

AN INDUSTRY BRIEFING FROM GRAIL

What's Changing in Your Capital Story

Your next €5M of capital. The realised rate you sign. The thesis your partnership can recite back. Three questions that look separate, but are actually one. A briefing for CFOs at European regulatory and compliance advisory firms.

PREPARED BY

Johan Grönstedt · GRAIL

FOR

European mid-market
regulatory advisory finance
leaders

DATE

April 2026

Monday morning, partner meeting in three days

Every CFO at a European regulatory and compliance advisory firm has had the same Monday morning. Four things on the screen at 7:30. Your Q2 realised rate on CSRD engagements printed eight percent below the partnership plan, the second consecutive quarter below. Two senior CSRD specialists resigned nine days ago for the competitor boutique; three mandate renewals have gone quiet since. Your practice heads want headcount for twenty more specialists in the next quarter to serve the DORA and AI Act wave, and the business case reads "demand is real." Your sponsor's partner forwarded an article yesterday about a mid-sized Dutch competitor announcing an AI-native regulatory methodology platform with a reference PE sponsor. One line: "curious to hear your thinking before the partnership meeting on Friday."

You have signed twelve forecasts for this partnership. The pattern used to be simple. Hire into the demand. Hold the realised rate. Close the quarter clean. Keep the auditor happy. The partnership draws cleared. The business was understandable.

Something changed. Your realised rate is drifting on the mandates where RFP procurement teams are putting your hourly quote next to an AI-native competitor's fixed-fee quote. Your AI investment is routed through an internal-operations line because "that is what the practice heads approve." Your methodology sits in four senior people and a SharePoint drive nobody has indexed. Your Controllers are closing faster than they ever have, and the audit committee is asking how the firm that advises clients on AI governance applies the same rigour internally. The close is clean. The story underneath it is not.

The job has not changed in fifty years. The bar has risen on every measure of doing it, simultaneously, and the contradictions you have been navigating since you took the seat are suddenly re-openable. The CFOs who treat them as engineering problems run the offensive play. The ones who treat them as permanent trade-offs sign next year's staffing plan and watch the realised rate compress for the three years after that.

This briefing covers what is happening in your sector, what it means for the finance function you run, and the three questions your team should answer before the next partner meeting.

Regulatory advisory just lost the equation that priced the sector for a decade

CSRD, DORA, and the EU AI Act are the biggest non-discretionary regulatory demand wave in a decade. Your practice heads are right: the mandate book is real, the deadlines are hard, and the clients are paying. Every firm in your competitive set is staffing proportionally into it. That is the problem. The intelligence layer of regulatory advisory work, the monitoring, the synthesis, the gap analysis, the first-draft compliance documentation, is AI-executable now. Senior regulatory judgment is protected and appreciating. The mid-market firms that hire into the wave at the current leverage ratio build cost structures that competitors with AI-augmented delivery will undercut within two to three years, at the same moment the regulatory wave levels off.

The AI-native competitors are not waiting. One Dutch regulatory boutique announced a methodology platform last month with a PE sponsor. A DACH firm is quoting fixed-fee on CSRD engagements where peers quote hourly. A Nordic specialist is advertising two-week gap analyses that previously took six weeks. None of them are replacing senior specialists. All of them are moving senior specialists up the judgment stack and running the intelligence layer on AI. Their realised capacity per specialist is 2-3x the hourly-billable incumbent. Their price point on the same engagement is ten to twenty percent lower with a gross margin that is five points higher. Procurement teams at the larger corporate clients are already running comparison quotes.

Your client value is rising. Your realised rate is not. That is not a utilisation problem. It is a pricing and delivery-economics decision the finance seat has not yet claimed.

The sector is bifurcating underneath everyone at the same time. The demand floor protects revenue for the next 18-24 months. It does not protect margin beyond that. The firms that treat this as a hiring project build the cost base they will spend 2028 trying to unwind. The firms that treat it as a methodology-IP capital-allocation decision build the asset the next wave runs on. Both firms look healthy in 2026. One of them looks structurally different by 2028.

Your capital, your forecast, and your narrative are feeling it every day

Your capital allocation. Your practice heads' ask for twenty more specialists is sitting in the internal-operations plan. The request reads as a staffing line. Read it as the largest single capital-allocation decision you will make this decade. The CFOs who ship this as a capital line, with alternatives against methodology-IP build, boutique tuck-in, and partner distribution, keep authorship for the next ten years. The ones who approve the hiring plan because this year's utilisation math works hand authorship to the practice heads by default.

Your forecast. The partnership built the plan on ninety-three percent realised rate. Q2 printed at eighty-five. Your Head of FP&A cannot reconstruct the engagement-level story. The rate-pressure signal lives in lost-RFP debriefs. The methodology-leakage signal lives in unbilled partner-review hours. The retention signal lives in exit interviews HR has never systematised. The data architecture was built for monthly utilisation reconciliation, not continuous reconstruction of the rate story.

Your methodology asset. The partnership voted on a growth plan that assumed regulatory judgment stays in senior heads and transfers through apprenticeship. The AI-native competitors stopped assuming that. They are extracting judgment from their engagement archive, regulator correspondence, and senior-partner reviews into decision trees the next engagement runs on. Your firm's judgment sits in four senior people and a SharePoint drive nobody indexed.

Your specialist bench. The routine monitoring, obligation-mapping, and first-draft gap-analysis work that used to train a junior into a senior specialist is running on agents at your AI-native competitors. The Q1 bench-growth win is real. The 2031 senior-leverage math is exposed. The finance function that adds specialists without rebuilding the junior pathway has a cheaper mandate this year and a hollow senior bench in five.

Your economic thesis. Your partnership has asked for the strategy-offsite preview. Your sponsor's partner has asked for an AI-and-methodology note. Your chair has asked how the firm stays ahead of the AI-native boutiques. Three audiences, three documents, each drafted by a different team. None anchored in the same data. The CFOs pulling ahead write the thesis once and let the three audiences draw from one architecture.

You do not have three scorecard problems. You have one.

Your sector is bifurcating from below because AI-native entrants bring three pricing mechanics to the same mandate that you quote hourly, and their realised capacity per specialist is two to three times yours. Your finance function is stretched because the forecast credibility, the capital-allocation authority, and the economic thesis are each being managed as a separate programme, each drawing on a different data layer, each drafted by a different team. Same force, two altitudes. But there is a third thing happening that most regulatory advisory CFOs have not named yet, and it is the one that matters most.

Capital allocation without forecast credibility is guessing. Forecast credibility without a narrative is scorekeeping. A narrative without a methodology asset underneath it is marketing. The finance seat that holds all three holds one integrated asset, not three separate programmes. Every capital-allocation question, every forecast-credibility gap, every narrative weakness is a symptom of the same missing layer: the methodology-intelligence infrastructure that feeds all three from the same regulatory judgment, the same governance, the same discipline.

This is the research-database decision of this decade, re-shaped for regulatory advisory. Every CFO in your cohort is making it right now, whether they see it or not. The law firms that personally owned the 1993-1998 electronic-research decision kept realised-rate authority for the next twenty years and moved associates up the stack toward client judgment. The ones that treated it as a research-librarian tool stayed on billable-associate-hour economics and watched the firms that rebuilt delivery become category leaders. The shape is the same. The asset under decision is different. The cost of getting it wrong in 2026 is compressed into eighteen to twenty-four months instead of five years, because the regulatory wave will not wait.

You can tell which camp a firm is in from a single question. Can your team price, scope, and deliver the next CSRD mandate using the methodology asset your last ten engagements built, or does the tenth engagement still re-invent most of what the first one learned? Most mid-market regulatory advisory cannot. The ones that can have already made the shift.

You have twelve to eighteen months. The CSRD demand wave peaks before the AI Act high-risk enforcement wave tapers. The CFOs who own this decision personally run the offensive play. The ones who do not become the CFO the partnership replaces when the successor walks in with a thesis.

What most firms are doing. What the winners are doing instead.

Most CFOs are making the same four decisions. A smaller group is making different ones. Default looks cleaner for three quarters. Winners compound from month fifteen.

THE DEFAULT PATH

Hire proportionally into the wave

Approve the staffing plan. Bench grows with demand. Cost base climbs faster than realised rate holds.

Hold hourly rate, ship AI-assisted drafts

Specialist capacity rises 30-50 percent. Realised rate flat. Procurement walks to fixed-fee quotes.

Run the forecast on utilisation and bench

Monthly cadence. Three scenarios take a week. No engagement-level story until the post-mortem.

Grow the specialist bench for the Q1 win

Headcount up fifteen to twenty-five percent. Junior pathway on commoditising work. Senior-leverage math reverses by 2031.

THE WINNERS' PATH

Route the capital through the M&A hurdle

Alternatives against methodology-IP, tuck-in, partner distribution. One capital line, four options.

Migrate pricing to three mechanics

Fixed-fee on methodology work, outcome-share on deadlines, retainer on regulator-relationship.

Rebuild the forecast as a live driver graph

Five scenarios in an afternoon. Below-plan quarters produce the rate story in the same partner meeting.

Redesign the junior pathway around judgment

New hires pair with agents on interpretation, scenarios, client judgment. Bench compounds faster.

The default path shows a cleaner Q1. The winners' path has visible friction for three quarters and compounds from month fifteen. The difference is whether the CFO is authoring the capital or administering it.

Capital Allocation. Forecast Credibility. Value-Creation Narrative.

Three questions every regulatory advisory CFO is tracking. The first is the crux. The other two are how you earn the right to answer it.

01 · CAPITAL ALLOCATION

Where does the next €5M actually compound?

Billable-specialist hiring? Methodology-IP build? Boutique tuck-in of an AI-native competitor? Partner distribution? Today's default: the practice heads ask, the utilisation math justifies the hire, the staffing plan gets approved, and the capital-allocation authority slides toward a bench-growth decision. The question is not how many specialists. The question is whose decision this is.

02 · FORECAST CREDIBILITY

Why did the realised rate print below plan, and what is the engagement-level story?

Your partnership voted on ninety-three percent. Your firm is printing eighty-five. Your Head of FP&A cannot walk the audit committee through the engagement-level story because the rate-pressure signal sits in lost-RFP debriefs, the methodology-leakage signal sits in unbilled partner-review hours, and the competitive-pressure signal sits in RFP response rates nobody has systematised. Five scenarios used to take a week. They now run in an afternoon. The bar has risen on what credible means.

03 · VALUE-CREATION NARRATIVE

What does this firm do that compounds faster than peers?

Your partnership wants the strategy-offsite preview. Your sponsor wants the AI-and-methodology note. Your chair wants the how-we-stay-ahead answer. Three audiences, three documents, three teams, and the numbers underneath them do not match. The CFOs pulling ahead write the thesis once and refresh it continuously from the same methodology asset that runs the forecast. The three audiences read excerpts of the same document.

What the firms winning this play are actually doing

Four concrete moves any regulatory advisory CFO can start this quarter. Each addresses one lever. Pulled together, they become one methodology-intelligence asset the firm runs on.

1

Capital: route the methodology-IP decision through the M&A hurdle, not the staffing plan

Your practice heads' €3M hiring request is a capital-allocation decision. Treat it like one. Present the alternatives on one page: methodology-IP build, billable-specialist hiring, boutique tuck-in of an AI-native competitor, partner distribution. ROIC-scored against the same five-year horizon you use for acquisition diligence. Name what you are choosing not to fund to protect the thing you are funding. That is the sentence that keeps authorship at the seat.

2

Forecast: rebuild the forecast as a live driver graph, not a utilisation spreadsheet

Your rate-and-utilisation model should draw from live RFP pipeline, live regulator-deadline calendar, live engagement-mix scenarios, and live lost-bid debriefs, as one graph rather than five spreadsheets stitched together. Five scenarios compress from a week to an afternoon. Below-plan quarters produce the engagement-level story in the same partner meeting, not in the post-mortem. The forecast stops being a deliverable on a cadence and becomes a live artefact the CFO invests in continuously.

3

Pricing: migrate from one billing mechanic to three

Fixed-fee on methodology-delivered engagements where the AI-augmented delivery is the value. Outcome-share on regulatory-deadline compression work. Retainer on regulator-relationship and novel-interpretation work. The hourly billable rate holds the base. The three new mechanics convert the 30-50 percent senior-capacity uplift into realised-rate expansion on the accounts where AI-native competitors are already quoting. Finance authors the migration plan. Practice heads build against it.

4

Narrative: write the economic thesis once, refresh continuously

Three sentences on one page. What does this firm do that compounds faster than peers? What capital gets starved to protect it? What gets fed? Refresh the thesis continuously off the same methodology asset that runs the forecast. Sponsor-monthly excerpts the thesis. Audit-committee prep excerpts it. Strategy-offsite deck excerpts it. Three audiences, one artefact, four registers. The CFO authors the narrative. The partnership recites it back.

The only firm that joins capital authorship to working infrastructure

The regulatory advisory CFO has four places to go. None can do what we do.

The big finance transformation practices will sell a twelve-to-twenty-four-month close-acceleration programme staffed by a partner and analysts billing hours. Their audit and regulatory arms create conflict on the governance question. Their billable-day model requires selling substrate that agents commoditise. They ship a tighter close, not authorship of the moat.

The finance-tech vendors will sell platform licences and a long implementation. Your methodology asset has to sit on firm-owned infrastructure or it becomes a vendor asset at renegotiation. The CFO who builds methodology intelligence on a vendor stack builds it for the vendor.

The FP&A and planning specialists will sell a point solution for one layer: scenario planning, rate-and-utilisation forecasting, reporting. None can run the capital-allocation-plus-narrative conversation the seat requires.

The AI-native compliance and RegTech startups will sell substrate tooling at the intelligence layer where depreciation is steepest. Buying them outsources the methodology moat. A cleaner gap analysis, the same authorship gap.

The market offers four things you have already said no to. GRAIL is the fifth option.

WHAT YOU GET

Senior advisory that speaks partner-meeting, not deck-room

Working infrastructure your team uses the same week

Custom agents built on your engagement archive, your regulators, your data

The start of a methodology-intelligence layer your firm owns

No vendor lock-in at any phase of the engagement

WHY IT MATTERS

Founded by operators who have carried CFO-adjacent seats

Business first, technology second

Three weeks from first meeting to working infrastructure

Your team keeps the infrastructure, you own the IP

Every next step earned by what just shipped, never assumed

Three sessions with your finance leadership. Working infrastructure from week one.

We start with your finance leadership team because the change cannot outrun the team's personal understanding of what is possible. Three workshops. Each delivers standalone value. Each earns the right to the next.

WORKSHOP 01

How to think

Walk through what is happening in your sector and inside your finance function. Build the first piece of infrastructure in the room: a live driver agent on your real rate-and-utilisation model, running against your real RFP pipeline, regulator-deadline calendar, and engagement-mix data. Your leadership team leaves with a shared view of what to do next and the first piece of working infrastructure already in their hands.

WORKSHOP 02

Your finance infrastructure

A half-day build. Your Controller, Head of FP&A, Treasurer, and Head of IR each leave with five to ten pieces of working infrastructure tuned to their function. Close-cycle agents. Continuous scenario generation. Covenant-monitoring intelligence. Partner-meeting narrative drafting. Infrastructure your team is using the same week, not decks about infrastructure.

WORKSHOP 03

Ready to run

Refined infrastructure based on real use. The rollout plan to the wider finance organisation. The capital-allocation-thesis document for the next partnership meeting. The pricing-migration roadmap for the practice heads. And the partnership and sponsor conversation with numbers they can check: ROIC alternatives, scenario ranges, methodology-asset measurement.

Three weeks. No IT project. No partnership approval needed to start. The infrastructure your finance function is already running on when we finish.

For your next partner meeting

The questions where your finance leadership cannot agree are the ones worth an hour on the agenda.

Your practice heads want €3M for twenty more specialists. Is it in the internal-operations plan, or on the capital page as one option among four?

Your partnership voted on a ninety-three percent realised-rate plan. Your print is eighty-five. Can your team walk the audit committee through the engagement-level story in the same meeting, or does it take a post-mortem?

Your AI-native competitors are quoting on two or three pricing mechanics. You are on one. What is the twelve-month plan to migrate, and who on your team is authoring it?

Your sponsor, your chair, and your managing partner have each asked for a different AI-and-methodology document. Are they excerpting the same thesis, or are three teams drafting documents that do not reconcile?

Of the junior consultants you are hiring to serve the CSRD wave this year, how many are being trained on regulatory interpretation from day one, and how many are still being trained on work agents now do?

If any of these produces a disagreement in your finance leadership, that is the conversation worth having before the partnership asks.

IN THIS SERIES

There's a version of this briefing for every seat at the table.

GRAIL has produced industry briefings calibrated to the specific reality of each C-suite role.

CEO

Revenue. Margin. Valuation.

Three numbers your board reads. AI is rewriting all three in your industry.

CFO

▶ YOU ARE READING

Capital. Forecast. Story.

What you allocate this year is the story your board reads next year.

COO

Cheaper. Better. Faster.

The triple threat that used to be a tradeoff is now table stakes.

CHRO

Capacity. Capability. Promise.

The biggest talent transition of a career. Compete on capacity, not headcount.

CPTO

Moat. Speed. Allocation.

The platform moat that survives 2028 is being chosen this year.

CCO

Margin. Pace. Position.

The whole GTM playbook is being rewritten in real time, across every commercial team at once.

Visit grail.works for the full series.

GRAIL

An AI-native management consultancy helping European mid-market leadership teams figure out what fundamentally changes about their business as AI enters their industry.

www.grail.works