Governance: Data & AI

Why one cannot exist without the other

by: Dr. Tommy Cooke, TommyCooke.com

Artificial intelligence (AI) is squarely embedded into everyday business operations across virtually every industry. It supports IT ticket triage, analytics, customer interactions, demand forecasting, document generation, decision support and beyond. For many managed service providers, office technology dealers and vendors, AI is no longer a future capability. It has galvanized into a present-day offering and it is here to stay.

Yet, as AI becomes operational, many organizations encounter a familiar question: How do we govern it responsibly? In answering that question, one point is often misunderstood and even entirely overlooked: AI governance does not start with AI. It starts with data governance.

While data governance and AI governance are often used interchangeably, they are not the same thing. They serve different purposes, address different risks and require different forms of oversight. But they are deeply connected. Understanding how they differ and how they work together is essential for any organization that wants to scale AI with confidence — let alone adopt it altogether.

Understanding the Difference

At a high level, data governance focuses on managing data while AI governance focuses on managing decisions made with that data. According to IBM (https://www.ibm.com/solutions/data-governance), data governance is a discipline that ensures data quality, security, availability and integrity through defined policies, standards and procedures. It clarifies ownership, controls access and establishes how data can be collected, stored, processed and used. Its goal is to ensure that data is trustworthy and usable for analytics, reporting and compliance purposes.

AI governance, by contrast, addresses how AI systems are designed, deployed, monitored and controlled. It introduces guardrails to ensure AI systems are safe, fair, transparent, accountable, and aligned with organizational and societal values. It focuses less on the data itself and more on how outputs are generated, interpreted and acted upon. Put simply: data governance is about trustworthy information while AI governance is about trustworthy decisions.

Why the Distinction Matters

The distinction matters because organizations often assume that if they are governing data, they are automatically governing AI. This is a risky assumption that creates blind spots.

Organizations may have well-documented data pipelines, strong privacy controls and clear ownership structures. And, yet, they still deploy AI systems that produce biased recommendations, opaque outcomes or poorly understood risks. Conversely, an organization may publish ethical AI principles or responsible AI statements while relying on fragmented, undocumented or low-quality data underneath. In both cases, something is missing.

AI systems do not operate independently. They learn from, rely on and amplify the data they are trained on. Without data governance, AI systems inherit and magnify existing issues such as biases, gaps, inconsistencies and errors. Without AI governance, organizations lack clarity around accountability, oversight and responsibility for how AI outputs are used.

A Foundation & a Structure

A useful way to think about this is the relationship between foundation and structure. Data governance is the foundation. It must be stable, documented and built to standard. If data is incomplete, biased, poorly classified or inconsistently managed, anything built on top of it will be unstable.

AI governance is the structure built on top of that foundation. It introduces decision rules, accountability mechanisms, ethical considerations and oversight processes. But structure alone does not make a building safe or usable if the foundation is cracked.

Both are necessary. One without the other creates risk. This is why research organizations such as ISG (https://research.

isg-one.com/analyst-perspectives/the-symbiotic-relationship-between-data-governance-and-ai) describe the relationship between data governance and AI governance as symbiotic. Issues that affect data — such as privacy, quality, ownership and compliance — inevitably affect AI outcomes. Attempting to introduce AI governance after AI systems are already deployed often results in delays, rework and stalled innovation.

> AI governance does not replace data governance, and data governance does not automatically govern AI. They are distinct, complementary and mutually reinforcing.

What This Means in Practice

For many organizations, especially MSPs and technology vendors, this relationship shows up operationally. A company may introduce AI-assisted analytics or automation only to discover that no one can clearly explain:

- Where the training data originated
- Whether personal or sensitive data were involved
- Who is responsible for reviewing outputs
- How bias or error is detected and handled

These gaps are not caused by AI itself. They are caused by misalignment between data governance and AI governance.

Strong data governance enables AI governance to function effectively. It clarifies data lineage, ownership, access controls and documentation, making it possible to audit, explain and manage AI behavior. At the same time, AI governance extends beyond data by introducing oversight for model performance, decision logic, human review processes and accountability structures.

Compliance Is Not the Finish Line

Regulatory requirements increasingly reflect this layered approach. For organizations operating in or serving the European Union (EU), for example, compliance often begins with the General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR) addressing data protection, privacy and automated decision-making provisions. The EU AI Act then builds on that foundation by introducing risk-based requirements for AI systems themselves.

This sequencing is not accidental. Data governance prepares organizations to meet AI governance obligations. However, compliance alone is not enough. Governance is not simply about avoiding penalties. It is about enabling sustainable, scalable AI use. Organizations with mature data governance programs are better positioned to expand AI adoption responsibly because they already understand their data environments.

The Business Advantage

There is also a strategic upside to getting this right. Data governance is sometimes viewed as restrictive, but when done well, it does the opposite. It enables broader, safer access to data by establishing clear rules and expectations. This, in turn, supports self-service analytics and faster, more effective decision-making.

AI governance also ensures that AI systems remain aligned with business goals, ethical standards and stakeholder expectations. Data governance teams monitor the integrity of inputs while AI governance teams evaluate outputs, decision logic and impact. Together, they create systems that are technically reliable and socially credible. Organizations that invest in both can innovate with confidence rather than hesitation.

Where Many Organizations Stand Today

Despite widespread AI adoption, governance maturity is remarkably uneven. Research suggests (https://www.precisely.com/data-integrity/2025-planning-insights-data-governance-adoption-has-risen-dramatically) that roughly three-quarters of organizations have some form of data governance in place. AI governance adoption, however, lags significantly even though most organizations are already using AI in some capacity.

This gap is risky. It creates situations where AI systems influence decisions without clear accountability, documentation or oversight. For service providers and vendors, this risk extends beyond internal operations to clients and customers that rely on those systems.

Why This Matters for Technology Providers

For MSPs, office technology dealers and vendors, governance is not just an internal concern. It is part of what you model for your clients. When you deploy AI without clarity around data and AI governance, you signal that governance is optional. When you demonstrate structured, transparent approaches, you set expectations for responsible use.

AI governance does not replace data governance and data governance does not automatically govern AI. They are distinct, complementary and mutually reinforcing. One ensures that information is reliable. The other ensures that decisions are defensible. ■

Dr. Tommy Cooke is a professional practice and ethics educator, researcher and consultant. He has worked with regulated professionals and organizations to help them navigate ethical, technological and compliance-related matters affecting their work and practice. Cooke's work focuses on professional judgement, confidentiality, accountability and public trust. He specializes in responsible digital practice involving data and AI, as well as communication and documentation coaching. Cooke can be reached at tommy@tommycooke.com. Visit www.tommycooke.com.