POST · 30 JULY 2026

The Wrong End of the Problem.

There is enormous urgency in every boardroom to adopt AI, but far less about the data it runs on. **That gap is the core problem.**

Nobody has got this right yet — which makes it worth discussing collaboratively rather than confidently.

The reality on the ground is this. The technology offers speed and depth that would have been unthinkable five years ago. And **it lands in organisations built for a different tempo entirely**: business processes designed around slower rhythms, functions that hand work to each other at a pace hardly improved in a decade, decisions that still wait for a meeting because that's where decisions have always been made.

A microscope, used as a hammer. It still works. Just not for anything it was built to do.

The most concrete version of this mismatch is data — and it's the one with the longest clock.

Master data structures that were not designed to support analysis. Transactional entries made to satisfy a system rather than record an event. Every organisation knows about this. Almost none of it is described as urgent, because it never has been. **The cost of weak data used to be slow and absorbable**: strange-looking reports that somebody eventually questioned, analysis that took longer than it should.

That absorption is what disappears now.

Weak data doesn't produce visibly odd output anymore. It produces confident predictions, quickly, behind a clean interface — and the human pause that used to catch the oddity has been designed out in the name of speed.

So, the sequencing question is real, and it's uncomfortable. Getting data foundations right in a large organisation is not a quarter's work. It's years. Which means, for most companies, the honest answer is that we should have started already.

That isn't an argument for slowing down on AI.

***It's an argument that the urgency has been pointed at the wrong end of the problem*.**