



Federated Data Governance, Sponsorship, Adoption & Benefits Framework

Federated governance as the operating-model driver | Data mesh aligned | Governed data democratisation | Microsoft Purview enabled

Core principle

Central teams set enterprise guardrails. Accountable domain experts govern the data they understand best. Data Products package governed data for discovery and reuse. Governed self-service broadens useful access without removing security, privacy, least-privilege or accountability controls.

Website: <https://www.dataskylabstudio.com>

Data Dave learning: [Part 1](#) | [Part 2](#)

A. How to use this document

One framework for sponsorship, adoption, delivery, benefits and public guidance

This framework is deliberately broader than a technical Microsoft Purview implementation guide. It explains the value proposition for federated Data Governance, why it matters, why people should contribute their time, how data mesh principles and governed data democratisation fit, how success should be measured, and how Microsoft Purview can support the operating model.

Primary uses

- Executive and programme sponsorship conversations.
- Governance Domain Owner, Data Product Owner, Data Steward, Data Custodian and Data Consumer onboarding.
- Data SkyLab Studio policy and public learning guidance.
- Marketing and thought-leadership material where claims need to be defensible.
- A 90-day proof of value followed by a 12-18 month enterprise adoption roadmap.
- Benefits realisation, OKR and KPI design for ongoing governance.

Simple message for every audience

Why the effort is worth it

We are not asking people to spend time “doing metadata” for its own sake. We are investing a controlled amount of structured effort from Owners, Stewards, Custodians and Consumers so the organisation stops paying the much larger recurring cost of everyone independently trying to find, understand, validate and gain access to data.

1. Executive summary

Federated governance is the driver; technology enables the operating model

Data Governance should not be positioned as a central team collecting metadata or as a technology deployment. It should be an operating model that combines enterprise-wide standards and assurance with domain-level ownership, stewardship and decision-making.

Data SkyLab Studio position

Federated governance provides the balance between central consistency and local accountability. A central governance function defines common principles, minimum standards and guardrails; accountable people closest to the data govern meaning, quality, priority and day-to-day use within their domains.

The strategic chain

FEDERATED GOVERNANCE -> DOMAIN OWNERSHIP -> DATA PRODUCTS -> GOVERNED SELF-SERVICE -> DATA DEMOCRATISATION -> BETTER DATA CONSUMER EXPERIENCE -> MEASURABLE BUSINESS VALUE

This model aligns naturally with data mesh principles without requiring an organisation to adopt a full data mesh architecture. Microsoft Purview can support governance, metadata, domain, Data Product, quality, health and access-management aspects of the model; the operating model, decision rights and domain capacity remain organisational responsibilities.

Value proposition - in one sentence

Federated Data Governance puts accountability with the people closest to the data while keeping enterprise guardrails consistent, so trusted Data Products become easier to discover, understand, access and reuse. Microsoft Purview can provide the enabling governance and catalogue capabilities, but the value comes from the operating model and the measurable outcomes it creates.

Executive framing

Do not ask leaders to sponsor “a catalogue implementation”. Ask them to sponsor a measurable change in how the organisation owns, governs, discovers, understands and consumes data.

2. Data SkyLab Studio value proposition

A clear promise of value before the technology discussion

A value proposition is useful because it connects the problem, the operating model, the people who benefit, the outcome and the evidence in one message. The benefits sections explain what improves; the value proposition explains why a stakeholder should support the model.

Core value proposition

Data SkyLab Studio helps organisations establish federated, outcome-led Data Governance so accountability sits with the people closest to the data, enterprise guardrails remain consistent, and governed Data Products are easier to discover, understand, trust, access and reuse. This enables governed self-service and data democratisation, supports data mesh principles where appropriate, and creates a clear route to measurable business value. Microsoft Purview can provide the enabling governance and catalogue layer where it is the selected platform.

Who receives the value?

Audience	Value received
Organisation	Scalable accountability across domains; consistent enterprise guardrails; less duplicated effort; clearer evidence of governance value.
Domain teams	Autonomy within agreed guardrails; clearer ownership and decision rights; the ability to improve Data Products close to the business context.
Data Consumers	Faster discovery; clearer meaning and ownership; better trust evidence; a clearer route to appropriate access; greater reuse.
Central governance	More focus on enterprise standards, assurance and cross-domain issues rather than becoming the curator or gatekeeper for every asset.
Executives / Sponsors	A governance model that can scale, with measurable outcomes for productivity, accountability, risk, reuse and business value before wider investment.

Why this proposition is credible

- Outcome-led, not tool-led: success is measured through the consumer journey, accountability, quality, reuse, access friction, risk and evidenced benefits.
- Federated, not over-centralised: enterprise standards stay consistent while accountable domains make decisions close to the data and business context.
- Consumer-centred: Data Dave makes the value visible in practical terms - find, understand, trust, request, access and reuse.
- Measurable: baseline testing, adoption OKRs, long-term KPIs, benefits realisation and the £ business case provide evidence rather than relying on activity counts.
- Practical: the 90-day Proof of Value gives sponsors evidence before committing to enterprise scale-up.

Marketing / elevator version

Put governance where the knowledge is; keep enterprise guardrails where the risk is; make trusted data easier to use.

Data SkyLab Studio helps organisations turn distributed data ownership into a scalable federated governance model, using Data Products and governed self-service to improve discovery, accountability, trust, reuse and business value. Microsoft Purview can enable the technology experience, while the operating model, roles and measurable outcomes create the value.

Short value messages by audience

- Executive Sponsor - Scale governance without creating a central bottleneck, while keeping enterprise guardrails, accountability and measurable outcomes.
- Governance Domain Owner - Gain clear authority to govern local priorities and Data Products inside agreed enterprise standards.
- Data Product Owner / Data Steward - Turn business knowledge, definitions, ownership and quality context into reusable organisational knowledge instead of answering the same questions repeatedly.
- Data Consumer - Find, understand, assess and request trusted data through a clearer governed route, with less dependency on personal networks and gatekeepers.

What the value proposition does not promise

- It does not mean unrestricted access or removal of privacy, security, least-privilege or regulatory controls.
- It does not mean every domain can invent its own standards; autonomy exists inside enterprise guardrails.
- It does not claim that Microsoft Purview alone creates federated governance, data mesh or data democratisation.
- It does not promise a fixed ROI; financial value must be demonstrated from local baselines and approved assumptions.

This makes the value proposition suitable for executive sponsorship, website copy, role onboarding and public marketing while remaining consistent with the evidence-led approach used throughout this framework.

3. Federated governance - the operating-model driver

A federated model sits between fully centralised governance and uncontrolled decentralisation. It retains enterprise-wide oversight while moving practical governance decisions to accountable people who understand the data and business context best.

Federated governance benefit	What it changes
Scalability	Governance responsibility is distributed across domains instead of becoming a bottleneck in one central team.
Business context	Meaning, quality and appropriate use are defined closer to the teams that create and use the data.
Accountability	Named Governance Domain Owners, Data Product Owners and Data Stewards have clear responsibilities.
Consistency	Central principles, standards, policies and minimum controls still apply across domains.
Responsiveness	Domain teams can resolve local issues and improve products faster within agreed decision rights.
Adoption	Governance becomes part of day-to-day business activity rather than an external compliance exercise.
Interoperability	Shared standards make independently governed Data Products easier to combine and reuse across domains.
Self-service	Clear ownership, metadata, quality and access routes allow consumers to do more for themselves within agreed guardrails.

Who decides what?

Decision level	Typical responsibility
Central / enterprise governance	Enterprise principles and policy; minimum metadata and quality standards; shared role model; global classifications; common health measures; platform guardrails; cross-domain standards; escalation and assurance.
Governance Domain	Domain priorities; Data Products; local business terminology; ownership and stewardship; domain quality expectations; local improvement priorities; domain access context and business rules.
Shared / federated decisions	Cross-domain definitions; global identifiers; interoperability standards; policy exceptions; shared Critical Data Elements; changes affecting multiple domains; enterprise-wide risk decisions.

The balance to protect

Federation does not mean every domain invents its own rules. Domains have autonomy inside agreed enterprise guardrails, with cross-domain decisions handled through a federated forum or agreed escalation model.

PoC / Proof of Value recommendation: Microsoft Purview supports five Governance Domain types: Functional Unit, Line of Business, Data Domain, Regulatory and Project. For an initial PoC / PoV, start with Functional Unit when the ownership policy assigns accountability by organisational function. Otherwise, choose the type that matches the actual ownership boundary. Ownership policy should drive domain design.

4. How federated governance supports data mesh

Data mesh is a socio-technical approach for managing analytical data at scale. Its four widely cited principles are domain-oriented decentralised data ownership and architecture, data as a product, self-serve data infrastructure as a platform, and federated computational governance.

Important distinction

Federated Data Governance and data mesh are related, but they are not the same thing. An organisation can adopt federated governance without implementing a full data mesh. Microsoft Purview can support important catalogue and governance aspects of a mesh, but Purview by itself is not a self-serve data platform and does not create a full computational-governance layer.

Data mesh principle	How the operating model supports it	Purview alignment / boundary
Domain-oriented ownership	Business or governance-aligned domains and accountable roles place decisions closer to the data.	Governance Domains, domain roles, Data Product ownership and data estate mappings.
Data as a product	Priority data is packaged around consumer use cases with clear ownership, context, quality and access information.	Data Products, Owners, glossary terms, Data Quality, lineage and classifications where supported.
Self-serve data platform	Consumers and domain teams should be able to use data and platform capabilities without unnecessary central bottlenecks.	Unified Catalog can provide discovery, metadata and governed request experiences; the broader self-serve data platform sits outside Purview.
Federated computational governance	Enterprise policies should be consistently applied while domains retain appropriate autonomy; automate controls where platforms support it.	Purview offers governance mechanisms such as health controls, inherited policies, classifications and DQ rules, but these are only part of full computational governance.

Benefits when these principles work together

- Data ownership can scale with the number of domains and Data Products.
- Consumers get a more consistent experience even when data remains distributed across many platforms and teams.
- Domain teams can improve products without losing enterprise interoperability.
- Central governance can focus on standards, assurance and cross-domain concerns instead of curating every asset itself.
- Reusable governed Data Products can create a stronger foundation for analytics, AI and cross-domain insight.

5. Governed data democratisation

Data democratisation means putting useful data into the hands of more people who need it to solve business problems and make informed decisions. It does not mean unrestricted access, bypassing security or removing role-appropriate privacy, regulatory and access controls.

Benefit	What governed democratisation enables
Discoverability	Consumers can search for governed Data Products instead of relying on personal contacts or specialist gatekeepers.
Understandability	Business descriptions, glossary terms, metadata and ownership make data easier to interpret.
Trust	Quality, lineage, classification, limitations and stewardship provide evidence for responsible use, where supported.
Governed access	Consumers can understand the access route and request appropriate access in context.
Reuse	Existing governed products become visible before new extracts, reports or pipelines are created.
Reduced shadow activity	A usable governed route gives people less reason to create uncontrolled copies or work around official processes.
Supports wider data literacy	Governed self-service can help people develop a better understanding of ownership, quality and appropriate data use.

Governed self-service, not open access

The goal is to remove unnecessary friction while preserving need-to-know, least-privilege, privacy, security and regulatory controls. Data should be easier to discover and understand without making inappropriate access easier.

6. Data Dave is everybody

Turn an abstract governance discussion into a recognisable working-day problem

Dave begins with a business question. He usually does not know the database name, storage platform, technical schema or which team owns the answer. He simply knows what information he needs.

Stage	What goes wrong today
Search for data	Dave searches reports, shared drives, SharePoint, databases, email or asks colleagues because there is no recognised discovery route.
Find a dataset	Finding something does not prove it is the right, current or authoritative data.
Find the Owner	Accountability may be unclear, or knowledge may depend on who Dave happens to know.
Gain approval	Approval is a governance decision; it does not necessarily mean technical access is already provisioned.
Request access	Dave may still need a separate IAM, platform or service-management process.
Access provisioned	Elapsed time and hand-offs can remain invisible to the consumer.
Can he trust it?	Without definitions, metadata, quality, lineage, classifications and known limitations, Dave may still have to validate the data himself.

Current-state challenge

FIND • UNDERSTAND • ACCESS • TRUST

SEARCH -> FIND -> APPROVAL -> ACCESS -> VALIDATE -> START AGAIN

Target-state journey

DISCOVER • UNDERSTAND • OWNERSHIP • TRUST • REQUEST • ACCESS • USE

Federated governance makes this journey sustainable: domain teams provide ownership, meaning and quality context; enterprise standards make the experience consistent across domains; the catalogue makes governed information discoverable to consumers.

Data Dave website pages and videos

Data Dave Part 1 page: <https://www.dataskylabstudio.com/learning-content/data-daves-data-journey>

Data Dave Part 2 page: <https://www.dataskylabstudio.com/learning-content/data-daves-data-journey-part-2>

Part 1 - Sasha Korniak Expert-Narrated Edition: <https://youtu.be/NThmhVDLJQM>

Part 1 - AI-Presented Data Consumer Training Edition: <https://youtu.be/2etFYxUQx6U>

Part 2 - Enterprise Data Catalogue future-state solution: <https://youtu.be/e2cmFxZMU1E>

7. Why each stakeholder should care

Make the exchange of effort and value explicit

Governance fails when roles are presented only as responsibilities. Every persona should understand what they are being asked to contribute, what recurring problem that effort prevents, and what they receive in return.

Persona	What they contribute	What they get back	What their effort prevents
Data Consumer	Use the catalogue first; provide feedback; use data responsibly	Less searching, clearer meaning, visible trust evidence and a clearer route to access	Repeated search, misinterpretation and avoidable rework
Governance Domain Owner	Set domain priorities, decision rights and accountable roles	Local autonomy inside enterprise guardrails and visibility of domain health	Central bottlenecks and unresolved cross-domain ownership
Data Product Owner	Own purpose, value, access intent, priority and key decisions	Visibility of demand and value; fewer repetitive questions; clearer accountability	Unowned data, inconsistent decisions and product drift
Data Steward	Curate definitions, metadata, glossary links, quality context and known limitations	Explain important context once in a reusable place; clearer issue ownership	The same questions being answered manually again and again
Data Custodian / Engineer	Maintain technical metadata, lineage, source context and technical access	Better requirements, clearer business ownership and fewer ambiguous requests	Technical teams becoming the default owner for business questions
Governance Professional	Define standards, controls, role model, measures and assurance	Measurable governance without becoming central curator of every asset	Governance activity that cannot show business outcomes
Privacy / Security / Compliance	Define policy, classification, permitted use and approval needs	Better visibility, traceability, classifications and evidence	Late involvement, inconsistent controls and difficult assurance
Data / Enterprise Architect	Align data concepts, domains, systems and target architecture	A business-facing view connecting architecture to use and accountability	Architecture known technically but poorly understood by consumers
Platform / Purview Administrator	Operate service, permissions, scans, health and configuration	Clear priorities and an operating model rather than configuration for its own sake	A technically deployed platform with weak adoption
Business Leader	Sponsor priorities, people and protected capacity	Faster value from data, clearer accountability and measurable risk reduction	Recurring productivity loss and weak ownership
CIO / CDO / CTO	Provide strategic direction, funding and enterprise authority	A scalable enterprise governance operating model and evidence of value	Duplicated tools, fragmented data use and unmeasured governance spend

The value exchange

Do not tell people only what governance asks from them. Explain what it gives back. The structured effort of Owners and Stewards should be compared with the recurring organisation-wide cost of people independently searching, asking, validating, escalating and recreating.

8. Target state and the Magic Seven

Data Consumer question	Governance capability
Who is responsible?	Ownership
Where does it actually live?	Data location / fully qualified links
What does it mean?	Stewardship and metadata enrichment
Can I have it?	Controlled access and workflows
Where did it come from?	Lineage
Is it good enough?	Data Quality
How should it be handled?	Classification

These capabilities sit behind the Data Dave future-state journey. The catalogue is the governance and metadata layer around underlying data platforms; it does not replace the databases, files, reports, applications or platform controls themselves.

Seven outcomes of governed data

Outcome	What good looks like
Discoverability	People can find appropriate data.
Understandability	People understand what the data means, intended use and relevant context.
Accountability	Ownership and stewardship are visible.
Trust	Quality, provenance, classifications and known limitations can be assessed where supported.
Accessibility	There is a clear, controlled route to appropriate access.
Reusability	Existing data is found and reused instead of unnecessarily recreated.
Measurable value	Data Products can be linked to organisational objectives and outcomes.

9. Business benefits and the priority principle

Benefit	What the organisation gets
Productivity	Less time spent searching, finding owners, interpreting data, chasing access and validating basic context.
Trust	Consumers have more evidence to judge whether data is fit for purpose before using it.
Reuse	Existing governed Data Products, datasets, reports and pipelines are more likely to be found before new ones are created.
Accountability	Ownership and stewardship become explicit, visible and measurable at enterprise and domain level.
Risk reduction	Sensitive, critical, low-quality or poorly governed data is easier to identify, prioritise and manage.
Business value	Governance effort can focus on Data Products supporting important use cases and business outcomes.
Scalability	Federated ownership reduces dependence on one central governance team as the estate grows.
Data democratisation	More people can discover and use trusted data through governed self-service.

Priority principle

Do not govern all data equally. Start with the data that creates the most value, carries the greatest risk, supports critical processes, or is repeatedly demanded by consumers.

10. Problem -> benefit -> measurable outcome

Problem	Business consequence	Future-state benefit	Measure
Does not know where to search	Time lost across systems and teams	Recognised discovery experience	Discovery time; search success
Finds data but cannot judge suitability	Wrong data, rework, duplicated analysis	Business context and intended use visible	Consumer comprehension; metadata standard
Does not know who owns it	Questions bounce between teams	Owner and Steward visible	% priority products with accountable roles
Terminology differs	Inconsistent interpretation	Common governed vocabulary	Glossary coverage; terminology issues
Cannot judge trust	Manual validation and uncertainty	Quality, lineage, refresh context and limitations visible where supported	DQ/lineage coverage; trust score; known limitations
Sends email for permission	Inconsistent and untraceable approval	Governed request linked to Data Product	% requests using governed route
Approval is mistaken for access	Consumers wait after approval	Decision and provisioning treated as separate stages	Request-to-decision and approval-to-provision times
Recreates something that exists	Duplicate datasets, reports and pipelines	Existing governed products can be reused	Reuse rate; duplication avoided
Knowledge sits with individuals	Key-person dependency and knowledge loss	Persistent organisational metadata and stewardship	% priority/critical data documented and reviewed
Nobody knows which data matters most	Governance effort spread too thinly	Prioritisation around high-value/high-risk products and critical data	% priority products governed; products aligned to business outcomes/OKRs
Central team is a bottleneck	Decisions queue in one function	Federated ownership and stewardship	Central escalations; decision time; domain health

11. The cost of doing nothing

Make recurring friction visible before asking for investment

The alternative to governance is not zero cost. It is the recurring cost of consumers, owners, engineers and support teams compensating manually for fragmented discovery, unclear accountability, inconsistent definitions, poor quality evidence and informal access.

SEARCH -> ASK -> VALIDATE -> EMAIL -> WAIT -> RECREATE -> CHECK -> START AGAIN

Cost area	Measurement approach
Discovery friction	People affected x search events x average time x loaded hourly cost
Access friction	Requests x active handling effort x loaded cost; report decision and provisioning separately
Duplicate development	Avoidable duplicate reports/datasets/pipelines x average build and support cost
Repeated explanation	Owner/Steward/SME time spent answering recurring context questions
Quality remediation	Incidents/issues x investigation and remediation effort
Delayed decisions	Where defensible, measure delay to analysis or operational decisions; avoid speculative cash claims
Audit/compliance effort	Manual evidence gathering, classification, review and investigation effort where relevant
Central bottleneck	Escalations or decisions that could have been resolved within domains x handling/waiting effort

Important

Do not invent a dramatic “cost of bad data” percentage. Use local measured time, finance-approved loaded rates, actual duplicate work and traceable incident/remediation data.

12. Microsoft Purview alignment and implementation boundaries

Microsoft describes federated data governance as a middle ground between centralised and decentralised governance: a central data office sets the rules while people in departments who understand the data are entrusted to govern it appropriately. Unified Catalog and Data Map can support this operating model.

Purview capability	How it supports federated governance / boundary
Governance Domains	Microsoft Purview supports five Governance Domain types: Functional Unit, Line of Business, Data Domain, Regulatory and Project. They provide flexible business or governance-aligned boundaries for ownership, discovery and business concepts. For an initial PoC / Proof of Value, Functional Unit is the suggested starting type where the ownership policy maps accountability to an organisational function; otherwise choose the type that best reflects the actual ownership model.
Data Products	Consumer-facing groupings of assets around a use case, with ownership and business context.
Glossary terms	Business vocabulary that improves understanding; active terms can carry policies that apply to linked products or assets.
Objectives and key results (OKRs)	Business concepts that describe measurable value and goals; health controls can measure product alignment to business OKRs.
Critical Data Elements (preview)	Logical groupings of important data concepts that require elevated governance.
Data Quality	Rules and profiling can produce scores that aggregate from columns to assets, Data Products and Governance Domains where supported.
Data health controls	Built-in measures track governance health, including self-serve access enablement, publication, ownership, Data Quality, critical data, classification and OKR alignment.
Access policies and requests	Support governed request and approval experiences. Approval does not itself guarantee that underlying technical permissions have already been provisioned; approvers or access providers must apply them.
Data Map	Captures metadata from supported data sources; Data Map and Unified Catalog roles do not by themselves grant access to underlying data.

Implementation boundary

Purview provides metadata, governance, quality, health and workflow capabilities; it does not replace accountability, business decision rights, source-system security, IAM, self-serve data-platform capabilities, operating processes or the need for domain capacity. Support varies by data source, connector and feature.

13. The Data Governance Value Chain

Keep the line of sight from activity to business value

Every major governance activity should be able to answer: what problem are we solving, what behaviour should change, what outcome should improve and what benefit should result?

Problem	Governance intervention	Behaviour change	Outcome	Benefit
Consumers cannot find data	Publish curated Data Products	Consumers search the catalogue first	Discovery time falls	Productive capacity recovered
Ownership is unclear	Assign Owners and Stewards	Questions route to accountable roles	Fewer hand-offs and unresolved queries	Faster decisions; less support overhead
Meaning is inconsistent	Govern glossary and metadata	Teams use agreed definitions	Fewer interpretation disputes	Less rework and better comparability
Quality is uncertain	Define and monitor DQ rules	Consumers review quality evidence before use	Issues are found and owned earlier	Reduced remediation and decision risk
Access is informal	Govern request and approval route	Requests use a visible process	Decision/provisioning time becomes measurable	Lower friction and better auditability
Duplicate data is built	Make existing products discoverable	Teams check for reusable data first	Reuse rises	Avoided engineering/reporting effort
Central team is a bottleneck	Federate decision rights and ownership	Domains resolve local issues within guardrails	Faster decisions and fewer central escalations	Scalable governance capacity

Standard chain

Problem -> Governance intervention -> Behaviour change -> Outcome -> Benefit -> £ value (where it can be evidenced).

14. Three levels of success

A deployed platform is only the first level

Level	Question	Evidence
Level 1 - Implementation	Did we build and configure the required capability?	Sources connected; roles configured; domains and Data Products established; workflows available.
Level 2 - Adoption	Are people using it and performing their governance responsibilities?	Active users; catalogue-first behaviour; Owner/Steward reviews; governed requests; active domain roles.
Level 3 - Value	Has the experience become measurably better, safer or more valuable?	Discovery time; reuse; DQ improvement; fewer hand-offs; reduced support effort; domain responsiveness; £ benefit.

Definition of success

A Purview programme can be technically successful at Level 1 and still fail organisationally. Data SkyLab Studio treats Level 3 - measurable value - as the ultimate success test.

15. Critical Success Factors

Critical Success Factor	Why it matters
Executive sponsorship	Senior authority can resolve cross-domain ownership, policy, funding and priority conflicts.
Federated decision rights	Everyone understands what is decided centrally, within domains and jointly.
Business ownership, not IT ownership alone	The business owns meaning, use and accountability even where technology teams host the data.
Clear Governance Domain model	Provides the structure for federated accountability and prioritisation.
Named Data Product Owners	Each important product has an accountable decision-maker.
Named Data Stewards	Meaning, metadata, glossary, quality context and review work have an accountable practitioner.
Consumer involvement	Design around real discovery and use journeys, not only governance-team requirements.
Prioritisation	Start with valuable/high-risk products rather than every table or asset.
Minimum standards	Define what “good enough to publish” means for metadata, quality, classification and lifecycle.
Governed access design	Connect catalogue request/approval to actual IAM/platform provisioning.
Data Quality ownership	Scores lead to named actions and improvement, not passive dashboards.
Guided Enablement	Give each persona role-based, step-by-step guidance at the level they actually need.
Measurable baseline	Capture the current journey before implementation.
Operational ownership after implementation	Define who runs, supports, reviews and improves the service in BAU.
Continuous improvement	Use search failures, requests, quality actions, health controls and feedback to evolve the service.

16. Organisational capacity

Sponsorship must include permission for people to govern data

Licences and configuration are not enough. Governance Domain Owners, Data Product Owners and Data Stewards need protected capacity. A programme that gives people governance responsibilities without time and priority can create the appearance of poor adoption when the real issue is under-resourcing.

Sponsor must provide	What this means
Authority	Resolve ownership, policy and priority conflicts.
Priority	Allow governance work to compete with operational work.
People	Appoint appropriate Domain Owners, Product Owners, Stewards, Custodians and consumer representatives.
Time	Protect capacity for curation, decisions, quality work, review and enablement.
Funding	Cover platform, implementation, integration, training and BAU operation.
Enablement	Provide role clarity, tools, examples, escalation routes and Guided Enablement.

Failure pattern to avoid

If domain roles are assigned but no time, authority or enablement is allocated, the organisation has distributed accountability without enabling delivery.

17. Adoption and change model

Measure adoption, but also actively create it

Federated governance introduces new decision rights and expectations. OKRs can show whether adoption is happening; they do not create adoption by themselves. Change activities must cover both the technology experience and the operating model.

Adoption mechanism	Purpose
Persona onboarding	Explain what each role does, why it matters and the smallest practical set of actions expected.
Guided Enablement	Role-based, step-by-step guidance showing what to know, what to do, why it matters and what good looks like.
Decision-rights communication	Make central, domain and shared responsibilities explicit.
Consumer-first launch	Start with real business questions and Data Products rather than technical navigation.
Owner/Steward induction	Provide checklists, review cadence, decision rights, escalation routes and examples.
Community / champions	Create a practical forum for Owners, Stewards and practitioners to share patterns and resolve cross-domain issues.
Feedback loop	Capture failed searches, confusing metadata, stale ownership, quality issues, access friction and missing products.
Support model	Make it obvious where consumers, Owners and Stewards go when they are stuck.
Reinforcement	Review role activity, health and benefits regularly so governance does not become a one-off onboarding exercise.
Recognition of contribution	Show where stewardship, ownership or reuse prevented work, resolved risk or improved a business outcome.

Leading and lagging indicators

Leading indicators	Lagging indicators
Training and Guided Enablement completion; catalogue visits; active Domain Owners/Owners/Stewards; published priority products; metadata reviews	Reduced discovery time; reuse; lower support demand; better DQ; reduced access friction; fewer central escalations; evidenced business value

18. Adoption OKRs

These are Data SkyLab Studio recommended starting targets for a proof-of-value and scale-up programme. They are not vendor guarantees and should be adjusted after baseline measurement.

Objective	Example Key Results
1. Establish federated accountability	100% of priority Governance Domains have active Governance Domain Owners; decision-rights model approved and communicated; >=90% of agreed domain reviews occur on schedule.
2. Make governed data easier to discover	>=90% of agreed priority Data Products published; >=80% of pilot consumers can locate an appropriate product without asking another team; >=70% successful search-to-product rate in tested scenarios; >=50% reduction in median discovery time.
3. Establish visible product accountability	100% of priority Data Products have a named Owner; >=95% have a Steward; >=90% of ownership records validated within the agreed review period.
4. Make governed data understandable	>=90% of priority products meet the minimum metadata standard; >=80% of priority terminology is governed; >=80% of consumers can explain product purpose after viewing catalogue content.
5. Increase confidence in data	>=80% of priority products have defined quality expectations; >=70% expose measurable DQ information where supported; 100% identify significant known limitations; >=95% of material issues have an accountable owner.
6. Make access clearer and governable	>=80% of applicable pilot requests use the agreed route; >=50% reduction in informal email/chat requests; >=30% reduction in median request-to-decision time; approval-to-provision tracked separately.
7. Enable governed data democratisation	Increase active catalogue consumers and reuse of governed Data Products; reduce dependency on central teams for routine discovery/clarification; maintain security, privacy and policy compliance as self-service grows.

19. Long-term KPI scorecard

What to monitor once governance becomes BAU

Dimension	Example KPIs
Federation	Active domain role coverage; domain health; cross-domain escalations; time to resolve ownership issues; central-team bottleneck volume.
Consumer experience	Successful search rate; median time to find appropriate data; zero/no-useful-result searches; trust score; product satisfaction; number of people contacted before success.
Efficiency	Discovery effort; request-to-decision time; approval-to-provision time; support tickets; repeated owner/steward queries; manual metadata effort; duplicated work avoided.
Governance	Owner and Steward coverage; products meeting minimum metadata standard; glossary linkage; CDE coverage where applicable; health-control score; stale products; overdue reviews.
Trust and Quality	Products with quality scores; average/threshold DQ performance; critical DQ failures; issues resolved within SLA; certification/endorsement where applicable; documented known limitations.
Risk	Critical data without ownership; sensitive products without expected classification; access outside governed route; policy exceptions; unresolved critical governance actions; audit findings.
Reuse and Value	Active consumers per product; Data Product reuse; duplicate datasets/reports avoided; business processes using governed products; products supporting strategic OKRs; evidenced time/cost avoided.
Democratisation	Growth in governed self-service usage; reduction in gatekeeper dependency; adoption across business functions; security/privacy compliance maintained as access broadens.
Adoption health	Monthly active consumers; active Domain Owners/Owners/Stewards; catalogue-first behaviour; completion of role reviews; Guided Enablement usage; feedback closure rate.

20. Do not mistake outputs for outcomes

A catalogue can be busy without being valuable

These measures are useful operational statistics, but they should never be the primary proof that Data Governance worked.

Output	Outcome that matters
10 million assets scanned	Consumers can find the right data more quickly.
500 glossary terms created	People interpret priority data consistently.
150 Data Products created	Existing governed products are found and reused.
80 Stewards trained	Stewardship reviews, issue resolution and metadata quality actually improve.
Access workflow configured	Requests become clearer, more traceable and faster where appropriate.
Data Quality enabled	Consumers can see quality evidence and owners act on material issues.
Purview deployed	People use the governed experience and it creates measurable value.
Domains created	Accountable domain roles actually make timely decisions within agreed guardrails.

Four measurement types

Type	Example	What it tells us
Activity	50 training sessions	What we did
Output	100 Data Products created	What we produced
Outcome	Discovery time reduced by 45%	What changed
Benefit	£85,000 of evidenced productive capacity recovered	What it was worth

Data SkyLab Studio position

Every important output should have an intended outcome, and every major outcome should have an evidenced benefit where practical.

21. Data Dave Consumer Journey Benchmark

Use the story itself as the before-and-after measurement method

Before implementation, give representative consumers realistic business questions and measure the journey.
After implementation, repeat the same or comparable tasks.

Capture more than elapsed time

- Elapsed time from question to usable access.
- Active person effort.
- Number of systems or locations searched.
- Number of people contacted.
- Number of hand-offs.
- Whether the consumer could identify the Owner and Steward.
- Whether quality, lineage, classifications and limitations were visible enough to judge suitability.
- Whether the journey succeeded without escalation.
- Which domain or cross-domain dependency caused friction, where relevant.

Journey stage	Baseline	90 days	12 months
Find suitable data	Measure	Improve	Improve further
Understand meaning	Measure	Improve	Improve further
Identify Owner / Steward	Measure	Improve	Improve further
Assess trust / quality	Measure	Improve	Improve further
Request access	Measure	Improve	Improve further
Decision time	Measure	Improve	Improve further
Provisioning time	Measure	Improve	Improve further
Start productive use	Measure	Improve	Improve further

Illustrative before/after only

Example: Find 90 min -> 4 min; understand 60 min -> 10 min; identify owner 2 days -> immediate; establish trust 4 hours -> 15 min. These examples show the measurement method only and are not benchmark promises.

Suggested pilot sample: 10-30 representative Data Consumers across priority personas. Use enough scenarios to expose repeated patterns; do not present a small convenience sample as statistically representative of the enterprise.

22. Benefits Realisation Framework

Turn promises into owned, reviewable evidence

For every significant promised benefit, record the baseline, intervention, expected behaviour change, KPI, target, Benefit Owner, evidence source and review date.

Field	Example
Problem	Analysts spend too long finding customer data
Baseline	Measured discovery time/effort and current hand-offs
Intervention	Priority customer Data Products governed by the Customer domain and published to the catalogue
Behaviour change	Consumers search the governed catalogue first and use the agreed request route
KPI	Median discovery time; successful-search rate; informal request volume
Target	Agreed improvement from baseline
Benefit Owner	Named business or Governance Domain Owner
Review cadence	Monthly during pilot; quarterly in BAU
Evidence source	Usage data, journey testing, support data, surveys and finance-approved cost assumptions

Governance of benefits

- Assign a named Benefit Owner for every significant claimed benefit.
- Review benefit performance regularly, not only at project close.
- Track both realised benefits and barriers preventing benefits from being realised.
- Distinguish measurable value from anecdotal improvement stories.
- The project team can deliver capability, but the business Benefit Owner owns whether the promised outcome is realised.

23. The £ business case

Compare the cost of change with evidenced benefits

Benefit side

Benefit	Example calculation
Discovery productivity	Consumers x annual discovery/access hours x measured improvement x productive-time recapture x loaded hourly cost
Reuse / duplication avoided	Avoided duplicate builds x evidenced average build/support cost
Reduced support / SME effort	Avoided recurring queries or manual handling x average handling time x loaded cost
Reduced remediation	Avoided or shortened quality/compliance remediation x measured staff effort/cost
Federation capacity benefit	Central escalations or delayed decisions avoided x evidenced handling/waiting effort
Risk reduction	Only monetise when probability, exposure and attribution are defensible; otherwise report as a non-financial benefit

Investment side

Investment category	Include
Technology	Relevant Purview licensing/consumption and related platform costs.
Implementation	Architecture, configuration, onboarding, integration, metadata/API automation and testing.
People capacity	Governance Domain Owner, Data Product Owner, Steward, Custodian, SME and governance-team time.
Enablement	Training, Guided Enablement, communications and support.
BAU operation	Administration, source onboarding, reviews, DQ, health management, forums and continuous improvement.

Decision metrics

Metric	Formula
Gross benefits	Sum of evidenced benefits over the period
Total costs	Implementation + technology + people + BAU costs
Net benefit	Gross benefits - total costs
ROI %	(Gross benefits - total costs) / total costs x 100
Benefit/Cost Ratio	Gross benefits / total costs
Payback period	Time until cumulative benefits exceed cumulative costs

24. External evidence

Use external benchmarks as context, not as promises

A 2025 Forrester Consulting Total Economic Impact study commissioned by Microsoft modelled the potential economic impact of Microsoft Purview for a composite organisation. It covers Microsoft Purview broadly, not Unified Catalog alone.

Study item	What it reported/modelled
Modelled three-year ROI	355% for the composite organisation.
Modelled payback	Less than six months.
End-user assumption	2,000 end users.
Discovery/access/records baseline	12 hours per end user per year.
Modelled reduction	75% reduction in time spent on data discovery, access and management.
Content rework assumption	90% reduction in time spent recreating content.
Productivity recapture	50% of modelled time savings counted as recaptured productive work.
Evidence construction	Forrester interviewed representatives from organisations using Microsoft Purview and combined their experiences into a composite organisation; the resulting financial model was risk-adjusted.

Data SkyLab Studio evidence rule

Use external studies to show that value is plausible, but calculate the organisation-specific business case using local baselines, local costs and locally approved assumptions. Do not imply that broad Microsoft Purview results are Unified Catalog-only outcomes.

Illustrative £ productivity example

500 consumers x 12 hours x 75% improvement x 50% recapture x £45/hour = £101,250 potential productive capacity recovered per year.

This demonstrates the calculation method only. Replace every assumption with locally measured or finance-approved values before using the figure in a business case.

25. 90-Day Federated Governance Proof of Value

Prove the operating model and consumer outcome before scaling

Phase	Focus
Days 0-30 - BASELINE & DESIGN	Select 1-2 meaningful Governance Domains. For the initial PoC / Proof of Value, consider Functional Unit as the default starting type where the ownership policy assigns accountability by organisational function; if not, select the domain type that reflects the actual ownership boundary. Agree central versus domain decision rights; identify Sponsor, Governance Domain Owners, Data Product Owners, Stewards, Custodians and representative Consumers; select 5-15 priority Data Products; baseline Data Dave journeys; document current access/quality issues; define minimum metadata, role, access and measurement standards.
Days 31-60 - ESTABLISH	Configure agreed domain structure and roles; register/scan agreed sources; establish relevant Data Products, assets, ownership, stewardship, glossary terms, Critical Data Elements (preview) where appropriate, classifications, lineage, Data Quality and access information where supported; create Guided Enablement and role checklists.
Days 61-90 - TEST & PROVE	Bring back the same consumer cohort; repeat comparable journeys; assess domain role adoption; compare discovery, understanding, ownership, trust, request, access and reuse; quantify evidenced benefits; capture lessons; present a scale/no-scale decision.

90-day exit criteria

- Priority consumer journeys show a measurable improvement or a clear explanation of why they did not.
- Governance Domain Owners, Product Owners and Stewards can perform their roles with documented guidance and realistic capacity.
- At least one material benefit is evidenced, not merely asserted.
- Known constraints, source limitations and integration gaps are documented.
- Federated decision rights and cross-domain escalation are understood.
- The operating model, costs and resource requirements for scale are understood.
- The Sponsor has evidence to approve, reshape or stop the next phase.

90-day decision

Not: “Did we configure Purview?” Instead: “Did the federated operating model improve accountability and the consumer journey, reduce friction or risk, and create enough measurable value to scale?”

26. 12-18 month enterprise roadmap

Move from proof to an embedded federated governance operating model

Time	Stage	Focus
0-3 months	PROVE	Pilot domains and decision rights; choose the Governance Domain type according to the ownership policy (Functional Unit suggested for a PoC where accountability is function-based); priority Data Products; baseline; consumer tests; initial role model and benefit evidence.
3-6 months	ESTABLISH	Formal federated operating model; domain hierarchy; minimum standards; stewardship community; Guided Enablement; support, governance forums and review cadence.
6-12 months	SCALE	Additional domains and products; cross-domain standards; Critical Data Elements (preview) where appropriate; more sources; DQ; improved lineage; governed access; metadata/API automation; wider adoption and reuse.
12-18 months	OPTIMISE	Health management; business-OKR alignment; lifecycle and stale-product controls; consumer behaviour analytics; cross-domain interoperability; automation; benefits realisation; mature governed self-service.

What changes over time

- The programme moves from project governance to BAU governance.
- Measures shift from implementation and adoption towards sustained value and health.
- Low-value manual curation is increasingly automated where reliable.
- Central governance focuses more on standards, assurance and cross-domain concerns as domain capability matures.
- The catalogue and operating model evolve from user feedback, search failures, requests, quality actions and new business priorities.

End state

Governance stops being a project and becomes part of how the organisation manages and uses data.

27. Sponsor Contract and Sponsor Ask

Make sponsorship a two-way agreement

Sponsor commitment	Meaning
Authority	Resolve cross-domain ownership, policy and priority conflicts.
Federated mandate	Approve the central-versus-domain decision-rights model and empower domains to act within it.
Priority	Make governance work a legitimate part of delivery, not an optional extra.
Capacity	Protect Domain Owner, Product Owner, Steward, Custodian and SME time.
Funding	Support technology, implementation, enablement and BAU operation.
Accountability	Review outcomes, domain health and benefits; challenge barriers or poor adoption.
Advocacy	Explain why governed self-service and accountable domain ownership matter.

What the programme commits to

- Transparent decision rights and role responsibilities.
- Evidence and measurable outcomes rather than activity reporting alone.
- Transparent measures and assumptions.
- Regular domain health, adoption and benefits reporting.
- Clear escalation of barriers, risks, cross-domain conflicts and capacity constraints.
- Continuous improvement based on consumer behaviour and domain feedback.

What we are asking the Sponsor to approve now

Sponsor decision	What it enables
Approve a 90-day Proof of Value	Permission to test the federated, outcome-led model in 1-2 meaningful domains.
Nominate accountable business roles	Sponsor, Governance Domain Owners, Product Owners, Stewards and consumer representatives.
Approve enterprise guardrails and delegated decision rights	A clear mandate for what is central, domain-owned and shared.
Protect role capacity	Explicit time for onboarding, curation, quality, access decisions and review.
Enable access to evidence	Usage, support, access and cost data needed to measure the baseline and benefits.
Agree success measures	Approve pilot OKRs, KPI baseline and benefits methodology before implementation.
Commit to a scale decision	Review evidence at day 90 and decide whether to scale, reshape or stop.

28. Data SkyLab Studio policy statement

Data SkyLab Studio - Federated, outcome-led Data Governance

Data SkyLab Studio advocates federated, outcome-led Data Governance. Enterprise principles, minimum standards and guardrails should be defined centrally, while accountable people within business- or governance-aligned domains govern the data they understand best. Data Products should make governed data easier to discover, understand, trust, request and reuse. Federation should enable domains to act with appropriate autonomy while preserving enterprise interoperability, security, privacy and regulatory obligations. Data mesh principles can strengthen this model through domain ownership, data as a product, self-serve data-platform capabilities and federated computational governance, but a full data mesh architecture is not a prerequisite for federated governance. Data democratisation should mean governed self-service: more people can use trusted data to solve business problems without removing need-to-know, least-privilege or accountable access controls. Technology adoption, catalogued asset counts, glossary counts, domain counts and Data Product counts are useful operational measures, but should not by themselves be treated as evidence that governance has succeeded. Success should be demonstrated through measurable improvements in accountability, discovery, understanding, trust, quality, access, reuse, risk management and business value. Microsoft Purview can support these outcomes, but sustainable federated governance also requires decision rights, accountable roles, domain capacity, agreed processes, Guided Enablement and continuous benefits measurement.

Technology-neutral first; Purview in context

The framework begins with business and governance outcomes. Where Microsoft Purview Unified Catalog is selected, Governance Domains, Data Products, glossary terms, Critical Data Elements (preview), OKRs, Data Quality, access policies/workflows and health controls can be mapped into the operating model. Support and feature status should be checked against current Microsoft documentation during implementation.

29. The one-page stakeholder message

A concise narrative for meetings, website copy and presentations

The value proposition

Federated Data Governance puts accountability with domain experts while retaining enterprise guardrails, making governed Data Products easier to discover, trust, access and reuse. The result is governed self-service, scalable accountability and measurable business value rather than governance activity for its own sake.

The problem

Today, people often have to know where data lives, who owns it and who to ask before they can use it. They search across systems, validate context manually, chase approvals and sometimes recreate data that already exists.

Why federated governance

As a data estate grows, relying on a central team to curate every piece of organisational data can become a bottleneck. Enterprise guardrails should be defined once, while accountable domain experts own meaning, quality, priorities and Data Products within those guardrails.

The target state

People can discover governed Data Products using business language, understand what they mean, see who owns and stewards them, assess trust evidence, follow a clear route to appropriate access and reuse what already exists.

How data mesh and democratisation fit

Data mesh principles reinforce domain ownership, Data Products, self-service and federation. Governed data democratisation broadens useful access to trusted data without removing security, privacy or accountability.

Why people should contribute

A controlled amount of structured effort from Domain Owners, Product Owners, Stewards, Custodians and Consumers turns individual knowledge into reusable organisational knowledge, reducing repeated questions, hand-offs, duplication and uncertainty.

How success is measured

Not by assets scanned or metadata created alone. Measure the consumer journey, federated role adoption, quality, reuse, accountability, access friction, central bottlenecks, risk and evidenced benefits.

Where Microsoft Purview fits

Microsoft Purview Unified Catalog and Data Map can provide important enterprise governance technology capabilities, while sustainable governance still depends on people, decision rights, process, domain capacity, operating discipline and continuous improvement.

30. Evidence and reference sources

Source	Reference
Data SkyLab Studio - Data Dave Part 1	https://www.dataskylabstudio.com/learning-content/data-daves-data-journey
Data SkyLab Studio - Data Dave Part 2	https://www.dataskylabstudio.com/learning-content/data-daves-data-journey-part-2
Microsoft Learn - Data governance with Microsoft Purview	https://learn.microsoft.com/en-us/purview/data-governance-overview
Microsoft Learn - Governance Domains in Unified Catalog	https://learn.microsoft.com/en-us/purview/unified-catalog-governance-domains
Microsoft Learn - Data Products in Unified Catalog	https://learn.microsoft.com/en-us/purview/unified-catalog-data-products
Microsoft Learn - Glossary Terms in Unified Catalog	https://learn.microsoft.com/en-us/purview/unified-catalog-glossary-terms
Microsoft Learn - Get started with Microsoft Purview data governance	https://learn.microsoft.com/en-us/purview/data-governance-get-started
Microsoft Learn - Data Quality in Unified Catalog	https://learn.microsoft.com/en-us/purview/unified-catalog-data-quality
Microsoft Learn - Data Health Controls in Unified Catalog	https://learn.microsoft.com/en-us/purview/unified-catalog-controls
Microsoft Learn - Data Product Access Policies	https://learn.microsoft.com/en-us/purview/unified-catalog-data-product-access-policies
Microsoft Fabric adoption roadmap - Data culture and data democratisation	https://learn.microsoft.com/en-us/power-bi/guidance/fabric-adoption-roadmap-data-culture
Microsoft Fabric adoption roadmap - Governance	https://learn.microsoft.com/en-us/power-bi/guidance/fabric-adoption-roadmap-governance
Zhamak Dehghani / Martin Fowler - Data Mesh Principles and Logical Architecture	https://martinfowler.com/articles/data-mesh-principles.html
Forrester Consulting - The Total Economic Impact of Microsoft Purview, commissioned by Microsoft (Aug 2025)	https://cdn-dynmedia-1.microsoft.com/is/content/microsoftcorp/microsoft/bade/documents/products-and-services/en-us/security/mccs-ms-purview-final-9-3.pdf

Evidence rules for Data SkyLab Studio public material

- Label commissioned studies as commissioned studies.
- Distinguish modelled/composite results from observed organisation-specific outcomes.
- Do not imply that broad Microsoft Purview economic results are Unified Catalog-only results.
- Do not publish organisation-specific ROI without a documented baseline, assumptions and calculation method.
- Keep product-feature statements aligned with current Microsoft documentation and review them before major publication updates.
- Clearly label Data SkyLab Studio target percentages as recommended starting targets rather than Microsoft product guarantees.

Product features, previews and connector support can change. Implementation guidance should be reviewed against current Microsoft documentation at the point of delivery.