

BEYOND SCALE

Data Products in Small Banks: Why Less Scale Does Not Mean Less Complexity

A Practitioner's Perspective on Building Data Capability in the Private Bank

Giovanni Leonardi

July 2026



Contents

1. Executive Summary	3
2. The Myth of Proportional Complexity	3
3. Where the Complexity Actually Comes From	4
4. What the Small Bank Cannot Do	4
5. Proportionality as a Design Principle	5
5.1 Lean architecture	5
5.2 High-value use cases first	5
5.3 Relentless prioritisation	6
6. What the Small Bank Can Do That the Large One Cannot	6
7. The Practitioner's Conclusion	7

Data Products in Small Banks: Why Less Scale Does Not Mean Less Complexity

Transformation · No. 384
July 2026

“Complexity in a bank is a function of what it does, not how big it is — and a four-hundred-person private bank does almost everything a Tier 1 institution does, only with fewer people to hold it together.”

1. Executive Summary

There is a comfortable assumption in the industry that data platforms are an enterprise concern — that a small bank, with its modest balance sheet and its few hundred staff, has a correspondingly small data problem that a spreadsheet and a reporting tool can hold together. The assumption is wrong, and the pattern I have observed across smaller institutions makes clear why. A four-hundred-person private bank serving high-net-worth clients suffers the same data fragmentation as a Tier 1 institution: the same proliferation of systems, the same conflicting definitions of a customer, the same regulatory reporting burden, the same demand for a single trustworthy version of the truth. What it does not have is the budget, the team, or the vendor leverage to solve the problem the way a large institution would.

This essay argues that complexity in banking is a function of what an institution does, not how large it is, and that the small bank therefore faces a genuinely hard data problem with genuinely constrained means. The resolution is not to pretend the complexity away, nor to shrink an enterprise blueprint until the budget runs out. It is to adopt proportionality as a first-order design principle: lean architecture, the highest-value use cases first, and a discipline of prioritisation more relentless than any large institution ever needs to practise. Done well, the small bank does not merely cope. Its constraints force a clarity that larger institutions, awash in scale, rarely achieve.

2. The Myth of Proportional Complexity

The intuition that complexity scales with size is natural, and for some things it holds — transaction volumes, headcount, the sheer number of accounts. But data complexity does not obey it. Complexity in a data estate comes from variety and fragmentation: how many different kinds of thing the institution does, across how many systems, with how many definitions of the same entity. A small private bank scores surprisingly high on every one of these.

Consider what a four-hundred-person private bank actually does. It takes deposits, lends against complex collateral, manages investment portfolios, deals in foreign exchange, administers trusts and estates, serves multiple generations of the same family, and reports to the same regulators as any other bank. Each of those activities tends to sit on its own system, often from a different vendor, each with its own model of what a client is. The bank is small in people and large in scope.

Scale drives volume. Scope drives complexity. A small bank with a wide scope has a small institution's resources and a large institution's data problem – and that mismatch, not size, is the real challenge.

This is why shrinking the enterprise picture does not work. The number of distinct entities to reconcile, definitions to align, and integration points to manage does not fall in proportion to headcount or balance sheet. The private bank has fewer of each account, but no fewer kinds of thing to govern.

3. Where the Complexity Actually Comes From

It is worth being precise about the sources, because a proportionate solution has to target them directly rather than diffusely.

- Entity fragmentation. The same client exists as a depositor in one system, an investment account in another, an FX counterparty in a third, and a trust beneficiary in a fourth – with no shared key and four subtly different definitions of who they are.
- Relationship depth. Private banking clients are not accounts; they are families, structures, and generations. Capturing that context is inherently more complex than recording a retail transaction, regardless of how many clients there are.
- Regulatory obligation. Proportionate supervision reduces the scale of what is demanded, not the kinds of governance, risk data, and reporting that must exist. The obligations apply in principle at a smaller size.
- Vendor heterogeneity. Specialist systems for wealth, treasury, and core banking rarely come from one supplier, and were never designed to share data. Integration is a first-class problem, not an afterthought.

None of these shrinks meaningfully with size. All of them are present in the private bank in full.

4. What the Small Bank Cannot Do

If the problem is Tier 1 in shape, the means are emphatically not. Three constraints define the small bank's position, and any credible approach has to respect them rather than wish them away.

1. Budget. There is no eight-figure transformation fund. Investment is measured against a modest cost base, and every pound competes with front-line priorities. A

solution that assumes enterprise spend is not a solution at all.

2. Team. The data function may be a handful of people, sometimes one, often part-time against other duties. There is no bench of specialist engineers, no dedicated platform team, no capacity for parallel workstreams.
3. Vendor leverage. When the bank's contract is a rounding error in a platform vendor's revenue, it cannot demand roadmap influence, priority support, or favourable terms. It takes the product largely as it is offered.

*“The small bank cannot buy its way out of complexity,
staff its way out, or negotiate its way out. It can only
design its way out.”*

The temptation, faced with this, is to conclude that a real data platform is simply out of reach — to carry on with manual reconciliation and heroic spreadsheets. That is the false economy the rest of this essay exists to refute. The complexity does not go away because the bank declines to address it; it re-emerges as risk, as reporting that cannot be trusted, and as relationship managers who cannot see their own clients whole.

5. Proportionality as a Design Principle

Proportionality is often heard as a lesser word — a polite way of saying do less. In the small bank it means something more demanding: design precisely to the institution, with nothing spent on capability it does not need and nothing omitted that it does. It is harder than building at enterprise scale, not easier, because there is no slack to absorb a wrong decision. Three disciplines make it real.

5.1 Lean architecture

The small bank cannot maintain a sprawling platform, so it should not build one. The right pattern is a thin, governed data layer that draws from the operational systems and becomes the single trustworthy source for reporting and analytics — without attempting to re-platform the operational estate or couple everything together. It buys, and configures, far more than it builds. It favours managed services over self-hosted infrastructure, because a team of two cannot run a data centre and a data function at once. Every component has to earn its place by being genuinely necessary and genuinely maintainable by the people who will be left with it.

5.2 High-value use cases first

A large institution can afford to build broad foundations and harvest value later. The small bank cannot fund foundation-building on faith; it has to lead with use cases whose value is immediate and visible — a consolidated client view that lets a relationship manager see a family's whole position, a regulatory report that currently consumes days of manual effort, a reconciliation that never ties out by hand. Each early win funds credibility for the

next, and each is chosen so that the shared foundation it quietly builds — the entity model, the governed layer — serves the use cases still to come.

5.3 Relentless prioritisation

This is the discipline the small bank must practise far harder than any large one. With one team and a modest budget, the cost of doing a low-value thing is not merely the thing itself — it is the high-value thing that then never gets done. Prioritisation cannot be an annual planning ritual; it has to be a constant, almost uncomfortable, saying-no. The proportionate data leader spends as much energy defending the roadmap from good-but-not-essential requests as delivering it.

Dimension	Enterprise default	Proportionate small-bank approach
Architecture	Broad platform, build-heavy	Thin governed layer, buy-and-configure
Value timing	Foundations first, value later	High-value use cases first, foundation as by-product
Prioritisation	Periodic planning	Constant, relentless saying-no
Operations	Dedicated platform team	Managed services a small team can run
Vendor stance	Leverage the roadmap	Partner within the product as offered
Success measure	Breadth of capability	Value delivered per pound and per person

6. What the Small Bank Can Do That the Large One Cannot

It would be a mistake to frame this only as constraint. The small bank holds real advantages that a proportionate strategy can exploit, and they partly offset the disadvantages of scale.

It has short lines. The person building the data platform can sit with the relationship managers who use it, and with the executive who funds it, often in the same week. Requirements do not travel through layers of intermediaries and arrive distorted; the feedback loop that large institutions spend fortunes trying to recreate exists here for free.

It has coherence. A small institution can hold a single, consistent view of what a client is because few enough people are involved to actually agree. The master-data problem that defeats large banks — not technically, but politically, across warring divisions — is tractable in a bank small enough to fit its data owners around one table.

It has proximity to value. Every use case is close enough to the front line that its worth is visible and quickly felt. There is little room for capability built for its own sake, which is itself a discipline larger institutions would envy if they noticed how much of their spend produces nothing anyone uses.

The constraint, in other words, is also a corrective. Forced to build only what matters, the small bank can end up with a data estate that is leaner, better understood, and more closely tied to value than the sprawling platforms of institutions many times its size.

7. The Practitioner's Conclusion

The assumption that data platforms belong only to the enterprise has left a great many capable smaller institutions under-served — talked out of solving a problem they genuinely have, or sold a shrunken enterprise blueprint that their budget cannot sustain and their team cannot run. Both outcomes fail them, and both rest on the same error: mistaking scale for complexity.

The honest position is harder and more hopeful. The small bank's data problem is real and Tier 1 in shape; its means are constrained and will stay that way; and the answer is neither to give up nor to overbuild, but to design with a proportion and a discipline that scale would otherwise let it avoid. A private bank that builds a thin governed layer, leads with the use cases that matter most, and says no relentlessly to everything else will not merely survive its lack of scale. It will have something many larger institutions never manage — a data estate where every part earns its keep, and where the people who run it understand every piece. Less scale, in the end, does not mean less complexity. But it can mean far more clarity.