

# **Driving Renewal – Host Satu Rekonen**

## **Season 2, Episode 5: On Artificial Intelligence, Organizational Renewal, and Leadership in Times of Change - guests Tuomas Syrjänen, Futurice and Charlotte Guillou, WithSecure**

**Satu:** A warm welcome to the Driving Renewal Podcast event here at the Marsio Saastamoinen Foundation stage. Without further ado, let's introduce our guests. Tuomas Syrjänen is the Chief AI Officer at Futurice and one of the company's founders. He served as the CEO of Futurice for ten years, during which the company grew rapidly and increased its revenue tenfold, becoming an international player.

Now Tuomas leads Futurice's Data and AI transformation program and also serves as the chairman of the board. He has long been a pioneer in combining artificial intelligence and business, and he is particularly interested in how data and AI can be utilized in decision-making, processes, and new business models. Tuomas also serves on the boards of several companies.

Charlotte Guillou is the Chief Culture and Performance Officer at WhitSecure. She has over two decades of experience in transforming organizations and leading people through change at the levels of culture, strategy, and leadership models.

At WhitSecure, Charlotte has been building a new culture where values and leadership practices support the company's growth, learning, and capacity for renewal. According to her, real change happens when values are reflected in everyday behavior and leaders dare to create space for experimentation, learning, and trust.

A warm welcome Tuomas and Charlotte, to the Driving Renewal Live. Thank you. I've had the pleasure of speaking with both of you before in the Driving renewal podcast, and I'm really looking forward to seeing what new ideas emerge as you build on each other's perspectives today at the same tables.

I would like to start by asking you to share a bit about the kind of changes you have been driving recently in your organizations. Charlotte, would you like to start?

**Charlotte:** Yeah, first of all, it's great to be here. Probably the most recent thing, as you mentioned in the intro, has been a comprehensive organizational change. Over the years, we've split up and simultaneously renewed our culture and ways of working.

And now, perhaps most recently, how we could use data through automation, to change our way of working towards data-driven management, and what kind of work it requires in renewing our practices in daily management or in each individual's behavior patterns, that's something we've been pushing forward quite significantly over the past year.

**Satu:** Yeah, interesting. How about Tuomas?

**Tuomas:** Well, probably the biggest changes I've been driving at Futurice lately are related to the use of artificial intelligence. There are, of course, different levels to this. In some changes, I'm mainly cheering on and observing from the sidelines, like how software development is evolving. But then there are other aspects, such as how consulting business can be done differently or how sales can be made proactive and highly personalized instead of generic and reactive.

In these cases, I'm directly involved, even coding some of these changes. But more recently, in my various board roles, I've had a specific agenda. Typically, boards are the last place where change happens, so I've been focused on how we can properly implement AI in all these boards. It starts with simple things, like ensuring board members have access to AI where they can, for example, input board materials and other documents.

They are often very simple, concrete issues that need to be solved.

**Satu:** Really interesting. Somehow it feels like AI is a theme that can't be ignored when talking about organizational renewal in this era. It will significantly change how we work and perform daily tasks, and in a way, it also has the potential to support that renewal.

I would be interested to know where both of your organizations stand on this matter. What are your thoughts on where you are, especially if you think about it in a futuristic sense?

**Tuomas:** This is always a difficult question because if you think about where you should be, the gap is quite large. And then if you start comparing to peers or those nearby, you could say it's okay. But the struggle is always that the idea of where you should be is much bigger than where you actually are.

Making a change in behavior is really challenging, and technology rarely becomes a bottleneck, but changing behavior, changing the operating model, and perhaps unlearning old conventions is indeed very difficult. However, it has been a positive year in terms of how things have gradually progressed.

**Charlotte:** Yes, I could agree with everything Tuomas said, that the desire is probably always much further away, but certainly, the fact that we are moving forward is important and that work is being done towards it and it is being monitored. So, how AI is used in daily work, whether in software development or other areas, and also brainstorming how it can be utilized.

But in reality, it requires leadership, it requires time, and it requires each person to have the courage to try out and get involved. And surely, one would hope to be further along. But I would also say that it's important to embark on that journey, to be brave, to allow room for experimentation. However, the challenge lies in knowing when to move from experiments to actual production or broader use.

I feel like we're often at the point, or we're starting to be, where certain individuals have really come up with a lot of ideas, tried things out, and used them for something. But how do you then get the full benefit from an organizational perspective? That's the step I hope we can reach next.

**Satu:** I've been thinking about it from the perspective of implementation costs. If you consider that everyone surely understands that once you learn to use it efficiently in your work, it will most likely bring benefits and make the job easier. But immediately, it doesn't eliminate the other tasks currently being done. And then the step in between, to get to the point where it lightens the workload, takes time.

And I've been thinking about how it requires experimentation, a desire to learn, and a change in the way we operate. Do you have any thoughts on how to make this transition as easy as possible? Tuomas, would you like to share?

**Tuomas:** There are probably a couple of different levels to it. In a way, there's the personal level, which I think involves a lot of encouragement and support, and sharing various ways to change how one does their work personally.

Then again, when it comes to changing how teams, entire units, or whole processes work, there are probably a few different perspectives. I've noticed that it's partly about leadership expressing their intent and desire for change. It also

involves understanding that when making significant changes, things don't always go smoothly right away.

Then you also have to tolerate that initially the productivity benefit might even be negative as you learn the new way of doing things. You need the right people and the right examples. One of the best things, in my opinion, is that leadership sets an example. And this again ties into other roles, with a lot of discussion about how the board can act as an example.

Usually, it goes like this: the board demands that the management should do something with AI, but they themselves don't do anything about it. So, that might not be the best leadership mechanism in this case and others.

**Charlotte:** Well that was quite a comprehensive answer. I believe that leading by example is very important, meaning you use it yourself and bring those examples forward. Sharing good experiences is also quite crucial, like how we communicate them. You can organize them within your own teams or at various events, ensuring that we highlight successful experiments, but also those that didn't go so well. It's about how we share and learn from them, and making room for the fact that not everything always goes perfectly, but we learn from it.

It's probably good to allocate time in your daily management practices for this, like taking a moment in your team meetings to discuss how you've been using AI personally. On the other hand, from my own experience, it's also important to find time for experimentation and learning. Sometimes this requires clarifying what can be deprioritized in certain matters, so that you also have time for learning.

**Satu:** Is there something that you think is currently the biggest challenge in getting AI to be used and beneficial in the best possible way? You can consider different levels, but what does Tuomas think?

**Tuomas S.:** One of them is probably many, and there's no single solution to this, but on some levels, I've noticed that one is a lack of imagination.

We are so stuck in old ideas and old limitations. For example, if we think that a person's skills are limited, then all process models are built on the assumption that a person's skills are quite limited. Now we see that we can augment people's skills quite well.

So it allows for a much broader role, and you don't necessarily need so many different people to do something. Or we start from the idea that individuality

costs. Well, in the future, it might not cost as much. What have we built on assumptions that no longer hold true. That's one. Then there's probably the idea of having a growth mindset, wanting to learn and push oneself. And the more senior you are, the more you need to be able to admit, "Oh, maybe I don't know this," which might be easier for younger people to acknowledge.

**Satu:** Can you think of any good practices at Futurice that have helped address the challenges you mentioned?

**Tuomas:** Yes, it's probably the best practices where someone does something differently and shows others that it can be done this way too.

Usually, debating doesn't get you very far, but when someone actually does something, others might think, "Oh, you can do it that way too? I'll do it as well." Another thing we've noticed is that behavior change can hinge on very, very small details. If we talk about the last mile, it's not just about the last mile but the very last inch.

We have, for example, a case where a new type of sales activity was seen to actually yield good results. When we talked to different salespeople, everyone was excited, but no one changed their behavior. It turned out that the only gap was that there were no ready-made examples of how to write the new type of email.

And then, when examples were given on how to write a new kind of email, things started to change. It wasn't out of malice that people didn't change their behavior, but the cognitive load was so high that it didn't get done because there was no model example.

**Satu:** Good example. Thank you.

**Charlotte:** Well, I could perhaps add something about the challenges.

One thing that has come up for us is certain policies and those old behavior patterns. And as a cybersecurity company, it's about whether it's safe. It's important that things are done securely and don't create certain risks. But how do you enable a fast enough cycle for these policies or procedures, for how something is implemented?

The development of AI is progressing so rapidly in many different fields that something that wasn't possible a month ago might very well be possible today. And how do you then get those new tools into trial, whether in product

development or even in everyday work? For us, it's been one of those things where we've had to rethink our IT and cybersecurity policies to speed things up.

**Satu:** Yeah, definitely a very important support element. I was thinking about what you Charlotte mentioned earlier, that some individuals have been very actively experimenting with AI. Maybe some are further along than others. I wonder if you see a risk that part of the company's staff can keep up with this transformation and leverage it to increase their productivity, while others might get left behind.

What thoughts does this provoke? Charlotte, would you like to continue?

**Charlotte:** Yes, it is probably like this in any major transition. Some will be the pioneers and will grasp it more quickly. Then there are those who follow behind, and perhaps it becomes the company's and leadership's responsibility to ensure that we provide opportunities for everyone and in all roles to develop their own skills.

But you can't make those decisions for the individual indefinitely, to take the initiative and start experimenting and doing things. But the opportunities must be provided, and the responsibility lies in us giving them. But surely, some will run ahead, and on the other hand, it's also about how the company or the leader recognizes those who are enthusiastic and running ahead, because they can likely become good change leaders within the organization. They share good practices, and then there's a bit of a pull effect, like "What are you doing there? Why are you doing that so quickly?" or something like that, to leverage that potential small difference to their advantage, rather than it being negative.

**Tuomas:** Yeah and maybe I see that on all these individual, organizational, and societal levels, and perhaps what I've mentioned several times is that if you think about a small fear, it's that I'm not really a huge fan of a Silicon Valley-type society where some earn millions while others are on the street, it feels like the middle class is easily missing, so there are risks here, among other things, that when technology, not just AI but all other technologies that come along, will it divide more strongly between those who master it and are really productive and valuable, and then perhaps those who are not so eagerly involved. So, I feel that at every level, there is a responsibility: individuals have a responsibility to keep themselves up to date with developments, organizations have a responsibility to provide opportunities, and society also has its responsibilities. But there are risks of inequality here, and then we get to what it means in terms of rewards and other aspects if productivity differences grow, the cumulative effects can become quite interesting in companies.

**Satu:** It just occurred to me, Charlotte, when you mentioned whether there are any incentives from either of yours organization that encourage experimenting with and learning about AI?

**Tuomas:** I personally believe strongly in social incentives, like getting credits, earning colleagues' respect, and receiving encouragement for what you've done and shared. I think that's the best approach.

And we should create an environment where everyone is encouraged to do more of so.

**Charlotte:** We also have sharing. Now, as a new addition to our performance evaluation, we talk about values and how we operate and achieve goals. One aspect of this is the utilization of AI and how it has impacted the job, along with some reflection on that. So, it's now an additional component for us, but more the incentive comes from sharing with others.

**Satu:** What practices did you have to make it visible to everyone what others are doing?

**Charlotte:** We have team and company-wide practices in place, such as using Teams channels to share recognition within our own functions.

Every month, we have an innovation lab where a team presents what they've been working on. We've also had AI hackathon-type events where people from different parts of the organization are invited. Additionally, we have organization-wide info sessions to share these successes and updates. So, we have various ways to bring these things forward.

**Tuomas:** Very similar, probably daily, experiences are shared on Slack or someone does something and others follow, and then there are separate sharing sessions.

Or a bit bigger was when one team decided to simulate our core business project and chose to simulate how it would be done entirely AI-natively. It was quite reasonably successful. When everyone is present once a month and the CEO speaks and all that, it was part of that.

It might have been about twenty minutes of the whole event, which was an hour long, that this team went through how they did it. It was very educational, but considering that about a third of the entire company's event was used for this, it was also quite costly.

The message probably got through that this is quite important.

**Satu:** Yes, exactly. We want more of this and keep on display. Good. So, if we consider, as you mentioned Tuomas, this multi-level aspect and also the responsibility of society, and I think about this efficiency narrative of companies and then somehow the fact that AI is often used to save costs and do things more efficiently and quickly.

And then on the other hand, perhaps the political economic goal is to keep as many people employed as possible. Do you see any kind of conflict here between the company's shorter-term goals and the political economic longer-term goals?

**Tuomas:** Well, it's probably a certain level of maturity that makes cost efficiencies easier, but I don't think it necessarily means, for example, I believe that while we do need to be more efficient, the big thing will come when we also find new value and consider what we're not doing right now because, for instance, the price is too high.

These are interesting exercises, considering what we currently leave undone because the cost of doing it is too high. There are definitely such cases, which also create new jobs and other opportunities. One of my favorite themes related to this is professional identity. How do these new ways affect everyone's professional identity?

And because right now, professional identity is very strict, like being a lawyer or something similar. But I believe that in the future, the line will be much more blurred because technology enables different roles. Yes, it's about efficiency, but it also significantly reshapes professional boundaries. And that leads us to some interesting discussions.

**Satu:** Yes, and part of the reason why the change might be slow and difficult is because it also involves professional identity issues. So, rebuilding that.

**Tuomas:** Yes, exactly.

**Charlotte:** Yeah, I mean, I think work is changing, and that's probably how it is, and surely some tasks will eventually end, but then there's this, that I also believe new jobs will emerge, tasks will become broader, and just thinking about my own work, how much more broadly I can contribute or give input or experiment when you use tools yourself, so work is changing.

**Tuomas:** Maybe, for example, in software development, there's a big identity crisis for software developers because they no longer write code; they review code written by AI. Someone might challenge me on this comment, but what does it mean? The cost of technology is coming down, and we use technology significantly more—ten to a hundred times more software will probably be used in the future because the cost is decreasing. One change I've noticed personally this fall is that I create disposable games for children so they can study for exams much more motivated than just reading a book. Making a small game currently takes about half an hour with AI from the book material, which reflects this change.

Would you have thought two years ago to make a disposable game for an environmental science test? Definitely not. But now it's a half-hour task.

**Satu:** A good concrete example. Thank you. If we summarize the previous discussion, do you have any thoughts on how to move this forward as responsibly as possible in each organization?

What should be taken into account to ensure that this major technological revolution we are all facing is also human-centered and humane?

**Charlotte:** That's a good question. The first thing that comes to mind is that it needs to be managed, systematically planned, led, and goals need to be set. What we talked about enables people to get involved, and work towards it, driving the change and the renewal of practices, and at the same time, advancing the culture.

I believe it needs to be managed.

**Tuomas:** Maybe one lesson that emerged almost ten years ago in different industries, even before the AI revolution, was starting an industry shift by creating a tool that gave management better control over work and asked employees to report more for better control. You can imagine how well that went.

Not a whole lot, but after we turned it around to focus on helping employees succeed in their work, things started to improve. Since then, I've always remembered that we need to create applications and solutions that help people succeed in their jobs. After that, as a secondary use case, we can integrate them into management processes or other things, but we should never start by asking people to do more just so management can have better control.

That usually doesn't end well.

**Satu:** This perhaps, Tuomas, leads to the next question. If we still talk about this AI upheaval and the rapid pace of change it brings, is there something permanent, some old wisdom that we absolutely must hold on to, even though many things are changing?

**Charlotte:** Well, that's quite a broad question. Well, what comes to my mind overall is that what we should hold onto is humanity and people. People are at the center of things after all. As humans, we haven't really changed from being psychophysically social beings. And then, how you lead people—human behavior is still quite structured in a certain way.

And that's how you can bring about change, by considering the people. That's my opinion.

**Satu:** Very good, thank you.

**Tuomas:** Maybe I would build on the earlier discussion by saying that from the organization's perspective, we need to help people succeed in their work. And from another perspective, what's the Finnish term for growth mindset? In the coming years, many of us will likely have to reinvent ourselves in several professions, so how does each person handle that?

It could also be about how much of that, I don't know if it's taught or how it could be taught to people, but it's probably one of the biggest skills for the future—to constantly redefine at both the individual and organizational level what you do, what your role is, or what your identity is, and so on.

**Charlotte:** And I have to say that I personally feel that curiosity is one trait that takes you quite far, or I've somehow noticed that being curious is a bit like having a growth mindset, but being interested and so on, so how can you take for people? It's quite a challenging issue, but I think it's necessary in this kind of transition.

**Satu:** Sure. Good. Let's move on to the next topic.

Indeed, the previous discussion also highlights and shows how much there is that we still don't know. What all will change with the AI and there is a lot of uncertainty. I think Charlotte, you said it well in your interview in the Driving renewal earlier that it is limited how much we can process change.

It's limited how much uncertainty we can handle at once. I'd like to hear your thoughts on this, given that we're going through such a transformation and there's also a lot of other uncertainty in the world. So maybe we can't completely separate it from our work selves. How do you see the kind of leadership that this time particularly needs? Charlotte, would you like to start?

**Charlotte:** Yes, this time demands a lot from leaders as well. It's not easy to lead in the midst of such change, in my opinion. And what it requires is genuine presence and curiosity towards people, so you can support them on their journey of change. And through that, also provide support and the courage to lead by example.

If I refer to AI now, it's really about trying it yourself, doing it yourself, and sharing both successes and failures. How you can model that it's okay to do this and that it's worth spending time on. I see an inclusive leader who still shows the direction, even though the transformation itself hasn't necessarily changed.

Like in leadership, but it requires that kind of interest in people and their current state. Because you need to know, maybe I should also say that as a leader, you need to know when to get closer and when to give space, and just understand what is currently burdening them. It might not necessarily be work; it could be the geopolitical situation or something entirely different. So, how can you create a space where these issues can be addressed, allowing everyone to focus on work or other tasks? It requires reflection and adaptation to different situations.

**Satu:** Yes, definitely. Thank you.

**Tuomas:** Well, a few things come to mind. One is definitely that through energy and positivity, we create belief and positivity and so on. But on the other hand, you also have to be a realist. Addressing those challenges and other issues...Maybe it's also about treating people like adults. This has always been close to my heart—talking to people as adults and so on. But then, perhaps the third thing is that if there's a vague, even somewhat scary change, the leadership also has the responsibility to try to find ways to make it more concrete or approachable, perhaps through analogies.

For example, I've been using quite a lot recently the idea that when we think about the change in the role of leaders, if we look at history, a similar change happened with marketing directors, probably about 15 years ago, 10-15 years ago. The role changed quite radically with the advent of technology, data, and even AI.

**Tuomas:** We can use these examples to ask, "Hey, if this same change happens in other roles, what does it mean?" Maybe through this, people can grasp what it means for them and move towards it. Grounding things in this way is likely to be an important quality for leaders in the future.

The world is pretty much full of vague, big terms about how the world is changing, but it doesn't help much if no one explains what it actually means.

**Satu:** Yeah, exactly. Thanks. I have to say, Charlotte, I've been following your LinkedIn posts lately. There have been some interesting themes related to leadership, particularly about energy levels or energy in leadership and the impact or shadow a leader leaves behind, that invisible something that remains in the room when the leader leaves.

And you've also talked about how it significantly impacts psychological safety and participation, which are crucial when driving change forward. How do you see the shadow of a good change leader when they leave the room?

**Charlotte:** It would be great if it were energizing, energy-giving, and inspiring, but mainly that it leaves a mark that creates a sense of security in the change.

Referring a bit to Tuomas's comment, you ground yourself and bring solutions, rather than just demanding more and more. But maybe it's like when I talk about the shadow, each of us leaves a mark. When you walk down the hallway, go to a meeting, or leave that meeting, do you create an atmosphere where people actually dare to challenge you, ask questions, or admit they've made a mistake? And when you leave that room, do they start whispering among themselves, or are they energized, thinking, "Hey, yes, even though sometimes things are tough"?

And then there's that self-reflection, I've thought about it a lot myself, about the energy I leave with. Have I felt energized? It's a pretty good indicator. If you feel a bit drained, you probably haven't been at your best in terms of leaving positive energy in the room.

So, a kind of reflection on what you bring with you, and maybe that, when there's a lot going on and a lot around us that we can't control, and then there are things we can influence, how you, as a leader, come into a situation, you enter the room and leave everything else outside.

You don't bring your own burden into the room, but instead, you are present and try to clarify the situation. That's quite important.

**Satu:** Yes, absolutely. Tuomas, did you have any thoughts?

**Tuomas:** Well, what I'm thinking is that, yes, of course, we have official leaders and others, but also how we can make this more collective so that everyone leads.

And the best ones, in my experience, are when the so-called employee starts leading the leaders and starts kicking them in the shins, like, "Do something now." So maybe that's also something you'd hope for more, that there would be a more collective responsibility, like, "Hey, let's change now."

And maybe not place so many expectations on that one official leader. But I don't know, maybe things like this, but probably this, I don't know if it's adaptability or change management, but its importance is likely emphasized.

**Satu:** Absolutely. Yeah, I'm thinking about the unified or shared understanding among leaders.

And at least, let's say, conveying that unified message to people when there's a change happening that needs to be led and driven forward. But how often do leaders actually have a unified vision about some change, and what would be good to do if they don't?

**Charlotte:** Well, that's exactly what I've been reflecting on myself, that probably the biggest obstacle to change is when there's no unified direction or when we think there is. There's quite a lot of that too, where people assume and nod in the room, agreeing that yes, this is the way to go.

And then, in fact, we end up doing something completely different outside that room. And I see that as a real obstacle to change if we start heading in different directions. Or another major challenge is doing nothing at all. Like, we agree in principle, but I'm not fully on board, so I end up doing nothing.

And I think it sends a very mixed message to the whole team. So, how can we address this? Well, by summarizing and clarifying before we leave, making sure everyone understands what we are doing. Actually, with just small actions, we can ensure a unified direction.

It just requires that we have the time. That we don't always rush out of the meeting. We always seem to be in such a hurry, and then the meetings end quickly. And maybe the most important thing would be to take ten minutes at the end to say, "Hey, are we all on the same page? What are we saying about

this when we leave?" Or are we communicating something about this? It could be quite important.

**Satu:** I liked when you wrote about how a good practice is to ask each leader to describe in their own words the decision we've made. It's quite revealing to see if we've actually understood it the same way.

**Tuomas:** I personally like spending time on dialogue to create a shared understanding. I believe that through this, the management system becomes more effective, though not necessarily always efficient, whatever the Finnish terms for those are. And there's this basic joke that management spends six months thinking about and discussing strategy, and then holds a half-hour meeting wondering why no one else is on board with the strategy. Then, of course, we should think about the ways to quickly achieve those "aha" moments.

The goal isn't necessarily to have a long debate or dialogue. What can be achieved? Are there any methods? Often, there have been good experiences where seeing an example or someone else's work suddenly makes everyone realize, "Oh, now we all understand what this is about." There was one situation where hours were spent trying to understand a particular phenomenon or model.

Then, when an example of how it works came up, everyone said, "Now we understand." You also have to learn quite a bit about the ways to create a shared understanding more quickly than just talking or other methods.

**Satu:** Exactly. Are there any examples of what is good?

**Tuomas:** Yes, often it is about seeing. Then there are interesting aspects, if we delve a bit into the AI side, one thing I must admit is that we haven't been very successful in implementing it, but we've thought about it a lot. For example, now we have things like writing Amazon Sixpagers or RSC-type documents, which are interesting because if we get more data from the organization, whether in text or other forms, we can immediately use AI to analyze whether they are aligned or in what ways they are not.

We can make that visible too. I believe that seeing the organization's shared agenda has become much easier in the age of AI, and we already have some good experiences with it. We can see directly whether there is alignment within the organization, whether different units are working on the same thing or not.

**Satu:** Well, you both are in top-level management in organizations and make decisions that certainly affect the entire organization. I'm wondering if you have experienced making a decision that actually ended up slowing down a change you wanted to implement? Tuomas?

**Tuomas:** Well, yeah, and I have to say that since I wear different hats—sometimes I'm a salesperson and sometimes a coder—in addition to these leadership roles, I was just thinking that there are decisions I've made in one role that I've found frustrating in another because they slow things down. But certain things, like the huge number of different agents and other factors, or what can be connected to the company's systems, for example, so of course, as a creator, it would be nice to just get things done easily, but from the organization's perspective, you can't allow that because it could quickly lead to bigger problems. Creating policies to avoid living haphazardly and taking unnecessary risks is essential.

**Charlotte:** I'm pretty sure I have. It would probably be an exaggeration to say I haven't. I doubt anyone ever does it on purpose, and it makes me think that there have definitely been situations where decisions are made to advance something without actually understanding how much time it requires from everyone involved.

And probably, often the same people are involved in handling another major priority. This then leads to the question of how we can achieve anything if we try to do everything a little bit.

That often the ability to prioritize and the courage to say, we'll do this first, then we'll do that.

And in that sense, I recognize that you always have to keep trying to get better at it. It's easy to make decisions without fully understanding their impacts and what they entail. And in doing so, you might accidentally halt something.

**Satu:** Is there any way to better understand the big picture by perhaps getting closer to where the actual work is being done?

**Charlotte:** What comes to mind with those big ones is that it would be good to have something like a transformation roadmap or something, but to have the big picture gathered and who is working there. In the big picture, it would always help to see that, hey, it's always the same people, so there must be some challenge, like.

**Charlotte:** Such visualization and concretization are certainly one way. We also use OKRs, which are transparent to the entire organization. We have high-level organizational goals and the key results associated with them, and each function links its activities to these. This is also a work in progress, and it involves identifying who is responsible, what other units are needed, and creating transparency about the projects being undertaken and what is required from all units to achieve a larger goal.

Rarely it is just one unit, like sales or product development; rather, the work must span the entire value chain when talking about larger transformations. I think such approaches are effective. I'm not saying they always work or are perfect, but at least they strive in that direction.

**Tuomas:** A couple of thoughts come to mind, based on my own experiences and a few examples. One frustrating thing is that it often feels like there's always a rush to leave some tasks unfinished, but there's always time to deal with the problems, the noise, and all the adjustments that follow.

Then, even though I think we handled communication well during an organizational change some time ago, it didn't go as smoothly as we thought. At some point, we realized it would have been better to call each employee personally; it would have been easier and faster than dealing with all the adjustments afterward. Just this week, we talked about how there's always time to handle the consequences, even if it seems like there's no time to sort things out initially. It often feels like we're always in a rush to move on.

But then again, if we jump to the AI agenda, I believe that since there are quite a few problems in leadership at the moment, and we often have to lead in the dark, AI has a big opportunity to make this more visible. We recently interviewed several dozen different leaders and strategy people, and managing dependencies emerged as one of the biggest issues in strategy implementation.

We don't just see that we have three good projects, all interdependent, and then none of them progress. Making these dependencies visible is something we're actually researching right now, to figure out how we can highlight these dependencies to make smarter decisions.

Exactly. It makes the overall picture more visible.

**Satu:** Yes, exactly. It makes the overall picture more visible.

Tuomas, in an earlier *Driving renewal* interview you talked about how central you see change agents to driving change forward, and you mentioned that even if the surrounding organization hasn't necessarily yet understood the change or isn't fully on board with it, having strong change agents often still makes it possible to move the change ahead.

I would be interested in understanding how an organization can identify and harness such change agents to their advantage.

**Tuomas:** That's a good question. Yeah, maybe to start with. From my experience, a successful change usually requires the support of upper management, and then you need those change agents to implement it.

But if you have to choose, a good change agent will make the change happen, even without upper management's support.

**Charlotte:** Yes, exactly.

**Tuomas:** But if there's a good top management but no change agents, nothing will happen unless the management itself becomes the change agent. But what they recognize, I would say, is that they should ensure they are not prevented from doing their job, that they are not held back. Often, change agents are also the ones who cause a bit of friction in the organization, create some tension, because if we start making changes, like doing things differently, we might have to step over different roles or units. Usually, in an organization, this causes friction and other issues. So, perhaps the big thing is how we recognize what good change agent behavior is, even if it causes some ripples somewhere, and supporting that, because it's not always pleasant to face the complaints.

**Satu:** Yes. So what are some of the key skills that a change agent should have, in your opinion?

**Tuomas:** Well, in my context, I see business understanding as crucial. Often, the best change agents come from the business side to some extent. They have an understanding of technology, though they don't necessarily need to be tech experts. Then, the ability to see the big picture, but also pay attention to details, and the ability to think differently, daring to challenge conventions.

It's not easy to find this type of people, but you need a handful of them to get things moving.

**Satu:** Once you find them, it's worth holding on to them.

**Charlotte:** Yes. I would also add that recognizing them is an important part of leadership work, where you get to know people. So, because change agents aren't in the hierarchy, like reporting to someone, how do you ensure that in your role, whatever it may be, you get to know people, have conversations, stop to chat? Whether it's over coffee or if you're traveling to meet at different sites, it's really important.

And hear those comments, when certain names always come up, that's where it also comes from. You can't lead from one room with data. You also need to understand the person, the people.

**Satu:** Yes. A very good addition. Thank you. Let's move on to our final topic.

Let's talk a bit more about resilience and maintaining it as a company grows and becomes established. In fact, both of you mentioned this in previous interviews, and I remember, Tuomas, you referred to how you and the founder of Futurice discussed that "big and boring is not an option," and that you have to fight against it every day. But at the same time, it can become harder to dare to do things differently when you grow.

And Charlotte, you mentioned yourself how you at WhitSecure have made experimentation one of your core values, and how it can actually be very challenging for an expert organization because it requires showing unfinished work and learning from it.

So, what are your thoughts on how to maintain that kind of renewal capability and how to fight against stagnation? Tuomas, would you like to start?

**Tuomas:** If only I knew the answer.

**Charlotte:** Tell me so we can figure it out.

**Tuomas:** But generally speaking, the problem is that with the growth of the organization and everything else, it tends to gradually, how should I put it, not exactly stagnate, but stabilize, and from stabilization to stagnation.

And it requires hard work to constantly stay sensitive and maintain a state of slight change. If I think about the ideal state, I believe an organization should always be on the edge between chaos and order, because that's where the highest energy is, things happen, but it still holds together.

Then we are always on one side or the other, never in balance. We are either too chaotic or too stagnant. And I would say that stagnation is more dangerous than a little extra chaos because it means that it's easier to bring a bit of order to chaos, but if there's no energy in the organization, then it's much harder to bring it.

But then there are certain specific concrete things, like whenever you see others, see competitors, see customers, it usually keeps the mind much more alert than just being by yourself or something like that. It requires the right kind of people, it requires a few rebels in the organization, and in many organizations, they are the ones who cause the most ripples and annoyances, but you have to tolerate them a bit like the most creative people, all that kind of stuff. But I don't know if I really have a final solution, maybe Charlotte can solve this.

**Charlotte:** Good thoughts. Yeah, if only we could. But in addition to those, what comes to my mind are things like putting words into action, like a culture of experimentation, what it means in every job and behavior, and how it's managed by sharing those experiences and successes.

And when you get those moments of success and encouragement, and colleagues and friends see that things are going well, it builds the courage to try new things. It's not some magical formula, but it helps. Another important aspect is balancing the team with new people, and ensuring that the quality is good enough.

So if we're making a major overhaul, like now when we're talking about this A.I. transformation, how do you ensure that there are people who have already been working with A.I. for several years and have built solutions with it, and combine them with those who are interested in learning? That way, we achieve balance.

Then another, or is it the third already, but the idea is that multi-skilled teams, in my opinion, are one solution to fostering enthusiasm and renewed vision. That is, how you bring together product development, sales, and other functions like product management. And when you bring, for example, product managers to meet customers and sales to see the product development and so on, it sparks those "aha" moments, like, "Oh, these are the kinds of questions that come up." Too often, we keep sales at the customer interface and product development separate, and then the communication in between isn't necessarily that strong.

And bringing those together has, in my opinion, sparked enthusiasm and new learning, as people start talking to each other.

**Tuomas:** Exactly. And then there are perhaps some individual cases as well. For instance, I once met with a large traditional organization that had invited various startups to their office—not to collaborate, but to offer them workspace and facilities. This was so they could concretely show their own employees what a different or new way of working looks like.

And these probably also fall into the category where seeing is better than just talking about things. Then maybe also, yes, I feel that I have perhaps learned, and hopefully I have learned, but if the company leadership gets the feeling that everything is stable and going quite nicely, we're definitely going to have problems soon.

I really liked it back in the day when I started getting into the Toyota and Lean mindset, that if things are going too well, then we have a problem, because it means stagnation and other issues start to set in. It also requires self-discipline from the leadership, or I don't know if self-discipline is the right term, but it requires the leadership to always be alert, that a stable and good situation is not actually good.

**Charlotte:** Exactly.

And yes, in our own industry, we saw that there were too many years that were, so to speak, too easy. Yes. So maybe a bit of sharpness was lost.

**Charlotte:** Right. Well, it can be a bit like, if everyone in the management team always agrees and everything is going really well, that also raises some flags. From these, it seems that something might not be going so well.

**Tuomas:** Or as one colleague once said well, nothing can save a successful company.

**Satu:** That's well said.

**Tuomas:** If there's too much fear or chaos in an organization, you need to bring order. If the organization starts to become too complacent or stagnant, then the leadership needs to introduce different activities. That's probably one of the key roles of leadership.

Always sense where we are going, and always go a bit against the current.

**Charlotte:** We talked at some point about daring to say when something isn't good enough, that you need to raise the bar, or you need to see them all the time

and dare to demand more when it feels like this isn't enough, this isn't taking us forward yet, or like with the use of AI, even for myself, this isn't enough, we need to do more, we need to go further.

**Tuomas:** And if I think about my own career, I still remember those three or four situations very clearly from the last 20 years, when I had an “aha moment” because someone was able to show me that I had, for example, a decade-long mistake in my understanding of what good looks like. These moments have happened, and they are still very clear in my mind. It was a great moment to realize that I was satisfied with something, and then suddenly I realized, oh, I need to put in more work because it wasn't even close to what good looks like.

**Satu:** How do you get that feedback?

**Tuomas:** It comes from very different situations. I don't know, almost 20 years now, but some might remember, there was a technology conference in France. I went there and believed that as there was a seven million turnover we actually have a company that operates. Then there were Americans and others. The first presentation showed a study that when you reach 25 million, there's a 70 percent chance of reaching 100 million. In their scale, a real company is only considered real at 100 million. So I thought, okay, fair enough. I probably need to go do some work if you think it's a real company.

Or sometimes in my leadership career, I had just received some awards which felt like this was nice. But then my mentor asked Tuomas, have you ever thought if you do this at all? That made me realize, wow, it opened up a whole new direction and I felt again that the only thing to do was to humbly go back and learn more.

Yeah, those moments aren't fun at the time, but looking back, they're really valuable.

**Satu:** You appreciate it once you've gotten through that phase. So, what are the things that an organization can recognize to stay resilient in terms of renewal? One thing is probably that everything is going too well and it's too easy and comfortable, but in a way, does the organization become blind to it then?

**Charlotte:** So probably one thing is that change is constant; there will never be a time without some kind of change. But maybe, at least for me, the measure of adaptability is whether it feels like we've been building it up over the past few years. We've had quite a significant change recently, and in other companies before as well, so the question is, do we become paralyzed?

So in a way, when a change comes along, do you see a kind of paralysis in the organization, or is it more like: okay, people take a moment to think and then start acting? And it's actually quite interesting to consider how that could be measured or observed. Essentially, the idea is that you would need to have constant "sensors" in place to see whether you're moving forward on that journey or getting stuck at some point

It's about continuously following the strategy and vision, seeing how it evolves and measuring the progress. There could be different metrics for this within the organization, but I think it's important. Actively tracking it ensures we don't stay stagnant.

**Tuomas:** I strongly believe in measurement, but the big problem so far has been that very important things like measuring the organization's energy have been quite silent. However, I've noticed in recent years that with data and AI, we can reach very interesting insights.

And if we can make them visible, when things are visible, it's much easier to, you could say, know where we stand and manage things and others. I believe there's a big shift coming in leadership from making traditionally invisible things visible, like organizational skills, flow efficiency, energy levels, all these kinds of things.

**Satu:** Sure. You both have mentioned the energy issue several times in different contexts. I'm wondering now, as we are all required to have a desire to learn, and you mentioned that it's also an individual's responsibility. It's not about whether you want to join in or not; you just have to because there's no other option.

Let's talk about the changes brought by AI. How can we maintain the joy of learning, curiosity, and the exploratory aspect, instead of feeling overwhelmed? It seems like we constantly need to learn something new and keep up as everything progresses so quickly. Any thoughts? What comes to mind for Tuomas.

**Tuomas:** Maybe somehow, if I go back to that, in a certain way, it's about always reminding yourself that learning is important, that even if you fail, you have to endure, that no matter how difficult the situation is, at least you learn something from it.

Maybe it's also about psyching yourself up for it. And then... It is very rewarding when you explore something new and achieve something in a

different way, and perhaps those small successes feed into themselves. Perhaps the big thing I notice is how we can get a person moving; maybe the first successes need some help, and then gradually, they can move forward.

Maybe it's a question of how we can maintain, rather than having more questions than answers, how we can maintain that desire and thirst for learning strong. Maybe it's also a societal theme here.

**Satu:** Yes, definitely. Thank you.

**Charlotte:** Yeah, it's really challenging because a lot of it depends on the individual, and you can't force anyone to want to learn.

I've been trying to think of ways, because it feels like there's so much... We talked about being busy, but also when you mentioned what should be done, like trying out AI in personal use or something, the response often is I just don't have the time. I don't have the time because I'm so busy and my day is so full.

That's a very typical response. And lately, I've been challenging it quite a bit by asking, are you really serious that you can't spend an hour or even half an hour today, which might help you next week if you invest in it? But then I've been thinking about what that means for leadership.

So, just help with planning the work so that it doesn't feel overwhelming. But actually, when you allocate time for something, it usually frees up energy. For example, if you decide to handle a task on Wednesday for three hours, then you don't have to think about it for the rest of the week because you've set aside those three hours to do it.

And could it be something like this, that we help our colleagues or team members by not wasting time, especially when there's so much noise and constant notifications? But having clear team rules about focusing on specific tasks could free up energy, allowing you to find time for new experiments. Often, the first step is the hardest, but once you learn from that first time, the next one goes a bit faster.

How I've used, for example just in very basic everyday use—basic ChatGPT—and then, as you go deeper, it starts generating ideas and you realize, “Hey, this actually works like this.” As you learn to prompt better or to work through certain things, you get excited because it genuinely helps you. Those are the kinds of things I’ve been thinking about: what kinds of tools we could provide.

And I've talked a lot about this with my own team—about how we could get support for dealing with that noise.

Maybe they are just small things, concrete actions, like taking time for things.

**Satu:** Sure, very good. Tuomas, would you like to continue?

**Tuomas:** Yes. Maybe initially, regarding energy and other aspects, I do feel that leadership involves a lot of balance between control and energy. And then if you think about it, being on the boards of public companies and such, you also understand where it stems from—that companies easily lean towards control. The bigger and more established they are, the more they have to lose, so this control issue always comes up.

**Tuomas S.:** If you think about startups, they have nothing to lose, so they hardly [01:00:00] need control since there's nothing to lose. And the same might apply on a personal level, as a fresh scientist, there's not much to lose, and there's freedom to experiment. Then, what I've understood, for example, is that many boards have difficulty accepting feedback, possibly because they've already achieved something and have more to lose.

**Tuomas S.:** Maybe being aware of these things all the time, whether we go through energy or through control. Talking about it, discussing if our balance is right, and so on. And having had experience in the financial sector myself, when regulation and authorities come into play, it adds another level to the control versus energy dynamic.

**Tuomas S.:** Really interesting

**Satu:** highlights from many. At Aalto, we promise to train change-makers, which I think is quite a big promise. A good one. A good one. And I would like to ask you at the end here, what kind of skills and attitudes do [01:01:00] you see that the future work life somehow requires? And how could we take that into account here when we are teaching those future employees?

**Satu:** Sorry, future change-makers. Charlotte, would you like to start?

**Charlotte:** Really good question. I would say that what you can do is... Certainly experimenting and daring to seek information broadly, combining information, and then trying to see how you can bring that kind of expertise. And then networking and seeking help and information, well, I think that generally comes from studies, but somehow in this era, learning how to utilize

the existing tools and learning to use them to your advantage is probably one thing, because as we talked earlier about the renewal of professionalism, the field is quite broad, what it [01:02:00] can become. So yeah, maybe Tuomas has something else, I can think a bit more if something else comes to mind.

**Charlotte:** A few broad borrowings. Previously, yes, that continuous curiosity is a crucial thing, persistence in these kinds of matters. What else?

**Tuomas S.:** a few widely quoted. Earlier, yes, that constant curiosity is quite essential, persistence in these kinds of things. What else?

**Charlotte:** Critical thinking and reasoning skills, that's probably one.

**Tuomas S.:** Yes, and I would add that I see a danger of becoming polarized, where AI makes it possible to stop thinking altogether if one chooses to.

**Tuomas S.:** If you want to develop your thinking, it's an absolutely magical tool. And yes, I already hear comments in a certain way that some people have difficulties thinking independently, as we've gotten used to the Google era, where the answer can always be found somewhere instead of thinking for ourselves. So, I would say that one essential [01:03:00] thing is to train that brain muscle a bit, not just outsource it to some AI, which is probably a really crucial skill.

**Tuomas S.:** Yes,

**Satu:** Absolutely. Very good. Hey, do you know what? We also have a general question now, is that okay with you? Sure. Well, let's see what has come in. During our discussion, quite a few have come in. Wonderful. Okay, so the first question is, if you look a few years into the future, what kind of organizations will thrive in this AI era?

**Satu:** What is your view?

**Tuomas S.:** This might be a bit too high-level, but we have thought a lot about what the competitive advantage of the future will be. And one possible conclusion is that it will likely be the ability to continuously adapt to new technology. And what that actually means is a much more difficult question.

**Tuomas S.:** But if we think about it now, even though we have [01:04:00] AI, there's also talk about quantum computing, but let's see when it actually breaks through. We've been waiting for AI for what, twenty years? Then there's

material science, biosciences, and everything. How all of this will actually change things, the ability to continuously adapt will probably be a key permanent competitive advantage for organizations.

**Satu:** Sure

**Charlotte:** Definitely. And then I think companies that can convey their mission or the reason they exist and touch people. In other words, they get the purpose of why this work is done and get people excited, because they attract the best talent. Somehow, that direction and why things are done is probably important.

**Charlotte:** It seems to be important already and will probably only grow in significance, what we do.

**Satu:** Alright, next question. AI can speed up learning and reaching the final solution, and sometimes we might skip over the [01:05:00] process, causing learning to not occur. How can an organization identify those points where AI usage should be more critical or cautious to ensure that learning happens and we don't skip over the wrong processes?

**Tuomas S.:** Good question. I keep thinking about this slow and fast thinking that's often discussed, and whether we should apply it more broadly. For instance, I notice myself that when I use code, especially with AI, I often just make sure the results are validated and all that, but I don't focus on the "what."

**Tuomas S.:** But then, one should probably always take a moment to think more deeply about it, which would elevate one's own thinking and abilities. Maybe it's like nine times out of ten we go quickly, and then the tenth time we need to stop and reflect a bit to develop our own thinking and so on.

**Tuomas S.:** Maybe there could also be some practices like this in one place.

**Charlotte:** [01:06:00] I agree, and as Tuomas mentioned earlier, we shouldn't stop thinking for ourselves. AI doesn't do everything yet, so there need to be some checkpoints or other measures in place, at least for now.

**Satu:** Well, next, let's move to a slightly different theme. What role does psychological safety play in supporting change, and how can it be created in daily interactions between people? Charlotte, would you like to start?

**Charlotte:** Well, in my opinion, it is an extremely significant and important part of change. It's difficult to drive and realize change without that psychological safety.

**Charlotte:** And probably related to that, as we already touched on, every person can think about it. Of course, the leader, but also everyone else, brings energy into the room. Do you create an atmosphere where it's easy to make mistakes and [01:07:00] try new things, or do you create an environment where you always have to be right, and it's really hard to disagree with you?

**Charlotte:** In my opinion, it's those everyday actions from each of us that create a safer environment.

**Tuomas S.:** I believe they are often very small and concrete expressions that create it. If I mention a few that I've noticed and still remember, for example, within one company, one person had a great habit of saying that there are always problems.

**Tuomas S.:** It's not a problem, but a bigger problem if it's the same issue for too long, or things like that. Or I really like this feed-forward thinking, where instead of just stating what went wrong in the past, we ask, "Hey, what would good look like six months from now?"

**Tuomas S.:** It's much easier to approach it that way than to try to fix history. Then we come back to this. Perhaps one of my best leadership insights was when a mentor once asked me, "Tuomas, [01:08:00] are you trying to fix things or help people succeed in their work?" It was quite a rhetorical question from him, but I quickly understood what he meant. I was, and probably still am, a fixer of things, but I always have to remind myself that my job is to help people succeed.

**Tuomas S.:** But then he had a very good point that when you help people succeed, you can give even harsh criticism because it comes from the right angle. And he just referred to sports, where the coach's role is to help the athlete succeed in their performance, even through tough criticism.

**Tuomas S.:** These kinds of things, even small ones, can create a sense of psychological safety in my opinion.

**Satu:** Yes, exactly. I have the same experience. The next question is directed at Tuomas, at least initially. Referring back to what Tuomas mentioned at the beginning about AI coding, how can AI change or how is it changing the

business models and value propositions of IT service companies, when the production costs of software decrease and customers have [01:09:00] a lower threshold to develop software themselves?

**Tuomas S.:** Yeah. Well, how it manifests in software development, I believe that software creation will become everyone's task. It will no longer be just a tool for coders, but a tool for everyone. This will be seen more and more. In a certain way, many other things as well. I personally strongly believe that in consulting, many services will become continuous services. For example, if we have AI tools for real-time strategy monitoring, it will become a strategy monitoring service.

**Tuomas S.:** A service for customers that combines human labor, technology, and data. I strongly believe that the consulting business will look quite different in a few years. There are already some initial validations of this. And it's actually quite fun because I've been selling various transformations as a day job for years, and now it feels like our own business is going to change quite radically.

**Tuomas S.:** And it's actually much more fun to tackle it because you can't just be [01:10:00] a wise guy from the outside; you experience all the same challenges yourself.

**Satu:** So, it might be better to advise others rather than just being right. Well, next, maybe I could direct a few more questions to Charlotte. How can we ensure that quieter voices are heard during these kinds of changes that affect everyone?

**Satu:** We've talked a lot about how there can be change agents who are quite vocal and high-performance maintenance people. It's a very important question.

**Charlotte:** and a very important task is to ensure this, because first of all, we need all types of people. Teams and organizations function best when, as I mentioned earlier, there's the right mix of new and old, but also a variety of employees and diversity.

**Charlotte:** I think that's a strength in an organization. These are small actions that ensure inclusivity. If you're in a meeting or an event, how can you [01:11:00] make sure everyone is heard and given space? It's also important to note that some people don't perform their best if you suddenly ask them something. Practical measures can help, like preparing the agenda in advance, ensuring everyone reads the materials and can comment beforehand, and

organizing tasks in workshops where individuals first think on their own, then work together, and only then share. This is because not everyone is comfortable thinking out loud in a group.

**Charlotte:** The best way is to have a diverse set of methods for leading brainstorming sessions or other tasks. For me, an important aspect of leadership is having one-on-one meetings with people, where there's time to just listen, discuss, and hear their thoughts without any specific agenda. I believe that such methods help bring out [01:12:00] ideas.

**Charlotte:** Just

**Satu:** So very good. Does Tuomas want anything else?

**Tuomas S.:** Well, maybe one historical example from when I was the CEO: we developed this practice of talking with every employee once a year. Initially, it was half an hour, but it quickly shortened as the number of employees grew. However, it was very rewarding, and I learned that if you only listen to the loud people, you get a pretty skewed view of where the organization is heading.

**Tuomas S.:** Often, all the best ideas came from the quiet ones, all the best insights about where the organization was heading, you just had to have the patience to listen. And I remember, every time it felt really daunting to start the process, because talking to hundreds of people did take a lot of energy. But every time I concluded that if I hadn't done it, I would have been quite clueless about what was happening in the organization.

**Tuomas S.:** And I think one of the biggest challenges for leadership is that it's quite easy to be out of touch with what's really happening and being thought within the organization.

**Charlotte:** You need to spend time on it, not just the CEO or me, but [01:13:00] everyone in a supervisory role should spend time on it more broadly.

**Satu:** listening.

**Satu:** Yeah, definitely. I'll take two more questions from here. How has the use of AI changed interpersonal interactions within your organization, if at all? And if it has, in what ways?

**Tuomas S.:** I haven't noticed any fundamental changes yet. And maybe, I know that people brainstorm, I brainstorm too, like how to handle this situation.

Sometimes I wonder if I could build an agent that replies to WhatsApp messages for me.

**Tuomas S.:** Or summarize at the end of the day what all the messages were and if I got any tasks, that sort of thing. But have I really seen how it has actually changed things? Nothing comes to mind right now.

**Charlotte:** I don't either, how it would have changed. I maybe think about what it has brought to me. I feel that I can better brainstorm with colleagues on some [01:14:00] themes that we discuss in meetings.

**Charlotte:** Or when I go to an area that's not so familiar to me, like when I'm preparing for a meeting. I specifically use it for my own sparring and I would argue that it has sometimes improved the way I can ask questions that then help move the person forward. That's what it has brought, but it probably has some challenges too.

**Charlotte:** I can't say right away.

**Satu:** into words. Let's take the last question. Can a leader be an obstacle to change and how?

**Tuomas S.:** Yes, absolutely. I don't know if anyone does it intentionally or anything, but even if you think about the core leadership, it's quite different to make decisions when you are responsible for the entire business, all the jobs, and everything else, compared to just seeing an opportunity [01:15:00] for the future.

**Tuomas S.:** Yes, you also have to understand quite a bit about the context in which the leader has to view the matter, or whether there are any regulatory issues or things of that nature.

**Speaker 6:** But

**Tuomas S.:** Then, in a way, there's also the fact that if you think about it, leaders are usually a bit more senior.

**Tuomas S.:** Then it might be that some younger people, who see and understand technology or needs more strongly, are perhaps much deeper into it. These kinds of differences might arise, and I think it's important for leaders to keep themselves aware of what's happening and so on. And now, in fact, there

are more and more reverse mentors, where younger people keep leaders up to date on what technology means and other things.

**Tuomas S.:** I think those are good ideas.

**Speaker 6:** Well

**Charlotte:** Yes. They existed even years ago. Absolutely, it can happen, and probably no one does it intentionally, but it can definitely happen if [01:16:00] you can't create that psychological safety or if there's a bit of fear-based leadership, it can certainly be the case.

**Charlotte:** Usually, there's some other fear in the background, which could be related to the business or its continuity, and then it shows. But also, yes, I would say regarding new technologies and others, that many, especially if we look at higher management positions, have reached that role through a certain pattern.

**Charlotte:** And often it can be functional expertise, deep knowledge in a certain area where you've proven your skills. And suddenly you have to change the way you operate. Work has evolved, and in most places, we are no longer very hierarchical; we've moved to much more agile ways of working.

**Charlotte:** At that point, the leader has to change, and sometimes it can be difficult to let go, which can also slow down the change. Leadership has evolved and continues to [01:17:00] evolve a lot.

**Satu:** Exactly. Hey, I tricked you, I actually have one more question because this ties into the theme we started with.

**Satu:** So if an AI user is not familiar or experienced, how can they identify tasks where AI could be beneficial, whether they are in a leadership or employee position? What kind of tips would you give to a beginner in this context?

**Charlotte:** I don't know if there's a task where it couldn't be useful. That's perhaps my challenge. I believe that in every task, you can use and benefit from some AI product currently available on the market in your work.

**Charlotte:** In some specific area. And I would encourage thinking about things that might not encompass the entire job, but parts of it, whether it's preparing a policy, writing an email, or going through [01:18:00] data. What are those small

tasks, or even larger ones, where you can complete or develop an entire process with its help?

**Charlotte:** But perhaps the encouragement is that in every task, there's something to be found, and then boldly spar with and ask others. There are many ideas and a lot can be found online or elsewhere if you search for what has been done in this area, and that can get you quite far.

**Tuomas S.:** you can get

**Charlotte:** ideas.

**Tuomas S.:** I would say that I would watch YouTube videos for hours.

**Tuomas S.:** There's an insane amount of content. From pretty simple channels related to personal productivity to people who create these, it's probably a good place to start. Then you start learning to see what they enable. You also need to jump into trying things out. It's not enough to just watch; you also need to try.

**Satu:** Hi, thank you very much. Excellent answers and excellent questions. Thank you.

[01:19:00]