

Ai Governance and Risk management

Author: Myriam Zgheib¹

Affiliation: CIRAME Research Center, Business School

Holy Spirit University of Kaslik, P.O Box 446, Jounieh, Lebanon

Abstract:

As Artificial Intelligence (AI) becomes fundamentally embedded within the financial services industry, the complexity of systemic risks—ranging from algorithmic opacity to regulatory non-compliance—has escalated significantly. While traditional financial institutions rely on technical oversight, current literature highlights a critical operational gap between high-level, conceptual AI ethical principles and the practical execution of traditional Model Risk Management (MRM). To address this disconnect, this study utilizes a qualitative, exploratory research design to synthesize current risk management paradigms with emerging global regulatory frameworks, such as the EU AI Act. The research constructs and proposes a dual-pillar theoretical oversight framework that bridges this gap. The first tier, AI Governance (the "Map"), establishes the strategic boundaries of ethical data usage, legal compliance, and corporate accountability. The second tier, Model Risk Management (the "Mechanic"), enforces the technical realities of algorithmic validation, continuous bias testing, and performance drift monitoring. Ultimately, this study concludes that by integrating this two-tiered governance framework throughout the entire AI system lifecycle, financial organizations can transition from reactive, isolated compliance to proactive, enterprise-wide risk mitigation, thereby securing both institutional trust and sustainable technological innovation.

Keywords:

Artificial Intelligence (AI), AI Governance, Model Risk Management (MRM), Financial Technology (FinTech), Regulatory Compliance, Algorithmic Bias, Risk Mitigation, Explainable AI (XAI)

Introduction: "The What & Why"

In 2026, Artificial Intelligence is now the major means for economic growth. It is significantly changing the way we produce, distribute, and consume goods. And as we embed these AI tools further into our society to a point where they can interact with humans and even control digital assets on a blockchain technology ledger, we are moving towards a new economic standard. And yet, with this new economic standard, we have a tremendous responsibility to ensure that these "intelligent" systems are not only safe but also reliable.

As AI is now responsible for identifying financial fraud, determining creditworthiness, and guarding against cyber-attacks, we can no longer view AI as a "black box" technology where we have no idea how it is working. In order to use AI to its full potential within an organization, there must be a delicate balance between the pace of technology and the stability of oversight. These two pillars are AI Governance and Model Risk Management.

AI Governance: The "Map"

AI Governance is the high-level framework of rules, ethics, and accountability. It acts as the "Map" for the organization, ensuring that every step taken with AI is legal, ethical, and aligned with human values.

- Rules and Regulation: It ensures the organization follows global regulations, such as the EU AI Act, to avoid bulky charges.
- Ethics and Fairness: It sets the standards for how data should be handled and how customers should be treated.
- Accountability: It defines exactly who is responsible if an automated system makes a wrong decision.

Model Risk Management: The "Mechanic"

While the Governance aspect deals with the rules, the Model Risk Management aspect deals with the technical reality. This is the "Mechanic" who continuously checks under the hood of the AI to ensure that the math machine is functioning correctly.

- Error Detection: This aspect recognizes when the model begins to "drift" or become less accurate over time as the world changes.
- Bias Testing: This aspect ensures that the AI system is making the right decisions based on the patterns.
- Validation: Before allowing an AI to go live on a business process, the mechanic has to test the AI in a safe environment to ensure that the AI is stable.

Finally, AI is just a tool; it's not a "silver bullet." It can give us incredible insights and process massive volumes of data; however, there still needs to be human judgment to effectively utilize the AI system. With a clear Map (Governance) and a competent Mechanic (Risk Management), AI can go from being a risk to being a valuable tool for the future.

Literature Review: "The story so far "

The use of Artificial Intelligence (AI) in financial services is a topic that has been extensively studied and written about, particularly with regards to issues of operational efficiency, analytics, and customer engagement (Kamel & beainy, 2023). The World Economic Forum and the Bank for International Settlements discuss the increasing trend towards the use of AI technologies, which cover aspects ranging from credit scoring to fraud detection and regulatory compliance.

However, despite the advantages, the literature has pointed to some challenges, mainly related to issues of transparency, fairness, and accountability. The development and increasing use of complex and self-learning models have, to some extent, strengthened the concerns over the so-called ‘black-box’ effect of AI systems, thus raising issues about their auditability. The literature on Explainable AI has emphasized the significance of interpretability for ensuring the validation and acceptability of AI-driven decisions.

Then, the literature has pointed to the fact that AI risks are multi-dimensional and systemic. The classification of AI risks into technological, data, economic, social, ethical, and regulatory domains indicates that AI-related risks cover the whole spectrum of the organization, not only the technical and technological aspects.

In answer to this, several studies have suggested a structured and layered framework of AI governance that maps risks to mitigation guidelines (Ibrahim et al., 2026). Such frameworks have highlighted the need for a continuous process of risk identification, control design, and implementation. This view of AI governance, therefore, does not see it as a static function of policy-making, but as a dynamic capability built into the lifecycle of AI systems.

However, there is limited guidance available on how financial organizations can effectively operationalize financial AI governance and how it can be used to bridge the gap between general ethical principles and technical model controls.

Methodology: "The how we did it "

To address the identified gap between conceptual AI principles and practical implementation in the financial sector, this study employs a qualitative, exploratory research design based on conceptual modeling and framework synthesis. Rather than conducting an empirical quantitative experiment, this research constructs a theoretical oversight model by systematically analyzing and integrating current risk management paradigms with emerging technological governance standards.

Data Collection

Data were gathered through a comprehensive review of secondary sources. This included peer-reviewed academic literature on Explainable AI (XAI) and financial risk, institutional reports from global financial authorities (such as the World Economic Forum and the Bank for International Settlements), and emerging regulatory frameworks (most notably the EU AI Act and standard banking compliance guidelines). The selection of literature was specifically curated to capture both the high-level ethical dimensions of AI and the technical, algorithmic challenges of machine learning in finance.

Analytical Approach

The analysis was conducted in two primary phases using a comparative and thematic approach:

Thematic Risk Categorization: First, the multi-dimensional risks associated with financial AI—ranging from data bias and algorithmic opacity ("black-box" effects) to broader social and regulatory vulnerabilities—were categorized to establish the scope of necessary oversight.

Comparative Paradigm Analysis: Second, the study evaluated the traditional scope of Model Risk Management (MRM) against the broader, principles-based requirements of AI Governance. This comparative analysis highlighted the operational limitations of using MRM in isolation, proving that technical validation alone cannot satisfy modern ethical and regulatory compliance.

Framework Development

Based on the synthesis of these findings, the study utilized conceptual modeling to construct the proposed two-tiered oversight framework. The ethical, legal, and accountability requirements were synthesized into the overarching governance tier (the "Map"), while the technical validation, drift monitoring, and bias testing protocols were structured into the operational risk tier (the "Mechanic"). By mapping these two domains across the entire AI system development life cycle, the methodology bridges the gap between static policy-making and dynamic, technical risk mitigation.

Results: "The facts "

The literature review indicates there is an inherent gap between conceptual financial AI governance and implementation in financial services organizations. Although the literature provides an extensive classification of risks associated with financial AI and proposes an approach to financial AI governance, it is generally vague on how it can be implemented in financial organizations.

One of the significant findings is that financial AI governance must be an enterprise-wide process. For instance, risks such as unfairness do not originate from the algorithm alone but can occur at other stages of the financial AI lifecycle.

On the other side, traditional Model Risk Management approaches offer robust processes in model validation, model performance monitoring, as well as model error detection, but these approaches are not necessarily effective in addressing broader model-related concerns, including ethics, transparency, and regulatory compliance.

In order to bridge the gap between AI governance and Model Risk Management, it is necessary to implement a two-tiered approach in AI oversight. One part of AI oversight involves AI governance, while the other part involves Model Risk Management.

This can be thought of as:

AI Governance – the “Map”: rules, ethics, and accountability

Model Risk Management – the “Mechanic”: making sure models behave and continue to behave. Moreover, with the increasing trend of more rigid regulatory demands, end-to-end traceability and accountability are required to show not only model performance but also fairness, transparency, and auditability. This further highlights the need to integrate governance controls within the AI system development life cycle rather than merely focusing on these controls after model development.

Discussion and conclusion: "The so what ? "

Artificial Intelligence is no longer an experimental tool but a cornerstone driving innovation and decision-making in the financial services industry. As the deployment of AI speeds up, so does the sophistication of the risks it poses. This study has shown that the risks involved in AI are not

limited to the performance of the algorithms but also encompass data, processes, governance arrangements, and regulatory requirements.

From the literature, it is evident that although tremendous strides have been made in the identification of AI risks and the establishment of high-level principles for governance, there still exists a crucial gap in the translation of these concepts into tangible frameworks in the financial industry. This is especially true in the areas of fairness, transparency, and auditability.

To bridge the identified gap, the paper suggests the development of a two-tier framework for AI management. The first tier would be AI Governance, which would be concerned with the development and establishment of guidelines, ethics, and responsibilities to ensure the organization is compliant with regulatory requirements, such as the EU AI Act.

The second level would be Model Risk Management, which would be concerned with the technical side by testing and ensuring the AI model continues to operate correctly over time. The “Map” and the “Mechanic” analogy for the two concepts suggests that the two concepts would work hand in hand. The “Map” would be concerned with the route and boundaries within which the AI would be operating, and the “Mechanic” would be concerned with ensuring the correct and smooth running of the AI model.

Ultimately, good AI governance will be embedded throughout the lifecycle of AI systems, allowing organizations to progress beyond reactive compliance towards proactive risk management. Through the integration of good AI governance principles and technologies, financial institutions are able to establish trust, regulatory compliance, and the full potential of AI as a trusted solution of the future.

References

- Beainy, R. H., & Kamel, J. K. (2023). The Importance of Technology, R&D and AI in the US Economy. *Migration Letters*, 20(8), 573-584.
- Bernd W. Wirtz, J. C. (2022). Governance of artificial intelligence: A risk and guideline-based integrative framework. *Government information quarterly* .
- Michelle Seng Ah. Lee, L. F. (2021). Innovating with Confidence: Embedding AI Governance and Fairness in a Financial Services Risk Management Framework. *Ethics, Governance and policies in artificial intelligence* .
- Ibrahim, Maritta, Cesar Kamel, Agatha Saber, and Richard Beainy. "Cryptocurrency's Transition to a Sovereign Financial Infrastructure 2025-2030." *Available at SSRN 6011174* (2026).