2025

The Global State of Data Trust

Navigating Inefficiency and Insecurity in the AI Era the Convergence of Funding Gaps, Systemic Inequity, and an Uncertain Future

A Strategic Analysis by

The Global Trust Deficit: A Fractured Foundation for the Digital Enterprise

The successful deployment of data-driven strategies and artificial intelligence hinges not merely on technological prowess, but on a foundation of trust. However, global enterprises are attempting to build this digital future on a deeply fractured base. An analysis of the global landscape reveals a pervasive trust deficit, characterized by societal polarization, economic anxiety, and a profound disconnect between corporate leadership and their stakeholders. Understanding this fragile context is the prerequisite to addressing the more tangible, technical challenges of data management.

A Polarized World: The Erosion of Institutional Trust

The 2023 Edelman Trust Barometer, a comprehensive survey of over 32,000 respondents across 28 countries, paints a grim picture of a world grappling with deepening divisions and a collapse in optimism.[1] This environment is dangerously polarized, a condition fueled by a potent combination of widespread economic anxiety, the rampant spread of disinformation, and a perceived failure of leadership across traditional societal institutions like government and media. A majority of the global population, 53%, now believes their countries are more divided today than in the past, a sentiment that signifies a weakening of the social fabric essential for cohesive progress.

This division is exacerbated by a stark decline in economic hope. Globally, only 40% of respondents believe they and their families will be better off in five years - a precipitous 10-point drop from 2022.[1] This collapse in economic optimism creates a high-stakes, high-anxiety environment where every corporate action, particularly those involving sensitive data and transformative technologies like AI, is subjected to intense scrutiny and skepticism.

The 2024 Edelman report extends this analysis, identifying a "collision of trust, innovation, and politics" as a defining challenge of the current era.[2] There is a growing, palpable worry over broad societal threats, coupled with a pervasive feeling that establishment leaders are actively misleading the public. This generalized skepticism toward authority figures does not stop at the company door; it directly influences how employees, consumers, and regulators perceive executive mandates, corporate data practices, and the introduction of new technologies.

Business as the Last Bastion of Trust

In this landscape of declining faith in government and media, the private sector has emerged as a unique and pivotal institution. According to the 2023 Edelman survey, business is the only institution globally that is viewed as being both competent and ethical.[1] Trust in business stands at 62% globally, a figure that is a significant 11 points higher than trust in government, which languishes at 51%.[1]

This positioning confers upon the corporate world both a unique opportunity and an immense burden. Society now expects business to step into the leadership void left by other institutions. CEOs are no longer seen merely as heads of commercial enterprises; they are now obligated to play a role in improving economic optimism, holding divisive forces accountable for their actions, and serving as a source of reliable, truthful information. This elevated societal role means that a company's internal data practices are no longer a simple operational detail. They have become a public testament to its commitment to ethics, transparency, and truth. A failure in data governance is now tantamount to a failure in public leadership. This elevates the roles of the Chief Data Officer (CDO) and Chief Information Security Officer (CISO) from purely technical functions to critical custodians of the corporate brand and its social contract.

The Great Disconnect: Unpacking the Executive Trust Gap

While the institution of "business" enjoys a relatively high level of public trust, a critical and widening disconnect exists within the walls of individual corporations. This "trust gap" reveals a dangerous blind spot among senior executives, who consistently and significantly overestimate the level of trust they command from their most important stakeholders: customers and employees.

PwC's 2024 Trust Survey lays this disconnect bare with startling clarity. An overwhelming 90% of business executives believe that customers have a high degree of trust in their companies. The reality is starkly different: only 30% of consumers actually do.[3] This 60-percentage-point chasm represents a fundamental

misunderstanding of the customer relationship and has widened from the 57-point gaps observed in both 2022 and 2023, indicating the problem is worsening.[3] A similar, and equally concerning, gap exists with the internal workforce. While 86% of executives believe that employee trust in their organization is high, only 67% of employees report that they highly trust their employer.[3] This 18-point gap has also widened in recent years, signaling a growing alienation between leadership and the workforce responsible for executing strategic initiatives. This erosion of trust is particularly acute at the managerial level. Separate research shows that employee trust in their direct managers has plummeted from 46% in 2022 to a mere 29% in 2024.

The root of this executive overconfidence appears to be a failure in measurement and perception. PwC's analysis suggests that companies often lack the internal structures and robust metrics needed to consistently and accurately gauge trust levels.[3] Many executives rely on subjective proxy metrics, such as employee satisfaction or customer retention rates. While related to trust, these indicators are insufficient and fail to capture the full spectrum of stakeholder sentiment, leading to a dangerously optimistic and inaccurate self-assessment.

This finding is reinforced by Deloitte's 2024 research, which establishes a direct link between trust and the perception of responsible data handling. The study found that when workers are confident that their organization is using their personal data responsibly, their trust in the business increases by 35%.[4] However, it also revealed that only 37% of workers are actually "very confident" in their company's data practices.[4] This demonstrates that the trust gap is not an abstract cultural issue; it is directly tied to the tangible practices of data governance and security.

This combination of declining societal trust and a specific, measurable trust gap within corporations creates an invisible but potent "trust tax" on all digital transformation efforts. Every new data-sharing protocol, every analytics platform rollout, and every AI-driven decision is evaluated by employees and customers through a lens of inherent skepticism. This tax manifests as slower technology adoption, active resistance to data sharing as employees hoard information in departmental silos, and a persistent questioning of the validity of insights generated by corporate systems. The failure to recognize that digital transformation is as much a political and cultural challenge as it is a technical one is a primary reason why, as McKinsey reports, 70% of such initiatives ultimately fail due to employee resistance.[5]

The Trillion-Dollar Drag: Quantifying the Global Economic Cost of Data Dysfunction

The abstract crisis of trust translates into a concrete and staggering economic burden. Systemic data mismanagement - spanning poor data quality, fragmented data silos, uncontrolled application sprawl, and inefficient digital workflows - imposes a multi-trillion-dollar drag on the global economy. This section quantifies the financial damage, aggregating data from leading global analyst firms to create a clear business case for addressing the foundational flaws in how organizations manage their most critical asset.

The Foundational Failure: The Staggering Cost of Poor Data Quality

The most fundamental issue plaguing data-driven initiatives is the quality of the data itself. Research from Gartner consistently finds that poor data quality costs the average organization between $12.9 million and $15 million annually in wasted resources, operational inefficiencies, and missed opportunities.[6] This is not a peripheral problem affecting a few laggards; it is a systemic crisis. A striking 77% of organizations rate the quality of their own data as average or worse, a figure that represents an 11-point decline from the previous year, suggesting the problem is escalating despite increased corporate focus on data.[7] The situation is so dire that, according to Harvard Business Review, a mere 3% of companies' data meets even basic quality standards.[8]

The macroeconomic impact of this foundational failure is immense. A landmark but still widely cited IBM study estimated that poor data quality costs the U.S. economy alone approximately $3.1 trillion per year.[9] Considering the exponential growth of the global digital economy since that study, the current worldwide figure is undoubtedly far higher. More recent, granular data from Forrester's 2023 Data Culture and Literacy Survey underscores the scale of the losses at the firm level: more than a quarter of data and analytics professionals report that their organizations lose over $5 million annually due to poor data quality, with a significant 7% reporting annual losses of $25 million or more.

The Structural Scourge: Data Silos and the Cost of Fragmentation

Compounding the issue of poor quality is the structural problem of data silos - isolated pockets of information trapped within disconnected departmental systems, applications, or geographic locations. This fragmentation prevents a holistic view of the business and creates massive inefficiencies. The global economic cost of these data silos is estimated to be a staggering $3.1 trillion annually, according to research from IDC and analysis by JP Morgan.[10]

This structural fragmentation has a direct and severe impact on both productivity and revenue. Further research from IDC highlights that the operational inefficiencies stemming from data silos can lead to revenue losses of as much as 30%.[11] The cost in human capital is equally stark, with employees wasting an average of 12 hours per week—equivalent to more than one and a half workdays - simply searching for information scattered across these disconnected systems.[12]

Beyond inefficiency, data silos create significant and costly security vulnerabilities. The global average cost of a single data breach now stands between $4.35 million and $4.44 million.[13] Siloed data architectures exacerbate this risk by increasing the attack surface, hindering the detection of threats, and complicating recovery efforts. IBM's 2023 Cost of a Data Breach Report quantifies this effect, finding that organizations with highly integrated security tools and data systems experienced breach costs that were, on average, $1.25 million lower than their counterparts with siloed approaches.

The Modern Multiplier: SaaS Sprawl and Redundancy

The traditional image of a data silo as a legacy, on-premise mainframe is outdated. The new, and far more prolific, engine of data fragmentation is the uncontrolled proliferation of Software-as-a-Service (SaaS) applications. This "SaaS sprawl" is creating thousands of new, cloud-based mini-silos at an unprecedented rate. While estimates vary across different research methodologies, they all point to a massive and largely unmanaged portfolio of applications within the average enterprise. Recent figures for 2023-2024 suggest the average company uses anywhere from 106 to 371 SaaS applications. This number explodes with organizational scale. Large enterprises, defined as those with more than 2,000 to 10,000 employees, now use an average of 410 to 473 distinct SaaS applications.

This chaotic expansion is fueled by decentralized procurement, a model where individual employees or departments can easily acquire new tools without central oversight. The result is that IT departments often manage only a small fraction of the total application portfolio - in some cases, as little as 16% of the applications and 26% of the total spend. This lack of governance leads to rampant redundancy and colossal financial waste. Data from SaaS management firm Zylo shows that the average company now spends $49 million annually on SaaS. However, a shocking 52.7% of all purchased SaaS licenses go unused within a 30-day period, which translates directly to an average of $21 million in wasted spending per company, per year.[14] This waste is driven by functional overlap; the average company has nearly 10 different project management applications and over 14 separate online training platforms in its portfolio. This is not just a cost management failure; it is the primary mechanism creating the next generation of data silos, undermining the very connectivity that digital transformation aims to achieve.

The Operational Drag: Digital Friction and Inefficient Workflows

The cumulative effect of poor-quality data, structural silos, and rampant application sprawl is a phenomenon known as "digital friction." This manifests as inefficient, broken, and manual digital workflows that act as a persistent drag on revenue and productivity. According to research from IDC, these process inefficiencies can cause companies to lose 20% to 30% of their annual revenue.[11]

The opportunity cost of failing to address this friction is enormous. Studies on the impact of workflow automation demonstrate massive potential returns. A Forrester Total Economic Impact study on a single automation platform calculated a 248% three-year return on investment for a composite enterprise.[15] Other analyses show that successful automation projects yield average productivity increases of 25-30% and reduce data processing errors by 40-75% when compared to manual processes.

These economic costs are not independent variables; they compound one another in a destructive feedback loop. The total drag on an enterprise is not the sum of these individual costs, but their product. For instance, the 12 hours per week that employees spend searching for siloed data is made even less productive because the data they eventually find is of poor quality, forcing them to spend additional time on manual validation and correction. This, in turn, contributes directly to the 20-30% of revenue lost to overall workflow inefficiency. This creates a vicious cycle of escalating waste, where SaaS sprawl creates more silos, which degrades data quality, which necessitates inefficient manual workflows, which encourages employees to adopt yet another "quick-fix" SaaS tool, starting the cycle anew.

Table 1: The Quantifiable Cost of Data Dysfunction

Category	Key Metric	Value	Source(s)
Poor Data Quality	Average Annual Cost Per Organization	$12.9M - $15M	Gartner[6]
	Estimated Annual Cost to U.S. Economy	$3.1 Trillion	IBM[9]
Data Silos	Estimated Global Annual Economic Cost	$3.1 Trillion	IDC[10]
	Potential Annual Revenue Loss	Up to 30%	IDC[11]
SaaS Sprawl	Average Annual Wasted Spend Per Company	$21 Million	Zylo[14]
Inefficient Workflows	Estimated Annual Revenue Lost	20-30%	IDC[11]

The Executive's Dilemma: The Chasm Between Data Aspiration and Decision-Making Reality

Despite colossal investments in technology and a near-universal corporate mandate to become "data-driven," a deep chasm persists between this aspiration and the daily reality of executive decision-making. This section diagnoses the critical human, psychological, and cultural factors that perpetuate data dysfunction. It reveals a paradox at the heart of modern leadership: executives are demanding data-centric cultures while simultaneously exhibiting a profound distrust in their own organization's data, frequently reverting to intuition. This leadership behavior creates a credibility gap that paralyzes data-driven progress from the top down.

The Data Deluge and Decision Paralysis

The promise of big data was empowerment; the reality for many leaders is paralysis. Far from clarifying decisions, the sheer volume and velocity of information are often crippling. A global study by Oracle revealed a startling admission from business leaders: 72% acknowledged that the overwhelming volume of data, combined with their lack of trust in it, has at times stopped them from making any decision at all.[16] This phenomenon, termed "decision distress," is now a widespread affliction in the C-suite. Between 85% and 87% of leaders globally admit to suffering from it, expressing regret, guilt, or persistent doubt about a significant decision made in the past year.[16] The problem has become so acute that in one survey, 70% of business leaders stated they would prefer a robot to make their decisions for them, presumably to escape the anxiety and uncertainty.[16]

The root cause is an unmanageable level of information overload. In a Qualtrics study, 56% of executives reported feeling overwhelmed by fragmented and disparate data sources.[17] This sentiment is echoed in another survey where 92% of business leaders asserted that the ever-increasing number of data sources has actively limited their organization's progress and success.[16]

The Crisis of Confidence: Widespread Distrust in Corporate Data

The core of the executive dilemma is not just the volume of data, but a profound and worsening crisis of confidence in its veracity. According to the 2025 Data Integrity Trends and Insights report from Precisely, a staggering 67% of organizations do not completely trust the data they rely on for their most critical decisions.[7]

This marks a significant erosion of trust, up from 55% in 2023, indicating that despite heavy investment in data platforms, the underlying confidence is deteriorating.

This distrust is not confined to the executive suite; it permeates the entire organization. Only 46% of frontline data and analytics professionals report having high trust in the data they are expected to use for decision-making. A survey of global executives by Teradata found that four in ten do not trust that their company's data is ready to achieve accurate outcomes from AI initiatives.[18] This widespread skepticism appears to be well-founded. A study by SoftServe found that 58% of business leaders openly acknowledge that key business decisions are already being made based on data they know to be inaccurate or inconsistent.[19] Further compounding the issue, 65% of these same leaders believe that no single person or function within their organization truly understands the full scope of the data being collected and how to access it.[19]

The Retreat to Intuition: Why "Gut Feel" Still Trumps Data

Faced with a deluge of data they find both overwhelming and untrustworthy, executives are defaulting to their oldest and most familiar tool: intuition. A compelling body of research shows that when it comes to high-stakes decisions, "gut feel" consistently overrides data-driven analysis in the C-suite. One survey found that 62% of executives still rely primarily on their experience and intuition over data when making decisions.[20] Other studies, including a global CEO survey from KPMG, place this figure as high as two-thirds of chief executives.[20]

This retreat from data is driven by a confluence of factors:

- **Lack of Trust:** As established, leaders fundamentally doubt the quality and accuracy of the data presented to them. 42% of C-suite executives explicitly cite doubts about data accuracy as a reason for ignoring it.
- **Lack of Skills and Comfort:** There is a significant comfort and competency gap. A Deloitte survey found that 67% of executives are "not comfortable" accessing or using data from advanced analytics systems. Only 30% of business leaders feel they possess the necessary analytics background to effectively use the data available to them.
- **Lack of Relevance and Timeliness:** The insights generated are often not fit for purpose. Executives complain that data is not available when needed or that dashboards and reports do not relate directly to the specific, urgent decisions they face.
- **Psychology and Culture:** Deep-seated cultural and psychological factors are also at play. In one study, 42% of executives who ignored data did so because they believed their intuition is what sets their decisions apart and provides a competitive edge. An additional 35% admitted they rely on gut feel simply "because they're used to doing things their own way".

This executive behavior creates a self-perpetuating cycle of distrust that systematically undermines data initiatives. When leaders are presented with data they don't trust, they override it with intuition. If that decision proves successful, it reinforces the belief that data is secondary to experience, thereby devaluing the work of data and analytics teams. This devaluation makes it exceedingly difficult for data leaders to secure the necessary budget and executive sponsorship for the very data governance and quality programs that would improve the data's trustworthiness in the first place. The lack of investment ensures data quality remains poor, which in turn justifies the executives' initial distrust and continued reliance on intuition. The organization becomes culturally and financially trapped in a state of low data maturity, a cycle orchestrated and perpetuated from the very top.

This dynamic also exposes a "data literacy" façade in many organizations. While companies roll out training programs to upskill their workforce, the core issue is often not a lack of employee skills but a lack of leadership credibility. Employees are being asked to operate in a data-driven manner while observing their own leaders disregard data in favor of personal judgment or, as 74% of employees believe, the "highest paid person's opinion". This creates a profound credibility gap. The official corporate message is "use data," but the observed and rewarded behavior is "align with the leader's gut feel." Consequently, data literacy initiatives fail because the organizational culture, set by leadership, implicitly punishes true data-driven inquiry, especially when it challenges

the status quo. The problem is not a skills gap at the bottom of the hierarchy; it is a behavior and credibility gap at the top.

Table 2: The Executive Trust Chasm

Executive Perception / Aspiration	Global Reality
"93% of executives agree building trust improves the bottom line."[3]	"Trust in managers has dropped to 29%."
"90% of executives think customers highly trust them."[3]	"Only 30% of customers actually do."[3]
"86% of executives think employees highly trust them."[3]	"Only 67% of employees actually do."[3]
"76% of organizations say data-driven decision-making is a top goal."[7]	"67% of organizations don't completely trust their data for decisions."[7]
	"62% of executives still rely on gut feel over data."[20]

The AI Imperative Under Threat: How Foundational Flaws Derail Innovation

Artificial Intelligence, particularly Generative AI, has shifted from a futuristic concept to a present-day strategic imperative for global enterprises. However, the widespread rush to deploy AI is colliding with the deep-seated, systemic issues of data dysfunction and cultural distrust. AI is not merely a technological implementation; it is the ultimate stress test of an organization's data foundation, its architectural integrity, and its culture of trust. The prevalent failure to generate significant return on investment from AI is a direct and predictable consequence of these unaddressed foundational flaws.

The C-Suite's AI Mandate

Across the globe, there is an overwhelming consensus within the C-suite that AI will be profoundly transformational. A 2025 Thomson Reuters survey of corporate executives across eight countries found that 85% believe AI will have a high or transformational impact on their businesses over the next five years. This sentiment is echoed in PwC's 27th Annual Global CEO Survey, where 70% of CEOs expect Generative AI to significantly change the way their company creates, delivers, and captures value within the next three years. This belief is translating into significant investment. A 2024 KPMG survey of over 1,300 corporate leaders revealed that 64% identified AI as their top investment priority, regardless of prevailing economic conditions. CEOs are optimistic about the near-term benefits, with a majority expecting AI to increase profitability and improve operational efficiency.

This strategic pivot towards AI is not driven by choice, but by a sense of existential urgency. A striking four in ten global CEOs believe their company will no longer be economically viable in a decade if it continues on its current path, with rapid technological change being a primary driver of this pressure. The mandate from the top is clear: adopt AI or risk obsolescence.

"Garbage In, Gospel Out": Why AI Initiatives Fail

Despite the massive capital allocation and strategic urgency, a vast number of AI initiatives are failing to deliver on their promise. Gartner forecasts a sobering reality: 80% of AI projects will fail to scale organization-wide, a failure attributed directly to poor data quality, incomplete data lineage, and a lack of robust data governance. The data unequivocally shows that the foundational data layer in most organizations is simply not ready for the demands of AI.

A global survey conducted by Precisely in partnership with Drexel University found that while 60% of organizations now consider AI a key influence on their data programs, a mere 12% report that their data is of sufficient quality and accessibility for effective AI implementation.[7] When data leaders are asked to identify the primary obstacles to AI readiness, data-related issues dominate. An Informatica survey found that poor data quality was the top challenge for 42% of leaders, followed closely by data privacy and protection concerns at 40%. The Precisely report is even more direct, finding that 62% of organizations cite a lack of data governance as the single greatest impediment to their AI initiatives.

This leads to a critical crisis of trust in the AI outputs themselves. The number one barrier to AI adoption, cited by 45% of respondents in one study, is concern over the accuracy or bias of the underlying data. This is the "Garbage In, Gospel Out" dilemma: if the data used to train an AI model is flawed, incomplete, or biased, the model's output will inevitably be flawed and biased as well. However, this output is often delivered with an aura of technological certainty, making it dangerously misleading and eroding trust in the very systems meant to enhance decision-making.

The Ripple Effect: How Data Silos and Sprawl Cripple AI

Effective AI models, especially large language models, are voracious consumers of data, requiring vast, diverse, and integrated datasets to be trained and fine-tuned effectively. The pervasive problems of data silos and SaaS sprawl, as detailed previously, directly sabotage this fundamental requirement. Fragmented data sources trapped in disconnected systems significantly delay model training, hinder the integration of new data, and prevent the creation of a comprehensive enterprise knowledge base.

The scale of this fragmentation is immense. MuleSoft's 2025 Connectivity Benchmark reveals that the average organization now runs 897 distinct applications, yet only 29% of these applications are integrated with one another. This massive integration gap makes it nearly impossible to create the unified, 360-degree data views - such as a complete customer profile or a holistic supply chain model - that are essential for developing sophisticated and accurate AI capabilities.

The impact of this poor connectivity on AI return on investment is not theoretical; it is direct and measurable. The same research found that companies with strong, well-integrated data ecosystems achieve an average 10.3x ROI from their AI initiatives. In stark contrast, companies with poor connectivity and fragmented data see their returns plummet to just 3.7x.

For years, many organizations have accumulated significant "technical debt" by consistently deferring necessary investments in data governance, architectural modernization, data quality improvement, and system integration. This was often viewed as a chronic but manageable operational cost. The sudden strategic imperative of AI, however, has acted as a high-stakes "margin call" on this accumulated debt. It is no longer possible to generate competitive value from advanced analytics and AI without a solid, trustworthy data foundation. The data clearly shows that companies are now hitting a wall, unable to deploy AI effectively precisely because of these long-neglected foundational issues. AI has thus transformed data quality and governance from a "should-do" operational task into a "must-do" strategic enabler. The cost of poor data is no longer measured just in the millions of dollars lost to current inefficiencies; it is now measured in the billions of dollars of future value from AI that cannot be realized because the bill for years of foundational neglect has finally come due.

This situation creates a debilitating "AI Trust Paradox" within organizations. The same leadership teams that exhibit a profound distrust of their own internal data and prefer to rely on intuition are simultaneously mandating the rapid, enterprise-wide adoption of AI. They are asking their organizations to place their faith in the outputs of the most complex, opaque, data-driven systems ever created, while the leaders themselves do not trust a basic sales report. This is a fundamental and unsustainable contradiction in strategy. Employees and middle managers, who are acutely aware of the underlying data's flaws and their leaders' own skepticism, will rightly and logically distrust the AI's recommendations. This will inevitably lead to low adoption rates, frequent manual overrides of AI-driven suggestions, and an ultimate failure to achieve the promised ROI. This failure will then reinforce a cynical belief that "AI doesn't work here," when the true failure was never the technology itself, but the lack of a trustworthy data foundation and a culture of data confidence to support it. To trust AI, an organization must first trust its data - a critical step that most have yet to take.

Table 3: Top Obstacles to Enterprise AI Adoption

Rank	Obstacle to Enterprise AI Adoption	Key Statistic(s)	Source(s)
1	Data Quality & Governance	"Lack of data quality" (42%) and "lack of data governance" (62%) are top inhibitors. Only 12% of data is AI-ready.	Informatica, Precisely[7]
2	Skills Gap & Resources	"Lack of AI skills and training" (60%) and "shortage of skills/resources" (42%) are major challenges.	Precisely[7]
3	Data Privacy & Security	"Data privacy and protection concerns" (40%) and "cybersecurity risks" are top-of-mind.	Informatica, PwC[3]
4	Leadership & Strategy	"Lack of leadership support" and "difficulty justifying ROI" are cited as key internal barriers.	Informatica
5	Integration & Silos	"Integration complexity with existing systems" (41%) prevents the creation of unified datasets.	Qualtrics[17]

Charting the Course for 2025 and Beyond: A Strategic Framework for the Resilient, Data-Driven Enterprise

Navigating the complex global landscape of data distrust and dysfunction requires more than isolated technological fixes. It demands a holistic, integrated strategic framework that addresses technology, process, and culture in unison. The following framework synthesizes forward-looking recommendations from leading global consultancies to provide an actionable roadmap for C-suite leaders. The objective is to move from a reactive posture of fixing problems to a proactive state of building a resilient, continuously adapting, data-driven enterprise.

Foundational Imperative: Establishing Enterprise-Wide Data Integrity

The first and most critical step is a fundamental shift in mindset: data must be treated as a core strategic asset, not as a mere byproduct of IT operations. This requires the formal adoption of a "data-as-a-product" operating model. In this model, critical datasets are managed like commercial products, with designated owners, clear quality standards, service-level agreements, and a design focused on meeting the needs of internal "consumers" of that data.

This model cannot succeed without a massive investment in and elevation of the data governance function. Recognizing its criticality, organizations are rapidly increasing their focus here, with adoption of formal data governance programs rising from 60% to 71% in a single year. The returns are clear: organizations with mature governance programs report 58% better data quality, 58% improved analytics, and 36% faster access to relevant data. Data governance must become a dominant and recurring conversation in the C-suite.

This governance must be paired with a robust, enterprise-wide data quality framework. This framework should establish clear standards for data accuracy, completeness, consistency, and timeliness. Crucially, it must be supported by investment in modern, automated tools for data profiling, cleansing, and continuous monitoring. Manual data quality processes are no longer viable at scale; yet, only 14% of organizations have fully automated these processes, highlighting a significant and urgent opportunity for improvement.

Architectural Vision: Building the Integrated Data Ecosystem

To overcome the trillion-dollar drag of fragmentation, organizations must commit to aggressively dismantling data silos. This requires a clear architectural vision that moves beyond the tangled web of legacy systems and the

chaotic SaaS landscape. The goal is to build a unified "data fabric" or a cloud-native data platform that makes data discoverable and accessible to authorized users, regardless of where it physically resides.

Such an architecture is the technical enabler for many of the characteristics of a future-ready enterprise. It facilitates the real-time data processing and delivery necessary for agile decision-making and responsive operations. A modern, flexible data architecture allows for the creation of sophisticated data products, such as a "Customer 360" view, which are foundational for personalization and advanced AI applications. Furthermore, this integrated approach positions the organization to participate in the broader "data economy." By leveraging modern data-sharing platforms and protocols, companies can begin to collaborate both internally across business units and externally with partners, suppliers, and even competitors in secure data ecosystems. This allows for the pooling of anonymized data to generate more valuable, industry-level insights that no single company could produce on its own.

The Human Element: Cultivating a Culture of Trust and Data Literacy

Technology and architecture alone are insufficient to drive transformation. The most sophisticated data platform will fail if it is deployed into a low-trust culture. Therefore, leaders must make a conscious and sustained effort to close the executive-stakeholder trust gap identified by PwC.[3] This effort must begin with an honest acknowledgment that the gap exists and requires fostering a foundation of trust and transparency within the C-suite itself before it can be projected to the rest of the organization. Leaders must actively work to "plug people into the datastream".

Michael Dalsgaard
Founder

Cited Works

1. Edelman. (2023). *2023 Edelman Trust Barometer*. https://www.edelman.com/trust/2023/trust-barometer
2. Edelman. (2024). *2024 Edelman Trust Barometer*. https://www.edelman.com/trust/2024/trust-barometer
3. PwC. (2024). *PwC's 2024 Trust Survey*. https://www.pwc.com/us/en/library/trust-in-business-survey.html
4. Deloitte. (2024). *2024 Global Human Capital Trends*. https://www.deloitte.com/ua/en/about/press-room/human-capital-trends.html
5. McKinsey & Company. (2021). *Why 70% of Digital Transformations Fail*. https://verified.com.au/why-70-of-digital-transformations-fail/
6. Gartner. (n.d.). *Gartner's Data Quality Market Study*. https://www.pacemaker.ai/en/blog/datenqualitaet-was-ist-das-und-wie-gut-muessen-meine-daten-sein
7. Precisely. (2025). *Data Integrity Trends and Insights*. https://e3mag.com/en/data-integrity-trends/
8. Harvard Business Review. (n.d.). *Only 3% of Companies' Data Meets Basic Quality Standards*. https://www.forbes.com/councils/forbestechcouncil/2023/04/04/three-key-misconceptions-of-data-quality/
9. IBM. (n.d.). *The $3.1 Trillion Cost of Poor Data Quality*. https://www.lightsondata.com/estimating-cost-poor-data-quality/
10. IDC & JP Morgan. (n.d.). *The Global Economic Cost of Data Silos*. https://medium.com/@clairehelenscanlon/hidden-costs-of-data-silos-30ec05ed14c6
11. IDC. (n.d.). *The Revenue Impact of Digital Friction*. https://www.artificiallawyer.com/2025/08/07/idc-data-reveals-investment-in-legal-tech-is-no-longer-optional/
12. Forrester. (n.d.). *Time Wasted Searching for Data*. https://medium.com/@clairehelenscanlon/hidden-costs-of-data-silos-30ec05ed14c6
13. IBM. (2023). *Cost of a Data Breach Report 2023*. https://www.upguard.com/blog/cost-of-data-breach
14. Zylo. (2024). *2024 SaaS Management Index*. https://www.prnewswire.com/news-releases/2024-saas-management-index-reveals-an-average-of-18m-in-annual-license-waste-with-significant-security-risks-from-employee-expensed-apps-302071679.html
15. Forrester. (2022). *The Total Economic Impact™ of the Workato Enterprise Orchestration Platform.*(https://tei.forrester.com/go/microsoft/powerautomatetei/docs/TEI_of_Microsoft_Power_Automate_PDF.pdf)
16. Oracle. (n.d.). *The Decision Dilemma*. https://ciosea.economictimes.indiatimes.com/news/business-analytics/85-of-apj-business-leaders-would-prefer-a-robot-to-make-their-decisions-oracle-report/99641079
17. Qualtrics. (2025). *Global Study of Senior Marketing and Insights Executives*. https://www.qualtrics.com/blog/data-vs-gut-instinct/
18. Teradata. (n.d.). *AI Readiness Research*. https://www.teradata.com/insights/ai-and-machine-learning/how-to-measure-ai-readiness-and-progress
19. SoftServe. (2025). *The State of Data Management in 2025*. https://www.softserveinc.com/en-us/news/bad-data-makes-bad-decisions
20. KPMG. (n.d.). *Global CEO Survey*. https://www.weforum.org/stories/2018/06/ceos-in-these-countries-are-more-likely-to-go-with-their-gut/