AI Integration and Technology Modernization in Finance Functions

Category: Financial Stewardship

Estimated Read: 12 Minutes

A fiduciary framework for building finance functions that can use AI, automation, and decision architecture without compromising controls, reporting integrity, or executive judgment.

Abstract

Artificial intelligence and technology modernization are now central to financial stewardship. The finance function is being asked to close faster, forecast more accurately, support audit and compliance processes, interpret operational data, monitor enterprise risk, and provide decision-ready insight to management and the board. Yet many finance organizations still operate through fragmented systems, manual reconciliations, spreadsheet dependencies, inconsistent data definitions, and control structures designed for a pre-automation environment. This white paper argues that successful finance modernization is not a tool-selection exercise. It is a fiduciary architecture project. AI can improve anomaly detection, variance analysis, forecasting, close management, KPI design, audit readiness, and management reporting, but only when it is deployed over disciplined processes, controlled data, and accountable human judgment. The board-level issue is not whether finance should use AI. The issue is whether the organization can modernize without creating new reporting, cybersecurity, model, vendor, and governance risks.

Introduction: Finance Modernization as a Governance Problem

For many companies, finance is still being asked to operate with one foot in the future and one foot in the past. Boards want faster reporting, cleaner data, better forecasts, more useful KPIs, stronger controls, and earlier visibility into risk. At the same time, accounting teams often remain dependent on manual reconciliations, ad hoc spreadsheets, fragmented subledgers, delayed operational inputs, and informal institutional knowledge held by a small number of indispensable employees.

This tension has moved beyond operational inconvenience. It is now a governance problem. Financial reporting, internal controls, audit readiness, cyber resilience, vendor reliance, data governance, and AI use all intersect inside the modern finance function. If the finance function cannot produce timely, reliable, decision-useful information, the board's oversight function becomes reactive. If AI is placed on top of weak process architecture, the organization may accelerate the production of information without improving the reliability of that information.

The most important question is therefore not whether finance should adopt AI. That question has largely been overtaken by market practice. KPMG's 2024 U.S. survey reported that 88% of finance functions were using AI, with 62% using it to a moderate or large degree, and 92%

reporting that AI initiatives were meeting or exceeding ROI expectations.[7] KPMG's 2026 global survey of senior finance leaders likewise frames the issue as one of deployment purpose, governance, measurement, and workforce readiness, rather than basic adoption.[8] The governance question is whether finance modernization is being designed as architecture or purchased as software.

The Failure of Tool-First Modernization

Finance transformation often begins with a technology demonstration. A vendor shows faster reconciliations, automated variance commentary, AI-supported forecasting, natural-language dashboards, or predictive analytics. The demonstration is persuasive because it addresses visible pain: slow close cycles, excessive manual work, inconsistent reporting, and limited analytic bandwidth.

The danger is that the organization mistakes the tool for the transformation. A new application does not, by itself, resolve unclear account ownership, inconsistent chart-of-accounts logic, poor master data, fragmented approval rights, undocumented spreadsheet models, weak change management, or operational systems that do not reconcile to the general ledger. Automation can make a controlled process more efficient. It can also make an uncontrolled process more opaque.

This is why modernization must begin with process discipline. Before a finance organization automates reconciliations, uses AI to draft management commentary, or relies on algorithmic forecasting, it needs to know where the data originates, who owns it, how it is validated, what adjustments are made, what controls exist, and which reports drive actual management decisions. The COSO internal control framework emphasizes that effective internal control has value beyond compliance and financial reporting: it supports strategy, sustained growth, confidence, integrity, and reliable information.[9] That insight is directly applicable to AI-enabled finance modernization. The technology stack must be built around control logic, not the other way around.

The Data-Control Gap

Most companies do not have a data shortage. They have a data-control gap. Sales, operations, procurement, human resources, legal, compliance, and accounting may each maintain separate systems, definitions, workflows, and reporting calendars. Finance then becomes the downstream reconciler of enterprise inconsistency.

The data-control gap is especially dangerous when AI is introduced. AI models can identify patterns, summarize variances, predict outcomes, and produce plausible explanations. But plausibility is not the same as reliability. If the source data is incomplete, late, biased, inconsistently defined, or outside the documented control environment, the resulting analysis may be efficient but misleading.

NIST's AI Risk Management Framework is useful because it does not treat AI as a purely technical system. It describes an AI risk-management core organized around govern, map, measure, and manage functions, and stresses that risk management should be continuous, timely, lifecycle-based, and multidisciplinary.[1,2] The finance function should adopt the same logic. AI used in finance should be mapped to business purpose, data lineage, control ownership, model limits, human review, documentation, and escalation paths. Otherwise, the organization may create a new black box inside the system responsible for producing its most trusted information.

Where AI Creates Practical Value in Finance

AI is most valuable in finance when it strengthens judgment rather than replaces it. The best use cases are not those that remove accountability from finance professionals. They are those that reduce low-value manual effort, surface exceptions earlier, improve the quality of analysis, and help leaders ask better questions.

Practical use cases include anomaly detection in account activity, automated support for account reconciliations, contract and lease abstraction, variance analysis, working-capital analytics, cash forecasting, expense classification, purchase-order matching, revenue trend analysis, audit-document organization, tax data preparation, and first-draft management commentary. In planning and analysis, AI can help identify non-obvious correlations, test scenarios, summarize operational drivers, and flag assumptions that deserve scrutiny.

The value, however, depends on design. A forecast generated from weak historical data may reinforce old assumptions. A variance explanation drafted by generative AI may sound persuasive while missing a control issue. A dashboard may highlight the wrong KPI because the metric is easy to calculate rather than strategically significant. AI can expand finance capacity, but it cannot independently determine which measures matter, which explanations are credible, or which risks require escalation. Those are fiduciary judgments.

The Control Problem: AI Changes the Risk Surface

Every finance modernization project changes the control environment. Manual controls may become automated controls. Spreadsheet models may become system workflows. Human review may become exception review. Vendor-hosted applications may replace locally managed files. AI-generated analysis may enter management reporting. Each change may improve efficiency, but each also changes the risk surface.

The PCAOB's 2024 staff outreach on generative AI in audits and financial reporting found that audit firms were using generative AI primarily for administrative and research activities, while also investing in GenAI-enabled tools and acknowledging limitations requiring strong supervision, including privacy and security risks.[4] PCAOB staff also observed that public-company preparers were exploring GenAI in accounting and financial reporting processes, though such integration appeared secondary to operational and customer-facing uses.[4] For boards

and audit committees, the lesson is clear: AI in finance will not remain experimental for long, but the assurance environment is still evolving.

The SEC has also signaled that AI claims create disclosure and enforcement risk. SEC enforcement leadership noted the rise in AI-related disclosures and warned against misleading claims about AI use; enforcement actions against investment advisers for alleged AI washing show that organizations must be able to substantiate what they say about AI capabilities.[5] A finance function that uses AI must therefore manage both operational risk and narrative risk. It must know what AI is doing, how it is controlled, and whether public or investor-facing statements about that AI are accurate.

The Modern Close as the Test Case

The monthly close is the best diagnostic test of the finance function. A company can claim to be modern, but the close will reveal whether its systems, processes, data, controls, and people actually work together. If the close depends on late operational inputs, heroic manual reconciliations, undocumented spreadsheets, unexplained adjustments, and post-closing corrections, the finance function has not yet achieved modernization. It has merely survived the reporting cycle.

Modernizing the close should not be measured only by days to close. Speed matters, but reliability matters more. The real objective is decision-ready financial information: numbers that are timely enough for management action, reliable enough for board oversight, organized enough for audit support, and detailed enough to reveal operational drivers. AI can support that objective by flagging unusual balances, matching transactions, summarizing account movement, identifying recurring adjustments, and organizing supporting documents. But the close must remain anchored in ownership, review, evidence, and control.

This is where finance leadership must resist the temptation to optimize isolated tasks without redesigning the close architecture. A faster reconciliation process may still fail if upstream data is unreliable. Automated commentary may still fail if the business driver is misunderstood. A dashboard may still fail if it reports post-close information too late to affect decisions. The modern close should be treated as a system of accountability, not a race to produce numbers.

KPIs, Forecasting, and Decision Intelligence

Technology modernization should also force a company to reconsider its KPI architecture. Many organizations have metrics, but not necessarily key performance indicators. A metric reports information. A KPI should connect performance to strategy, economics, accountability, and risk. When finance modernization simply adds more dashboards, the organization may increase visual sophistication without improving decision quality.

The finance function is uniquely positioned to discipline KPI design because it can connect operational activity to cash flow, margin, working capital, capital intensity, customer

profitability, covenant compliance, enterprise value, and risk-adjusted performance. AI can help identify trends, anomalies, and relationships, but finance must determine whether a measure is useful, whether it is controllable, whether it is leading or lagging, whether it can be manipulated, and whether it aligns with strategic objectives.

Forecasting requires the same discipline. AI-supported forecasting can be valuable because it can absorb more variables and test more scenarios than traditional spreadsheet models. But forecasting is not merely statistical projection. It is structured judgment about drivers, constraints, behavior, and probability. The danger is false precision. A model that produces a highly specific forecast can create a sense of certainty that the business does not actually possess. Finance should use AI to widen the range of questions, not to narrow executive skepticism.

Cybersecurity, Vendor Risk, and Assurance

Finance modernization increases dependence on third-party platforms, cloud systems, APIs, data lakes, automation scripts, and AI-enabled applications. That dependence creates cybersecurity, access-control, data-privacy, availability, and vendor-concentration risks. These risks are not outside the finance function merely because they are technical. If a platform supports financial reporting, close management, forecasting, payments, or board reporting, its failure can become a finance, disclosure, and governance issue.

The SEC's cybersecurity disclosure rules require public companies to disclose material cybersecurity incidents and to provide annual disclosure regarding cybersecurity risk management, strategy, and governance, including board oversight and management's role.[6] Even private companies should treat that regulatory development as a benchmark for investor-grade governance. Finance systems contain sensitive data, support transaction processing, and inform external reporting. Their modernization must therefore be tied to cybersecurity oversight and incident-response planning.

Assurance mechanisms matter. SOC reports and related control-assurance frameworks provide a way to evaluate service-organization controls relevant to security, availability, processing integrity, confidentiality, and privacy.[10] These reports do not eliminate management responsibility, but they help boards and audit committees ask better questions about vendor reliance, complementary user-entity controls, data protection, and the boundaries of outsourced responsibility.

Audit Readiness and the Three Lines of Defense

AI-enabled finance modernization should improve audit readiness, not complicate it. A modernized finance function should produce cleaner audit trails, better documentation, stronger account ownership, more timely reconciliations, and clearer evidence of review. If AI tools generate analyses used in financial reporting or management review controls, the company should be able to explain the tool's purpose, input data, output use, review process, limitations, and change-management controls.

Internal audit has an important role. The Institute of Internal Auditors' AI resources emphasize governance, management, and auditing of artificial intelligence, including assessment of AI strategy, governance maturity, and AI-related risks.[11] This is particularly relevant in finance because AI may affect internal controls over financial reporting, operational reporting, compliance monitoring, and board-level risk communication.

The board should expect coordination among the first line, second line, and third line. Finance owns the process and the outputs. IT and information security support the systems and access environment. Legal and compliance monitor regulatory and policy implications. Internal audit provides independent assurance and advisory insight. External auditors evaluate financial reporting implications within the scope of their professional responsibilities. A mature AI finance architecture clarifies these roles before a control failure or audit issue occurs.

Fiduciary Architecture: The Board's Role

The board does not need to select the software. It does need to oversee the architecture. Directors should understand whether finance modernization is improving the organization's ability to produce reliable information, identify risk, allocate capital, support audit, and make better decisions.

The board and audit committee should ask management to present a finance technology roadmap that identifies current system limitations, manual dependencies, data-governance gaps, AI use cases, control implications, implementation priorities, vendor dependencies, cybersecurity considerations, and success metrics. The roadmap should distinguish between automation of existing work and redesign of the finance operating model.

Directors should also insist on an AI-use inventory for finance. The inventory should identify tools, owners, use cases, data sources, outputs, whether outputs affect financial reporting or management controls, whether third-party data is involved, whether confidential information is processed, and what human review is required. This inventory should be updated as use cases evolve. AI risk management is not a one-time approval event. It is a continuous governance process.

A First 100 Days Finance Technology Modernization Framework

A disciplined modernization program can begin with a 100-day architecture review. The first 30 days should focus on mapping. Management should identify core finance processes, critical reports, close dependencies, spreadsheet models, data sources, manual workarounds, pain points, vendor systems, and current AI or automation usage. The purpose is to create a factual map of how financial information actually moves through the enterprise.

Days 31 through 60 should focus on control and risk classification. Each process and tool should be assessed for financial reporting impact, management reliance, cybersecurity risk, data sensitivity, audit relevance, and board-reporting significance. This phase should also identify

quick wins, but quick wins should be limited to areas where the data and control environment are already reliable.

Days 61 through 100 should produce the modernization roadmap. The roadmap should prioritize use cases based on value, risk, feasibility, control maturity, and leadership need. It should assign ownership, define success metrics, identify required policies, establish model-review protocols, address training needs, and specify audit-readiness documentation. The result should not be a list of tools. It should be a finance operating architecture capable of responsible acceleration.

Conclusion: Architecture Before Acceleration

AI integration and technology modernization are now essential to the future of finance. But the companies that capture value will not be the ones that simply add AI to old workflows. The advantage will belong to organizations that combine modern tools with disciplined process design, clean data, strong controls, thoughtful KPI architecture, cyber-aware vendor governance, and experienced human judgment.

The modern finance function is no longer merely a reporting department. It is becoming an information architecture function. It must connect financial reporting, operational performance, forecasting, risk management, compliance, audit readiness, and board oversight. AI can help finance move faster, but speed without architecture is not modernization. It is merely acceleration.

For boards and executives, the mandate is clear. Treat AI and finance technology modernization as financial stewardship. Require architecture before acceleration. Build systems that strengthen judgment rather than obscure it. In the next generation of finance leadership, the central question will not be whether the organization has AI. The central question will be whether the organization can trust the information architecture through which AI operates.

Board-Level Questions for Finance Modernization

- Which finance processes remain materially dependent on manual spreadsheets or undocumented institutional knowledge?
- What AI tools are currently being used in finance, by whom, and for what business purpose?
- Do AI-generated outputs affect financial reporting, management review controls, forecasts, KPIs, or board materials?
- What controls exist over source data, model outputs, human review, vendor access, cybersecurity, and change management?
- How will modernization improve audit readiness, close reliability, decision quality, and risk visibility?

References

1. National Institute of Standards and Technology. Artificial Intelligence Risk Management Framework (AI RMF 1.0). NIST; 2023. Accessed May 20, 2026. https://www.nist.gov/itl/ai-risk-management-framework

2. National Institute of Standards and Technology AI Resource Center. AI RMF Core. Accessed May 20, 2026. https://airc.nist.gov/airmf-resources/airmf/5-sec-core/

3. National Institute of Standards and Technology AI Resource Center. NIST AI RMF Playbook. Accessed May 20, 2026. https://airc.nist.gov/airmf-resources/playbook/

4. Public Company Accounting Oversight Board. Staff Update on Outreach Activities Related to the Integration of Generative Artificial Intelligence in Audits and Financial Reporting. Published July 2024. Accessed May 20, 2026. https://pcaobus.org/documents/generative-ai-spotlight.pdf

5. Grewal GS. Remarks at Program on Corporate Compliance and Enforcement Spring Conference 2024. U.S. Securities and Exchange Commission. Published April 15, 2024. Accessed May 20, 2026. https://www.sec.gov/newsroom/speeches-statements/gurbir-remarks-pcce-041524

6. U.S. Securities and Exchange Commission. SEC Adopts Rules on Cybersecurity Risk Management, Strategy, Governance, and Incident Disclosure. Published July 26, 2023. Accessed May 20, 2026. https://www.sec.gov/newsroom/press-releases/2023-139

7. KPMG. AI in Finance: US Report. Published 2024. Accessed May 20, 2026. https://kpmg.com/us/en/articles/2024/ai-in-finance-us-report.html

8. KPMG International. KPMG Global AI in Finance Report. Published 2026. Accessed May 20, 2026. https://kpmg.com/xx/en/our-insights/ai-and-technology/kpmg-global-ai-in-finance-report.html

9. Committee of Sponsoring Organizations of the Treadway Commission. Internal Control - Integrated Framework. Accessed May 20, 2026. https://www.coso.org/guidance-on-ic

10. AICPA & CIMA. System and Organization Controls: SOC Suite of Services. Accessed May 20, 2026. https://www.aicpa-cima.com/resources/landing/system-and-organization-controls-soc-suite-of-services

11. The Institute of Internal Auditors. Artificial Intelligence Knowledge Center. Accessed May 20, 2026. https://www.theiia.org/en/resources/knowledge-centers/artificial-intelligence/

12. International Federation of Accountants. AI & Intelligent Automation - Disrupting Business; Elevating the Work of Accounting & Finance Professionals. Published October 23, 2023. Accessed May 20, 2026. https://www.ifac.org/knowledge-gateway/discussion/ai-intelligent-automation-disrupting-business-elevating-work-accounting-finance-professionals

13. International Organization for Standardization. Standards. Accessed May 20, 2026. https://www.iso.org/standards.html

14. International Organization for Standardization. ISO Store: AI and Information Security Management Package. Accessed May 20, 2026. https://www.iso.org/store.html

About the Author:

George (Keoki) Wallace, PhD, LLM, JD, is a multi-disciplinary executive with an extensive background spanning finance, law, and corporate leadership. As a licensed attorney, CPA candidate, CEO, CFO and General Counsel, he specializes in bridging the gap between complex financial data and legal compliance.