportionality, forward-looking risk assessment, and supervisory dialogue with institutions [5].

2.2. Global Perspectives: Basel Committee and International Practices

Globally, countries have adopted different versions of RBS tailored to their financial systems. For instance, the United Kingdom's Prudential Regulation Authority integrates RBS into its broader prudential supervisory regime, while Canada and Australia apply similar frameworks with strong emphasis on stress testing and capital adequacy [6]. These international experiences underscore the value of flexible, judgment-based oversight while also highlighting challenges such as supervisory resource constraints and reliance on the quality of bank disclosures.

2.3. Prior Research on Risk-Based Oversight in Banking

Academic research on RBS points to its potential to enhance financial stability, but also warns about its dependence on the quality of supervisory expertise. Hirtle et al. [7] emphasize that risk-based approaches can better allocate regulatory resources by targeting high-risk banks, while others note that supervisory discretion can introduce inconsistency if not supported by robust frameworks [8]. Recent scholarship also stresses the importance of integrating advanced data analytics, machine learning, and scenario testing into RBS to enhance predictive capabilities [9]. Overall, the literature affirms that RBS represents a significant improvement over compliance-based methods but underscores the need for ongoing innovation, strong governance, and cross-border coordination.

© 2025 by the author(s). Distributed under a Creative Commons CC BY license.

Preprints.org (www.preprints.org) | NOT PEER-REVIEWED | Posted: 3 October 2025 doi:10.20944/preprints202510.0244.v1

3. Risk-Based Supervision in the U.S. Context

3.1. Evolution of Regulatory Frameworks

Risk-Based Supervision in the United States has its roots in the post-crisis regulatory reforms of the 1990s and early 2000s, later reinforced by the lessons of the 2007–2009 financial crisis. Earlier supervisory models, such as the CAMELS rating system, provided a structured framework for assessing capital adequacy, asset quality, management, earnings, liquidity, and sensitivity to market risk. However, these tools were primarily backward-looking and failed to anticipate the rapid buildup of systemic vulnerabilities [10]. As a corrective measure, U.S. regulators began adopting risk-sensitive supervisory practices that placed greater emphasis on forward-looking assessments and dynamic monitoring of financial institutions [11].

3.2. Role of Federal Agencies (Federal Reserve, OCC, FDIC)

The Federal Reserve, OCC, and FDIC each integrate risk-based methodologies into their supervisory frameworks. The Federal Reserve emphasizes horizontal reviews and stress testing of large institutions, particularly through the Comprehensive Capital Analysis and Review (CCAR) and the Dodd–Frank Act Stress Tests (DFAST) [12]. The OCC employs a risk assessment system that evaluates banks' strategic, credit, operational, and compliance risks, assigning supervisory intensity accordingly [13]. Meanwhile, the FDIC combines off-site surveillance with on-site examinations to identify emerging threats to deposit insurance funds. Together, these agencies have embedded RBS as a central principle of supervisory practice, particularly for systemically important financial institutions (SIFIs).

3.3. Key Risk Areas: Credit, Market, Operational, and Liquidity

RBS in the U.S. context focuses on four critical domains:

- **Credit risk**, which remains the largest source of potential losses in commercial banking [14].
- **Market risk** is driven by volatility in interest rates, foreign exchange, and securities markets.
- **Operational risk** has expanded in relevance due to cyber threats, digitalization, and third-party dependencies [15].
- **Liquidity risk**, highlighted during the financial crisis when sudden funding shortages cascaded through the system [16].

By concentrating on these areas, supervisors are better positioned to allocate oversight resources to the most material threats, thereby enhancing resilience in the financial sector.

4. Discussion

4.1. Advantages of Risk-Based Supervision

The central advantage of RBS lies in its proportionality and efficiency. By differentiating banks according to size, complexity, and risk exposure, regulators can avoid a "one-size-fits-all" approach, allowing smaller community banks to face less intrusive supervision while larger institutions with systemic implications receive more attention [17]. This targeted allocation improves regulatory effectiveness and ensures better use of supervisory resources. Moreover, RBS encourages banks to internalize strong risk management cultures, aligning their incentives with broader financial stability goals [18].

4.2. Challenges and Limitations in U.S. Implementation

Despite its advantages, RBS is not without shortcomings. One major concern is the heavy reliance on supervisory judgment, which can introduce subjectivity and inconsistency across agencies [19]. Another limitation lies in resource intensity: effective RBS requires highly trained supervisors capable of interpreting complex risk models and financial disclosures. Additionally, the

© 2025 by the author(s). Distributed under a Creative Commons CC BY license.

Preprints.org (www.preprints.org) | NOT PEER-REVIEWED | Posted: 3 October 2025 doi:10.20944/preprints202510.0244.v1

fragmented U.S. regulatory structure with overlapping roles among the Federal Reserve, OCC, FDIC, and state regulators creates coordination challenges that can dilute supervisory effectiveness [20].

4.3. Role of Technology, Data Analytics, and AI in Modern Oversight

Modern supervisory frameworks increasingly rely on advanced technologies, such as machine learning and artificial intelligence, to identify vulnerabilities in real-time. Supervisory technology ("suptech") tools allow regulators to process vast quantities of transaction data, flagging unusual patterns that may indicate compliance failures or hidden risks [9]. Adaptive intelligence models, particularly reinforcement learning approaches, are also emerging as powerful tools for optimizing oversight in complex and dynamic financial environments. Such models can adjust supervisory strategies in response to shifting risk profiles, thereby enhancing the predictive capacity of risk-based supervision [2].

4.4. Implications for Banking Stability and Public Trust

By prioritizing risk sensitivity and proportionality, RBS strengthens both systemic stability and public confidence in the financial system. Effective supervision mitigates the likelihood of institutional failures that could trigger widespread economic disruption. Furthermore, transparent risk-based approaches reinforce accountability and trust, assuring the public that regulators are proactively addressing vulnerabilities [23].

5. Conclusions

This paper has examined the evolution and application of Risk-Based Supervision (RBS) in the United States. Unlike the compliance-heavy frameworks of the past, RBS represents a forward-looking, proportional, and dynamic method of oversight. It prioritizes key risk domains such as credit, market, operational, and liquidity exposures, enabling regulators to allocate resources where they are most needed. The U.S. experience demonstrates both the strengths and challenges of this model. On the one hand, RBS has enhanced supervisory efficiency, fostered stronger risk management practices in banks, and contributed to greater resilience in the financial system.

On the other hand, its reliance on subjective judgment, high resource demands, and fragmented regulatory structure poses persistent limitations. Looking ahead, the incorporation of advanced data analytics, AI, and machine learning will play a decisive role in shaping the future of RBS. For policymakers, the challenge lies in ensuring these tools complement, not replace, human judgment. Overall, a balanced approach that combines technological innovation with sound supervisory expertise will be essential to strengthening banking stability and maintaining public trust in the U.S. financial system.

Funding: This research received no external funding.

Institutional Review Board Statement: Not applicable.

Informed Consent Statement: Not applicable.

Data Availability Statement: No new data were created or analyzed in this study. Data sharing does not apply to this article.

Conflicts of Interest: The author declares no conflict of interest.

References

1. Koffi, B. A. (2024). Strengthening financial risk governance and compliance in the US: a roadmap for ensuring economic stability. *The Edge Review Journal*, 1(10).
2. Basel Committee on Banking Supervision (1999). *Core Principles for Effective Banking Supervision*. Bank for International Settlements.

© 2025 by the author(s). Distributed under a Creative Commons CC BY license.

Preprints.org (www.preprints.org) | NOT PEER-REVIEWED | Posted: 3 October 2025 doi:10.20944/preprints202510.0244.v1

3. Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation (FDIC) (2021). *Risk Management Manual of Examination Policies*. Washington, D.C.
4. Office of the Comptroller of the Currency (OCC). *Large Bank Supervision*. Comptroller's Handbook. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of the Treasury, 2019.
5. Federal Reserve Board (2005). SR 05-19: Interagency Policy Statement on the Internal Audit Function and Its Outsourcing. Washington, D.C.
6. Hirtle, B., Kovner, A., & Plosser, M. (2020). The impact of supervision on bank performance. *Journal of Financial Intermediation*, 41, 100812. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jfi.2019.100812
7. Tarullo, D. K. (2008). *Banking on Basel: The Future of International Financial Regulation*. Peterson Institute for International Economics.
8. Kupiec, P. H. (2020). Bank supervision and regulation: Are we safer now? *Journal of Financial Economic Policy*, 12(3), 359–378.
9. BCBS (2011). Principles for the Sound Management of Operational Risk. Bank for International Settlements.
10. Jagtiani, J., & Lemieux, C. (2019). The roles of big data and machine learning in bank supervision. *Journal of Economics and Business*, 100, 105–126. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jeconbus.2018.11.003
11. Cetorelli, N., Hirtle, B., Morgan, D. P., Peristiani, S., & Santos, J. A. C. (2007). Trends in financial market concentration and their implications for risk-based supervision. *Federal Reserve Bank of New York Economic Policy Review*, 13(1), 33–59.
12. BCBS (2012). Core Principles for Effective Banking Supervision: Revised Principles. Bank for International Settlements.
13. Carmassi, J., Dobler, M., & Schäfer, A. (2018). Supervisory stress tests: A frontier framework for risk-based supervision. *Journal of Banking Regulation*, 19(4), 287–301.
14. U.S. Department of the Treasury (2017). A Financial System That Creates Economic Opportunities: Banks and Credit Unions. Washington, D.C.
15. Goldstein, I., & Sapra, H. (2014). Should banks be diversified? Evidence from supervision and regulation. *Review of Finance*, 18(2), 633–675.
16. Herring, R. J. (2007). The rocky road to implementation of Basel II in the United States. *Atlantic Economic Journal*, 35, 411–429.
17. Flood, M. D., & Mendelowitz, A. I. (2013). The Federal Reserve's evolving role in bank supervision. *Journal of Economic Perspectives*, 27(4), 89–108.
18. Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System (2019). *Supervisory Guidance on Model Risk Management (SR 11-7)*. Washington, D.C.
19. IMF (2021). United States: Financial Sector Assessment Program—Technical Note on Banking Supervision. International Monetary Fund, Washington, D.C.

Disclaimer/Publisher's Note: The statements, opinions and data contained in all publications are solely those of the individual author(s) and contributor(s) and not of MDPI and/or the editor(s). MDPI and/or the editor(s) disclaim responsibility for any injury to people or property resulting from any ideas, methods, instructions or products referred to in the content.

© 2025 by the author(s). Distributed under a Creative Commons CC BY license.