



CLOUD REALITIES

CR011

Criticality of Psychological Safety
in Digital Transformation with
Duena Blomstrom, People Not Tech

CLOUD REALITIES



[LISTEN NOW](#)

Capgemini's Cloud Realities podcast explores the exciting realities of today and tomorrow that can be unleashed by cloud.

CR011

Criticality of Psychological Safety in Digital Transformation with Duena Blomstrom, People Not Tech

Disclaimer: Please be aware that this transcript from the Cloud Realities podcast has been automatically generated, so errors may occur.



[00:00:00] All of the things are in place. These humans should be high performing. The humans must be broken.

Welcome to Cloud Realities, a conversation show exploring the practical and exciting alternate realities that can be unleashed through cloud driven transformation. I'm David Chapman. I'm Sjoukje Zaal, and I'm Rob Kernahan. In this week, we're going to be talking about why human wellbeing is critical for successful digital transformation and value creation.

And what. Concerning factors around where we are as a society at the moment, following a very difficult couple of years.

Joining us this week is founder and CEO of people, not tech influencer and author, Duena Blomstrom, also a friend of mine. And we've been [00:01:00] having this conversation now for a few years. So I'm delighted to welcome Duena onto the pod. Duena, how are you? And say a little bit about yourself. I'm doing great.

Thank you so much for having me and a pleasure talking about these topics. It's usual. It's time we talk about all of them. As you say, I run this company called People Not Tech. I also write and I speak and I live and breathe psychological safety, human death and human well being in technology. Let's get on to the subject of human well being and humans at the center of all of this.

So let's just start with like quite broadly. Do I know like in your head, having thought about this, our conversation on this is probably at least lasted the last. Three years or so now you've been thinking about for a lot longer in your mind. Why is human well being itself? So critical in the middle of something you would think it might be techie like digital transformation Well, I don't think we can have any kind of transformation or any kind of digital for that matter until we figure out exactly where we are in [00:02:00] terms of keeping our people safe, happy, productive, performant, and all the things that they should be.

And that is simply because in the old scheme of work where, you know, you came in, you clocked in, you did some individual work, maybe you did some common work, you went home. That model worked where we had less emphasis on people's well being and humanity these days, considering what our to do is, which is to deliver technology as fast and as delightfully as possible, we just won't be getting there when we have to have a completely different world of collaboration, of understanding each other, of pair programming, of talking, of going to dojos, of doing things in common, which are not in the comfort zone of most of our workers.

And that's because, I mean, I'm setting aside the obvious, everybody wants to have a good work life balance and everybody wants to be kind of happy at work and ideally as like an employer or [00:03:00] transformation leader, you know, you don't want to be like an industrial age driver of a factory sort of thing.

But what in it from a creativity and engagement perspective is important? Well, there are several tenants of success. If you're attempting to make a team super functional, and those are to do with the dynamic between people, they've been studied over the years by academics extensively, obviously, but the study I come back over and over again to and it remains kind of the staple of all the data to me still, unfortunately, is Google's project Aristotle of a few years ago, which to me still remains the absolute skeleton of any cultural code.



anything, any cultural endeavor, um, in this study, which was for, for your listeners and for the ones that haven't heard about it, although I doubt it, this is a, an esteemed audience of people that would know about it. I'll do it anyway. The study was the biggest of its kind comprised about, I think [00:04:00] maybe 50, 000 people over a period of about four years, many, many, many teams.

And, um, maybe, I don't know, close to 200 teams. And they went through over a hundred variables to see what is it that makes a Google team super performant. And, um, they've asked all kinds of things, from the most absurd to the most logical ones that you'd expect. Is it because we have ping pong tables? Is it because we pay people more?

Is it because of our interview process? Is it because they're women? Is it because what is it? And at the end of it, all the survey discovered is that it came back to these four ideas, one of which they had to go find the definition outside of, they weren't quite as versed in it. main idea that came on top of every, every respondent, um, answers, uh, said was that, um, to have a team that's high performing, you have to have a dynamic in the team called psychological safety.

There were a number of other things that came out of this study, but this particular thing is the most important one to us really. Again, [00:05:00] the study in itself, if anyone that's a new Um, culture change person to me, whether it's a culture officer or a happiness officer or a CTO to me, if you want to build culture, you look at these five things from Google and you go like, right, how do we get these in?

Because they are psychological safety, first and foremost, um, dependability, which just means that you have some form of cadence that you can count on in terms of variability. It doesn't even matter how fast you go. It just matters that you can depend on it and each other, whether or not you have structure and clarity, which, you know, is massive for any enterprise.

And that's the whole essence of building generative cultures that where you do have that. And then whether people have meaning and impact. If you have those five things, you're fine. You're golden. You don't need any of your, with, with all due respect to everyone, any of your specialists that are doing the hundreds of other things around the people topic.

And if you don't have those things, you can have as many ping pong tables as you like, and you're not going to be improving your creativity and productivity. You're just not going to have the type of innovation and, [00:06:00] and the, the speed that you get out of having the dynamic in the team that moves people forward.

Before we dig into that, I'm interested in what your take on the sort of general landscape is obviously just as you know, the world we've had a torrid couple of years or probably longer than that now, and it doesn't look like it's getting sort of. You know, particularly better, um, at least for the next couple of years, given the economic situation.

So just before we dive into the detail of things like psychological safety and the other themes, what's your read on the psychological state of workers at the moment? It's very grim. I'll be very honest. I feel like we are in a moment that's a lot more desperate than the media or even LinkedIn would like us to believe.

I think what's happening is there's a degree of overall burnout, obviously, but there's one that we are almost having all of us at the common level, at the foundational level, if you wish. And that's across [00:07:00] society that they've had recently studies of children being affected of obviously different segments in different ways, but everyone suffers from what



has now been recognized as a post pandemic stress disorder, um, to a degree or other.

And in fact, I was just writing this. in my upcoming book called Tech Led Culture. If governments would have given us each enough money for therapy every month, they would probably have halved their spend on mental health issues for the next few years. But no one has done that. So now we have like, like I say, like a foundation of tired, upset, confused, and super, super exhausted.

But on top of it, what we have in the technical industry is a longer term burnout. which I think is going to become our second great resignation, if you wish, or even worse than that, because we have technical people who have worked double time all their lives. They've always been super stretched. And on top of everything, they've had to [00:08:00] keep super alert on learning and on growing because in the technical industry, no one talks about it, but it's, it's super taxing from an intellectual point of view and from, from a pressure point of view and learning point of view.

And those things are now coming to bite us. And I think what we're looking at really across the knowledge industry is a good few years off of potential catastrophe. We do some quick moves and those quick moves have to be cultural. They have to be big and they have to be about, um, serious ways of, of working that signal people, people have changed mentalities.

And how do you think additional to that? I mean, that's a complex enough situation you described. Is there a change in worker expectations as well, given what went on during the pandemic? I don't know, like lots of different definitions now about actually what working looks like. You know, it hasn't to my mind, you're much beyond using words like [00:09:00] hybrid.

I'm not sure it's really settled back in yet, has it? Really good question. One of the reasons why I left my, I like to think that one of the reasons why I left my, my book very late is because... Intention, that was all intentional, wasn't it? Right, right. It's because it is in a sense a hot... situation that's developing under our very eyes.

Like I had finished a chapter on on servant leadership last week. I had to go back to it today to yesterday to write about Jacinda's exit and kind of how she's half blamed it on being on an empty tank and burned out. So I'm just saying it's a very moving situation with that. said, I have worked very hard to try kind of to separate these terms and to, to make some clarity in this ridiculous amount of, of confusion and trends and tick tock insanity about acting your way to quiet quitting, quiet hiring, climate quitting, the amount of hashtags, soft resignation.

Right, right. It doesn't help anyone. I think that we [00:10:00] look, we need the hashtags. I think that the amount of hashtags we have is a signal of the fact that the market, as you put it, or people, workers, employees, knowledge workers, they are waking up and they are starting to realize that it is now time that they kind of ask for what they rightfully need to function as individuals.

It isn't responsible for a professional to not say what they need. Um, and end up in a situation where they're no longer performing. But let's face it, we've lived in workplaces where we weren't allowed to be human. We weren't allowed to have emotions. It wasn't professional to express ourselves. We shouldn't have asked for any type of rights because we're fortunate enough that we work in an office in the heat and not in the street.

So there's a number of factors that have made knowledge workers be maybe overly modest. and too shy in asking for what they need out of the enterprise. And enterprise on the other hand, has just been so focused on trying to make a buck and, and, and meet some artificial



goals that people have [00:11:00] fallen by the wayside.

It's part of what I call human debt. And I think we need to fix it quite quick. That that point i mean it's very start we say around the the worker is becoming frustrated and they know something's wrong but all these hashtags and proliferation of discussion maybe you know there's lack of clarity in their head but from a sort of company business perspective it sounds like they don't see it and there's this lack of awareness i suppose it's if is there an example where a more traditional enterprise has picked up on this and they've started to move on it because you need those you Fast movers at the beginning and everybody looks at and going, Oh, what have they done?

And then success comes out of it and everybody gets a bit happier. It feels like this broiling situation in the middle of, have you got a view on where somebody from a more traditional background has picked it up and gone? Yes, this we have to do this. We will action it. And it's made an improvement. Um, this is a really good question, and I have a really disappointing answer.

There are very few examples [00:12:00] of big ships that have turned around. You have Silicon Valley companies that are doing okay ish. But that's because they have started from zero on a on a piece of paper, and they have designed culture with people at the center. And the chief of operation is actually the people person or the risk officer is the people person.

Um, and they haven't built a business how they learned in business school in 1992, but how it effectively worked based on outcomes. genuine flexibility and caring about their people. Those people are doing fine, but they were doing fine before the pandemic as well. The people that have turned ships. I'm really it's a horrible thing to say.

I don't see anyone who is genuinely turned ships. Some people are making moves. But I believe that the moves that had to have been made at the very beginning would've had to have been a lot more courageous. So I'll give you an example. A good two year ago or more, I was already seeing kind of the window on the conversation on people closing.

And I, I had multiple conversation with CTOs and CIOs [00:13:00] where they were saying, you know, were just gonna get back to normal. And so this disconnect between you, you have several systemic issues in organizations. I hate talking about organizations 'cause it doesn't matter if we want better. culture, we need to focus on the team and on the individual.

But fine, if we're gonna be honest, we have, from an academic perspective, you can see that there's disconnects in organizations at the, at the top level, there's disconnect in silences, there's disconnect everywhere. And the disconnect is chiefly based on fear. You have your management layer that is just desperately clinging on to whatever they know works, trying to put those same structures in place with a ridiculous amount of Oh, my God, what if something happens?

A mentality of command and control that will not serve them will not take them anywhere. But when you have that, what happens is you cannot have an open conversation about what does it really mean to bring these people in a different paradigm at work and not just bring them a different hours. The funniest and saddest thing I've heard over the last few weeks has been someone who told me, [00:14:00] no, no, no, they've decided that after all, we can do what we want.

And it is true flexibility. So the only minor thing I would say is that I have to clock in and out. So at nine, when I started being flexible, I have to tick a box to say I am flexible now. Thank you very much. Officially acknowledged. Officially flexible. At 5pm I'm stopping flexibility. So



it's, it's just insane.

That is exactly what's happening now. So people haven't taken the big conversations and they have to. What does flexibility genuinely mean? What do outcomes genuinely mean? Why are we doing this thing? You, you mentioned earlier in the conversation, your notion of human debt. I wonder if you could just, let's return to that for a second and just, and just dive into that in your mind, what is it?

And why is it of higher criticality than tech debt, for example? Well, I won't say it is necessarily worse than tech debt. Not everyone has the same amount of tech debt. And many CTOs, when I talk about this in keynotes, start laughing because when I say you should do the exact same thing you're [00:15:00] doing about technical debt, about human debt, and the response is we are doing the same thing.

We're not doing anything about any of them.

Right. So human debt to me is like the equivalent of technical debt, but for people. So all of the things that we haven't really, the corners we've cut, the things we haven't really put in place, the big conversations we haven't really brought to light and we haven't sorted, your DNIs, your respect, your self care, your human work inside organizations, all of that stuff created now human debt.

And I think the biggest factor to human that actually you have several kinds. You have some that's at the organizational level and maybe you can clean some of that. But now you have human that at a team level, if you wish, you have people that have years and years of practically emotional abuse from their enterprise who are now having to get over it and start to put some work in themselves again, despite being burnt out so that they get anywhere.

So really what we're looking at is this moment where In the, we already had human [00:16:00] debt By the time we entered the pandemic, we're exiting the pandemic with a moment where it's time we landed some of these wins, but it will take workers to help lend them as well. This is not something that can come from the enterprise and be given a golden biscuit with the answer to all of your problems.

But instead, you're going to have to kind of put put some more work into it. Everyone has to do what I call the human work, which is all of this EQ conversation, all of this spending time with each other, all of this hard bit of interacting with other humans. Right. What do you think that the current economic situation is going to affect this?

This is another really good point. We're all entering a recession. I mean, at the end of the day, no one printed money for free, like it seems to be that we are hoping, but entering a recession doesn't necessarily mean that it will change people's view of how they see their workspace. I've not seen the recession fear slow anyone [00:17:00] down from the big resignation, for instance.

So people kept going despite being convinced that they're that they're going to be out in the snow. They'd rather do that. That's what I'm telling everyone that I believe we are arriving at the point of inflection where people have had enough. Because they are ignoring economical signs that are ignoring, like, their need for economical safety.

They're just leaving. They have had enough. So it's a moment of, of we have to do better, all of us. So let's explore why this is critical and how it shows up in digital transformation. Rob, I wonder if you wouldn't mind just giving us a couple of minutes on the modern organization and the transition from sort of traditional, and let's focus on IT for the basis of this conversation.



Just a quick little sketch of. You know, the move from traditional IT to modern IT and then let's explore the human in the center of that. Yeah, sure. Absolutely. So, I mean, the jury's in. It's the product. It's the platform. It's empowerment. And if you think about what that actually means, it's about giving [00:18:00] control back to the individual and enabling them to do their job.

So we discussed that earlier in the podcast, but there's some major blockers to it. One, the concept. of I'm in a line management structure. That's where I sit. We need to break that and understand that people need to have freedom to go do the role that they need to do where the organization needs it. And there's also things like the, you know, the traditional, I draw my governance as a triangle.

No, no, no, no, no. Let's write down the rules of how we should all behave together and how we interact. And then that leads us to, as long as you obey your highway code. You're able to just to get on with what you need to do. And then when you have to ask for permission and you go and have to seek something different, then it's a it's an interaction through exception as opposed to constantly have to get permission to go and do something.

So we live our lives by codified laws. Everybody gets on quite well on the roads and in the streets and everything else to a large degree. Why does the corporate world feel that it needs this constant check and balance with everybody where they, you know, they, they have to seek this. Can I do it? Can I do it?

And that becomes extremely frustrating. It slows everything up. And this idea of [00:19:00] forming teams with a purpose around this product based structure and understanding what the outcome they're trying to create and giving them a goal as opposed to what is the corporate layer cake where the purpose cuts through about 15 different teams and everybody gets confused about what that purpose is and why they're actually here.

This, this move towards this new type of organization definitely helps. The problem is Many organizations pay lip service to that structural change and keep in secret the old ways of working behind the scenes and then it's a nice sort of glossy overlay that says look at us for a modern organization was actually what i see.

And there's very few organizations you've done this actually get to a proper business aligned organization structure with purpose and clarity and run. More codified rule based ways of working. I personally observed that happiness does go up and people feel more buoyant and you get better product activity, etc.

But it's, I think the phrase was used earlier, the leap of faith [00:20:00] from the business to be able to say it's safe and okay to do this because we know it works now. We've done it, we've proven it, we've seen it. It's just that there's a lot of traditional thinking that still remains within. Organizations and you almost need to just delete that and start again.

But there's a sort of the pathway to it needs courage, basically, from my perspective. So it sounds like that bit that you described as needing deleting and starting again, that seems to me that that aligns quite closely to Your concept of human debt. Do I know what we're saying? The same thing. So it's slightly different words, but we can't agree anymore.

It does take courage to start all the thing precisely where you are. Be very honest, use the real language and not corporates in time and just be like, right, what are we doing here? How are we doing it best? How do we align around product that people actually want to buy from us? And how do we do that in a way that that's respectful to your needs as a human and your needs as a worker?



and do that together when we can and not together when we don't have to. It's really not brain surgery. The fact that [00:21:00] we have wrapped ourselves up into these kind of complicated structures and we discuss whether or not the organization has the right hierarchy and stuff, this is all artificial and it's all because we are almost afraid to be honest, which is, it's a simple matter of let's get back to basics.

and be respectful and kind to each other. It's really not that complicated, but we can't accept that it's that simple of an answer. It feels like with this frustration we discussed earlier, and the potential great resignation, there'll be a compelling event that occurs. Maybe the awareness comes into sharp focus a lot faster than people might have thought it would be there, and there's a sharp wake up call, and that feels to me maybe brewing in the background, and we're just waiting for it to crescendo.

Let's hope so, because if you look at the, and I don't want to go into, into it necessarily, but if you look at the Twitter moment, I would have thought that that's good enough for people to just like all of us to go like, right, let's go out in the streets and tell the government that that's not acceptable.

You can't make developers sleep on the [00:22:00] floor after you fired their co workers, but you can. Seems like it. Really, nothing happens. Back to something you said earlier, Dave, just to leave it so that your listeners are not left without a definition, because we were discussing psychological safety as the number one thing found.

So what we're really talking about to get a bit of, I think, to my mind, a bit of clarity, I always think of it as the organization is one thing. And like I say, I'm not a big fan of changing the organization because that seems to me like a little bit of a pointless exercise. Necessary, you should talk about it.

You should have the lofty goal of being an open and honest and fearless organization, but whether or not you get that done, it's almost secondary to the fact that you should focus on the team in my view. The only caveat I would have to that is to Rob's point, there's a certain way that organizations orientate themselves and have done.

Because that's how you have to run an industrial age company that can be different now because our ways of working and our technology and [00:23:00] actually the sort of things that we want to produce it like they're not industrial age artifacts anymore like it's, you know, true digital age stuff yet we still working in industrial age sort of way and that comes with different types of governance and different types of codification I do agree though strongly in, you know, rewriting organograms and moving the deck chairs around on the Titanic.

It's not going to get you anywhere. No, but you're perfectly right. So there are, I would say that this falls under structure and clarity to me. Still, it's all in those five lines from, it's unfortunate they're from Google, but they could have been from like Moses. I would have still agreed as much as my, so still, still around structure and clarity at the end of the day, because if you have that structure and clarity in an organization, and then you've built some dependability and all your teams have psychological safety impact and purpose.

I guarantee you have an organization that's generative and you don't have to rewrite the key the other way around. So start with the team, make that team happy and productive and super performant, and then make sure that your [00:24:00] leadership is in a team. They're stop being fearful. They'll stop wanting everyone to come back and sit down so they can look over their shoulder.



They'll understand. It's important that people trust each other and have psychological safety. And then at the end of the day, you start raising some human debt. Just genuinely starting to focus on the team and making the team the best it can be convincing people to do some of the human world. So they kind of grow from from an EQ and personal point of view.

Those are the things that are most important. If I had to choose one thing and someone gave me, you know, kind of the keys to the kingdom and said, Here is this biggest enterprise ever. How do you make them better? The first thing I would do would be to make half of your work week human work. I don't care how, when, and how you work, but for half of the work you have to show me that you've spent time with other people, you've thought, you've discussed, you understood other feelings, you've had some empathy, and you kind of expressed yourself.

That's all you need to show me. And just by way of bringing today's conversation to a close, I'm interested in something you talked [00:25:00] about earlier when you referred to Jacinda's resignation recently, servant leadership. So to sort of complete a bit of a picture here, what's the role of a leader in the sort of organizational shapes and ways of working that you're talking about?

I think it's a really, really interesting topic because it's a simple one, but it's equally, probably the most thorny one. We've all had, um, brushes with our own identity, idea of being, um, in a position of authority or not. And all of those kind of human dynamics come into play on top of the organizational and societal dynamics of it, if you wish.

So what we're looking now, like we said earlier today, is at a society that has largely been built on hierarchy and having command and control as these leaders that look over your shoulder, micromanage, tell you what to do, and then make sure you're doing it. This is essentially command and control. But that simply does not work in the ways of order we have had.

For the [00:26:00] last 20 years, it never really did work. I mean, Agile never said, and you can have this dude oversee that you're taking this nice little ticket in the way that the client needs it. It's never been compatible that you have command and control leadership and do Agile. But no one seems to have really, truly gotten to the bottom of it.

And I still have. People asking me today, can I please not call it servant leadership when I do master classes? Or can I just call it something else like new leadership or empathic? Because the word servant is too bad. Yeah, it's just don't even get me started on the political correctness on top of every other problem we're having in life.

But realistically, whatever you call it, it's the new kind of leadership where you need to be helpful. You need to be super acute and you need to spend all your time on your humans and making them happy. That's really the short of it.[00:27:00]

Sjoukje, what have you been looking at this week? Yes, each week I will do some research and this week I found it very interesting to look a bit into high performance teams. So what is a high performance team? So they are composed of individuals with specialized expertise and complementary skills who are goal oriented and hyper focused on achieving clear and outstanding results.

And with the right approach, you empower them to collaborate, innovate, and produce work at the highest level. So within these teams, the people are highly skilled and are able to interchange their roles. And also leadership within the team is not vested in a single individual. Instead, that leadership role is taken up by the various team members, according



to the needs at that moment in time.

So Duane, you already covered a couple of the key attributes of a high performance team, but just let me add a couple of them to it as [00:28:00] well. So effective decision making is an important thing. Also valued diversity. Mutual trust, clear goals, and a positive atmosphere. So to be honest, in my career, I worked for a couple of employers who also try to work with high performance teams, implement high performance teams.

And I also worked for a system integrator who tried to sell high performance teams to customers. Like a product. Yeah. And on paper, it looks very good. So. That looks even better on a whiteboard. Yeah. Brilliant. So what actually happened in that case, those teams were put together. There was some team building around that.

They got some time to actually get to know each other. They added an experienced cron master to that team as well. They created a team mission statement, and then it was [00:29:00] actually time to perform. And that failed. Because all customers and organizations were really having high expectations that that team would perform highly in each and every situation.

So no room for failures and mistakes because they were promised a fully high performance teams. So, and that is really the misconception here. And I really want to know your opinion about that Duane as well. So what is a good way for organizations to really invest in that and try to solve that? Really good question.

Um, first of all, that's more than most people would have solved. So putting them together, you know, in a functional state is more than most people would have. So I've met plenty of system integrators who call people on the morning of, Hey, can you go to this thing? It's going to be on your team. I can't believe that ever happens.

But realistically, I think it doesn't, I don't think it works that we make perfect teams. And I, I've put a lot of money and time into [00:30:00] demonstrating this to myself. Unfortunately, um, Dave knows this. We started, uh, at people are not tech by making a piece of software on how to make the perfect team, um, spent a lot of money and time to figure out that that's a dumb idea and there's never going to be a perfect team.

And it doesn't matter if your team is perfect or not. It matters that whatever team you have. They have a certain type of dynamics. So we completely abandoned that the morning that I told my developers that we should scrap it. I'll never forget that. It looked at me like I had four heads. Oh, that was a proper mission.

It was a mission. But, uh, so yes, we, we went back to the drawing board and we said, look, it doesn't matter how you ended up with this team, what it matters is that you have this team now that's. Supposedly kind of together to a degree around a certain goal. You can make sure that you understand everyone's motivations.

Did you improve everyone's purpose? Did you make them connect with what they're doing? You make sure that they have an inside emotional bond that we call engagement. Um, the, the wrong world that the industry has used for other things. So [00:31:00] once you have those things in place, you can hope that this team that you already have is productive and high performing.

Yes. Thank you. Totally agree on that. So when you put a lot of effort in it, maybe in the end, they really become a high performing team. I have this wonderful vision in my head of a manager stood there with a clipboard with a load of checkbox. And going, I don't understand why it's not working. Yeah. Where we've done all the things on the list, all the things are in



place.

These humans should be high performing at this point. , the humans must be broken. Yeah. . Thank you, shek. Look, we end every episode of this show by asking our guest what they're excited about doing next. Sona, assuming you're writing the book at the moment, what are you excited about? I'm super excited about waking up one morning at five 30 at the 4 45.

because it's not happened since the book has started to be an emergency. So the book is called Tech Led Culture. Just writing your book overnight for you and then you're waking up and like, I've got it. [00:32:00] I wish, I wish, but it's not been as fast or as painless as I was hoping, but this is cause we're trying to cover everything.

Everything to do with flexible work, everything to do with cerebral leadership, everything to do with agile. I do believe strongly that if it hadn't been for technology needing us to see this human side faster, many other industries wouldn't have kind of taken advantage of this moment. So it's, it genuinely culture is changing in the workplace.

Thanks to technology. We just cannot do technology without doing this human bit. And we worked that out faster because we had to do fast technology and we had bought all the cloud we needed, hopefully. But, uh, yes. So I think where we are, what I'm excited about is to get this out and to see people having landed this wind.

I'd love to see genuine. Signs of flexibility. What we're seeing today is not that the four day week is not that the clock in and out and you start being flexible is not that all of these are newfangled [00:33:00] constraints. What we need is genuine flexibility, trust and the willingness to make great things.

Thank you so much, Duena. Always a blast to see you. Have a great weekend. You do. It was lovely speaking to everyone. Really lovely. You guys are awesome. Brilliant. Thank you very much. Not you, them.

So a huge thanks to our guests this week. Duena, thank you so much for being on the show. Thanks to our producer Marcel, our sound and editing wizards, Ben and Louis, and of course, to all of our listeners.

We're on LinkedIn and X, Dave Chapman, Rob Kernahan, and Sjoukje Zaal. Feel free to follow or connect with us and please get in touch if you have any comments or ideas for the show. And of course, if you haven't already done that, rate and subscribe to our podcast.

See you in another reality next week

[00:34:00]

About Capgemini

Capgemini is a global leader in partnering with companies to transform and manage their business by harnessing the power of technology. The Group is guided everyday by its purpose of unleashing human energy through technology for an inclusive and sustainable future. It is a responsible and diverse organization of over 360,000 team members in more than 50 countries. With its strong 55-year heritage and deep industry expertise, Capgemini is trusted by its clients to address the entire breadth of their business needs, from strategy and design to operations, fueled by the fast evolving and innovative world of cloud, data, AI, connectivity, software, digital engineering and platforms. The Group reported in 2022 global revenues of €22 billion.

Get The Future You Want | www.capgemini.com

