

# Webinar Transcript

## AI Pulse survey findings

So hi, everybody. Welcome to our webinar today, where we are unveiling the findings of our recent AI Pulse Survey, looking at where the AI governance gap is.

Our webinar team today is Helen Van Orton and Alexei O'Brien. And my name's Sean, Sean McDonald. I shall be your host and moderator in the background for the next forty five odd minutes.

Firstly though, thank you for attending today wherever you are dialling in from. We always appreciate the effort you make to be here for our live webinar events.

During the session, if you have any questions, which of course we hope you will do, please try and use the Q and A button as against chat. It just enables us to keep a track of the questions as they're coming through.

And finally, if you stay through till the end, which of course we hope you will do, we've got a really short one minute survey at the end of the webinar that we'd love you to consider. Your feedback really helps us bring relevant content to you week after week and it enables us to position the wealth of expert presenters that we have for you. So please take a minute to complete the survey as you leave the webinar today.

For those not too familiar with BoardPro, we are a board software provider, sometimes called a board portal.

We serve just over thirty five thousand users across the world, about four thousand five hundred boards and about eight thousand five hundred to nine thousand committees. And we're represented in about, well, I think about thirty four different countries these days.

And we enable organizations to prepare for and run their board meetings more efficiently and effectively with less time and deliver more impact and value for the organisation.

And as much as we are a board software provider or a board portal, part of our wider mission here at BoardPro is to make the fundamentals of governance free and easy to implement for all organisations, but especially those organisations with resource constraints.

And one of the many ways we do this is by providing free access to hundreds of governance templates, guides and resources, which you will find funnily enough in the resources section of our website. And these webinars that we host every Thursday are also a great way of accessing key governance knowledge without the time commitment and costs associated with in person events.

So for the next forty five odd minutes, just relax, listen, and add to the discussion by asking as many questions as you would like using the Q and A tool on the toolbar.

A full recording of the webinar along with the slide deck and the other resources that we'll talk to you about a little bit later on will be sent to you twenty four hours after our session today.

So let me have our team introduce themselves starting with, oh, who should we use first? Let's go with you first.

Thanks and welcome everybody. I am Alexey O'Brien from Leadership Academy dot ai, and I'm joined by Helen Van from Directly. We are sharing the findings from the first board Pro AI Governance Pulse, and this will share with you how boards and senior leaders are thinking about AI.

Kia ora everyone. I'm Helen Van Orton. I'm an experienced director and chair sit on a number of boards, but also run directly where we work with boards education and adoption. So we're not gonna spend so long talking about ourselves because this is all about the survey data.

So a really, really good response for this first survey. There were four seventy six percent of people, sorry, four seventy six people responded, Eighty five percent of those were from Australia and New Zealand. So these results are quite weighted to there. In terms of who responded, two thirds directors, board chairs, or governance professionals, and the others are a mix of CEOs, execs, company secretaries, etcetera.

Forty four percent sitting in the not for profit sector, twenty three percent commercial, and then the rest are a balance across education, health, government, etcetera.

And more than half are from organizations with less than fifty people. So some quite small organizations represented in there.

Yeah. And they're quite a governance engaged audience too, Helen, you know, these people really care about getting governance, right? So what was really interesting is that if this group shows gaps, the broader market is actually probably likely further behind and, there were some gaps.

Really were.

Okay. Let's start with that headline.

Fifty three percent of respondents are using AI every single day and seventy nine percent are using it. That's, know, eight out of ten people are using AI every week or more. And that's not dabbling, that's moving into embedded behavior.

Yeah. They're not just using it for drafting emails. Seventy four percent are using it for researching, drafting, and editing. Forty two percent though, are now using it to really start to challenge our own thinking, get a second opinion. Thirty one percent are using it for strategic

thinking and scenario planning. And nearly half are seeing it as a thinking partner, not just a productivity tool.

So that's really strong, right? The personal adoption story is strong, but there's this massive gap, is the right hand side of the slide, only four point six percent of these organizations have got what we would call full governance. So that's that triad of policies, active board oversight and regular reporting.

And it's almost a third, twenty nine percent have got nothing in place at all. No policy, no training, no oversight.

So what does that mean? And in every one of those daily AI decisions or drafting advice, summarizing data, informing strategy is actually being done without a governance framework. If something goes wrong and with how big the adoption rate is and the exploration that people are doing, something will go wrong at some point. The board won't be able to point to a policy or an approval process or who's actually overseeing it inside of their organizations. And that's not a gap on a maturity model. It's a governance gap, but it's also a personal liability exposure for all of us directors.

Oh my God, you're right, Alexei. It's not hypothetical. So AI related D and O claims have actually risen twenty seven percent. And average settlements are sitting around a really scary number, which is I think is about fifty six million.

And now there's a number of insurers that are actually writing AI exclusions into their D and O policies. So if your AI causes harm and you don't have that governance framework, your cover may not actually respond. So the question for directors is increasingly becoming not should we govern AI it's can we demonstrate that we did?

Oh, go on.

Yeah. Was gonna say I've got a breakfast this morning with our insurance insurers and while that exclusion is happening in the States they anticipate it being here in Australia and New Zealand in the next six months. So it really needs to be discussed.

Yeah. Yeah.

Sure. Thank you.

So, we asked you all, where is the biggest gap between what your board says about AI and what's actually happening? And the responses were really candid.

Yeah. And you guys can obviously read faster than we can speak these out. So we're not gonna run through all of them. But the one of the respondents came back and said the board is AI aware, but not AI enabled. And I think that line just really captures the pattern that we saw again and again through the survey responses.

Aware is it's sitting in our briefing deck and we've heard someone talk about it.

Enabled is sitting in that conversation that follows on for it, which we will come to later in the session.

Yeah. And another comment, is telling and it was a theme across the entire survey results was, the board is aware, but not AI enabled. So that single line, sorry, I'm just, just said what you said, Helen. So management is well ahead of the board. So we've got that asymmetry management really has the volume of the exposure to using AI on a daily basis, but the board has the agenda paper and that gap is continuing to widen.

It really, really is. And then the only, probably the other one I'm just going to touch on on this slide is that third one, Dan. So that one around the lack of insight or the blinker approach, you guys can read it. But there was a much longer comment that was associated with this. So the respondent actually went on to describe AI as being used at both the board and the staff level with no policy, no process, no direction. And that's what we were just talking about is that balance and tension between governance going too slow and innovation going too fast. And probably every director who's sitting listening to this, they'd know that right now in every organization, the adoption is winning over the governance, which is definitely lagging.

Yeah. These aren't outliers. So these were patterns repeated across hundreds of responses and themes across multiple questions. That, so do gap is absolutely real and we're aware of it.

So where do we go from there? We're using it, not confident with it. It's where the data starts to get really interesting. So we talked earlier about the fact that seventy nine, so eight out of ten people are using it weekly, but only nine point four, so less than one in ten people actually feel really confident in using it. And almost half of people said that they're still figuring out how to use AI effectively.

So people are using tools that they're not fully confident with, and that has implications, right? So if people in governance roles aren't confident in their own fluency and own use of AI, what does that actually mean for the quality of AI informed decisions that are reaching boards and how we're governing across what our management teams and our organizations are doing with AI?

Yeah, exactly. And it compounds, right? Because like one in five respondents don't actually know what their staff are even using AI for.

Seventeen percent saying, yeah, it's probably embedded in the tools that we're using, but nobody's actually mapped it. You put that, those two numbers together, and that's more than a third have got really limited visibility into how AI is actually being used in their organisation, which is a huge blind spot.

Yeah. And one of our respondents captured that perfectly. They said both the board and staff don't fully know what they don't know. And both are unwittingly using AI and exposing the organisation to risk.

Yeah. And, you know, Alexei and I in our last webinar talked a lot about AI risks. So feel free to go back and listen to that one.

But I just sort of final point probably to wrap out this slide.

This isn't just about confidence because KPMG did AI in the workplace survey last year. And that showed that forty six percent of employees, I'm just gonna say that number again, forty six percent of employees upload sensitive company data into AI tools without approval. So the so what for directors is, because that's what we always ask. Your people are feeding your data into tools nobody's approved, nobody's monitoring, and your board may not even know exist.

So if you can't see it, you can't govern it. And as unfortunately as a board, if you can't govern it, then you own the consequences. So there's some really scary numbers on that, that slide. So I think Alexa, I'll hand back to you to start the next one.

And there's a couple more to come too. So we asked, how frequently management is providing the board with information on AI. We asked about three topics. So workforce impact, emerging regulation, AI performance and risks too.

And the pattern was identical across all three. Roughly seventy five percent of boards get information either on an ad hoc basis or never. And the thirty seven percent are the ones that get absolutely nothing at all of that seventy five percent. So that is a significant amount of boards that are actually really flying blind.

Yeah. And so even though earlier in the survey, we had a number of boards saying, yep, yep, we're governing AI.

What they actually probably mean is that they're governing it in a bit of a information vacuum because you can't oversee what you're not actually seeing.

Absolutely. And when we asked which specific AI risks the board has explicitly discussed, not what concerns you, but what have you actually discussed? A quarter of the boards have actually discussed not one of thirteen risks that we listed. That's a scary number too.

Yeah, is. And those thirteen risks were based on the last couple of webinars that Alexei have webinars that Alexei and I have done around AI risks. So we weren't just, you know, that survey wasn't just randomly pulling risks out of the air. It was real live risks that your board is facing in the AI space.

So, yeah, and add to that, the fact that that top right hand number there in green there, the fact that less than a fifth of boards have actually got that oversight of the detail of how AI is being used in the organisation. So even when you've got that awareness, oversight unfortunately seems to be the exception rather than the rule.

Yeah. And conversations at a board level have been discussed, you know, about fifty three percent are on data privacy, which absolutely makes sense. But dropping off down below on the

bottom half of that slide, less than twenty percent or seventeen percent have actually discussed directors liability from AI decisions and less than ten percent in and around that D and O insurance gap. Agentic AI and prompt injection also less than ten percent. So these are risks that actually could hurt directors personally, and they're almost entirely unexamined.

Yeah. Yep. And I just think it's not from the board pro survey, but just like building on that Grant Thornton did an AI survey impact survey earlier this year. And they found that seventy eight percent of execs lack confidence that they could pass an independent AI audit gov a governance audit.

And, you know, looking at this from the board side, it's saying exactly the same thing.

So some, again, some scary, some scary numbers.

We have a few questions, team.

Yes, fantastic.

Do you want to take those now?

I think we should probably take them at the end because we'll kind of come through and then we'll close them off because I don't want to run out of time because we've got quite a lot to cover if that's okay.

But we will come back to No problem.

So we designed a survey really around two parallel tracks. This is where they come together. So we've got the readiness side. So seventy six percent of organizations exploring or experimenting with AI. That's probably not a surprise. But forty percent, thirty six percent are doing it without any clear strategic direction at all.

Yeah. And then that counter that we've talked about on the other side, which is the governance piece, seventy two percent still in early stage, eighteen percent no policy, no discussion, twenty seven percent aware of the need, but we haven't acted on it. Twenty seven percent again, developing policies. So there's just such a small number of boards. It's like less than one in three have actually reached the point of having policies or more mature structures in place. So, it's kind of, kind of scary. I think I'll pass that to you, Alexey actually.

Yeah, that's the cliff right on this slide.

AI usage is already operational in most organisations, but governance is really just still aspirational. And the gap between the two columns is the story on this slide and what we've seen throughout the survey.

Yeah. And again, recent research MIT Sloan this time on three hundred companies. This is the exciting piece. So the companies that have got board level AI governance frameworks get fifty

five percent higher return on investment on their sorry, ROI on the AI investments than those without.

So I know we often look at governance and go, particularly in this very, very fast moving space, is it a break in innovation? Actually, it's not. It's what gives the leader the confidence to invest decisively. Actually the organizations that are pulling ahead, it's not about how much AI you've got in the organization.

It's about having the right governance frameworks in place to be actually able to scale it properly.

Absolutely. And the gap isn't static. It's widening every single week because there's new tools, are adopted and they're released. You know, you've got employees checking in and trying them out.

New data is shared, new decisions are being made, none of it without being governed. And so those regulators, like Helen said, they're no longer asking, you know, have you got an AI policy? How are we governing our AI? And if our readiness and our exploration is ahead of our governance, we don't just have a risk.

We've got an exposure that actually grows with every AI decision our organization is relying on, without oversight. And I really believe, like, I think that our audit requirements in the future, as we continue to get more and more agentic AI will continue to grow, which means this oversight is need to going to need to be harnessed, so we can be audited for for agentic AI.

Yeah, a hundred percent agree. And those of you who are unfamiliar with the, some of the phrases that we're using, for example, Agentic AI, that unseen and unchecked risk webinar that we talked, we talked more specifically around that worth going back and watching, which is on the board pro site.

So just moving on to this, where is it that organizations are actually going wrong? Why why have they fallen into this cliff between those those two different issues?

So the data points show three deployment mistakes that again, we see again and again. So the first one is that there is no owner. So again, only one in five companies have got a named person who's actually accountable for AI governance. And if you haven't got an owner governance suddenly is everybody's problem, but at the same time, it's nobody's problem.

And it sits in there. Yeah, we definitely need to do something about that pile. And we all know as boards that we have a lot of those in the organization. But the problem is with the practical consequence of that is who's writing the AI policy?

Who's looking at the shadow AI reports? Who's reporting that through to the board? And unfortunately, right now the answer is in eighty one percent of organizations, it's nobody. So the fix on the cart is the right one, which is name someone this week.

It doesn't need to be an expert. It just needs to be someone who is responsible for this in your organization.

Absolutely. Number two, ShadowAI. And again, as Helen mentioned before, if you're not familiar with some of these terms, we have discussed them in our risk webinar. It is the default. Forty one percent say that AI is used informally by individuals that hasn't been sanctioned and it's not systematic. I actually really believe that that number is probably on the conservative side, which actually to me indicates that it's a potential blind spot for boards.

So one of our respondents wrote, you know, the taking up of coding copilots and agents is slower than reported to the board with a high use of unauthorized large language models for routine tasks. So the board is being told one thing, but the reality is completely different. So the risks are real. The fix for this is to really run practical AI usage audits before your next board meeting. And you'll find potentially there is more AI in use than your board papers might suggest.

A hundred percent. A hundred percent. Every organization I talk to, it's sort of like, oh yeah, we didn't really realize that. And the other thing that people say is, oh, but we haven't got it installed on our systems. Well, yeah, people can still use it on their personal devices as if they've got access to it, which most people have.

And vendors are bringing it in too.

Oh, totally. Yeah. We won't even go into the whole vendor piece today. So the third piece.

So AI disconnected from strategy. And I so often see this when I'm talking to people. So people go, oh, yep. Well, we can do admin automation, that's really good, or we can reduce our frontline or whatever.

Only thirty one percent of people are looking at AI for strategic thinking, which is, you know, the admin side's valuable. But if that's the ceiling of your ambition, you are definitely leaving it on the table.

So you need to put AI on the board agenda as a strategic item. And please don't have this coming from your technology team.

AI is not a technology strategy. Your organization strategy is your strategy and it's where can AI help me with this? Not what's our technology strategy about AI. Don't get me wrong, the tech team need to figure out what tools you're gonna be using, but your actual AI strategy needs to sit with you as a board. It needs to change your ability to execute on whatever your mission is.

Because if you're parking it in IT, it's not going to go anywhere.

No. And at the new KPMG NCAD principles, the first one is that the board's responsibility for AI is a fiduciary responsibility and, it is all around the strategic, oversight of long term value creation. So, that's an interesting and great principles that they've just published as well. So

we're going to shift gears a little. We've spoken about all of the things that can go wrong. The blind spot, the missing owners, the shadow AI, the strategic disconnect, but that's only half the conversation because the CEOs and directors have also told us what they actually believe AI could unlock for their organization.

So we asked them what is the biggest opportunity? There's five quotes on the screen, but we're just gonna touch on a couple for a few different angles.

Yep. Sure. So, the first one I just wanted to touch on is this it's around the scale and the strategic shift. So we touched on it a little in the last slide around that productivity gain.

So productivity gains allow humans to use their time to be more strategic and focus on game changing actions. So if you're at, particularly if you're in a not for profit or a smaller organization, that really can change the equation. So you don't need to hire your way to greater capacity. If you can get AI handling some of that routine work and that frees your people up to do the work that's actually moving the dial.

So it's so powerful.

Especially for impact organisations and then as well. The second one at the board level value. So stress testing scenarios, supporting, improved research, challenging exact assumptions and biases. And that's not a productivity play.

That's actually leveraging AI as a governance tool. So helping boards ask better questions and testing management's thinking. And that's exactly the kind of challenge function that a board should be performing that strategic oversight for long term value creation. So your mission doesn't change because of AI.

AI changes your ability to actually execute on it, but only if governance is there to enable it rather than blocking it.

Love that. So jumping onto the next one, we don't wanna leave you hanging because we've shown you the gaps. We've shown you the mistakes. We've talked about the opportunity, but what does success actually look like? So both Alexey and I work with boards across Australia and New Zealand.

The ones who are doing this really well share these three building blocks that are on screen, which we'll just quickly run through. Alexei?

So, and the first one is informed oversight. So it doesn't mean the board has to become the technologists. It just means that directors have got to be fluent enough in the understanding of AI to be able to interrogate management's assurances and the information that they are receiving, not just receiving and taking them on board for face value. So can you ask your CEO which agents are operating in our business? What can they access? What can they do without human approvals?

And if you can't ask that question with a level of confidence, that's the fluency gap that boards actually need to close.

Yep. I'm coming back to one of my favorite topics that you'll have picked up from earlier, which is strategic enablement. So it's again that point, but it just needs to be landed again. Boards that get value from AI do not treat it as a technology project or a risk that needs to be managed. I'm not saying those aren't important, but AI needs to be treated as that strategic capability. It's sitting on the strategy agenda, not just sitting hidden in your risk register.

And, you know, that the board asking how can AI help us deliver on our mission in parallel with what could go wrong.

And seeing that starting to see that shift from AI rather than it being a threat to a tool where it's really unlocking huge value for the organization.

Absolutely. And ethical leadership. So having really clear boundaries on data, named accountability for AI governance and a culture where staff actually feels safe to raise concerns about AI rather than hiding their use of it as well. That's really some of the antidote to shadow AI. You won't fix shadow AI just with the policy, but you fix it with a culture where people don't feel the need to hide. And in the KPMG principles, I think it's their third principle. It's all around workforce transformation and human accountability and having and keeping that human in the loop, especially when we are relying on AI to support decisions that we're making for the organisation.

Yeah. And that bottom line on the slide is the number that we referenced before, right, around the fact that the organizations who've got those governance frameworks in place do get that higher ROI. So it's not about slowing it down. It's helping you move forward with confidence.

Okay. So that's a huge amount of data onto you guys. So again, trying to just break it down into some really practical steps. So, you know, what could you do next Monday rather than going, oh my gosh, what it's starting from next week.

The three building blocks from the last slide, so your oversight, enablement and ethical leadership, that's where you're heading, but that's just not gonna Let's be real, that's not gonna happen in a single board meeting.

And we've heard from quite a lot of organizations that the reason that they don't start is because they think they need this huge AI strategy before you can act and you really don't. You actually, the first thing you need is that visibility. So seeing what's happening, where is it owned? What are the boundaries? What's the reporting? And you can put all of those things in place in the next thirty days.

So we've broken that down week by week for you, so you can get started quite effectively. So week one, what's happening? Asking three questions. What tools are staff actually using in the AI space?

What data is going into them? Who approved them? And if the answer is we don't know, that's your starting point. So the outcome we're after is that we actually know what AI tools are in use by whom, what data they're touching, how accurate the data is that they're relying on so that we don't have surprises.

Exactly. And that's immediately overcoming that shadow AI problem that we talked about earlier. So week two, and this is one again, that's really critical, name the owner. So who is that person who is accountable for AI governance?

Again, it doesn't need to be the AI expert. It's someone who understands governance and can coordinate that response. Again, if you remember back to those earlier slides, only nineteen percent, so less than one in five organizations that just have done this. And just naming that one person is gonna put you ahead of eighty percent of the market.

So that will make you feel really good on Monday morning when you do that.

But without a named person, all of those other tasks are going to drift. So putting that person in place, that's gonna create the accountability that makes everything else stick. That person can come through report to the board, not on an ad hoc basis, not just when something goes wrong, but as a standing agenda item. So you are getting the visibility.

Absolutely. And our third week start to set the boundaries. That minimal viable AI policy should have simple components to it. So three elements. What data must never be used and entered into AI tools?

What tools are actually approved for use in an organization and the consequences of tools outside of that being used and what requires a human to review before being acted on any AI output. And that last one is critical because right now, less than seven percent of our organisations are actually auditing AI output. So that's like blind faith on something that we know can confidently lie.

And crucially, we've got to make sure that our staff know, what is in the AI policy. A policy in a drawer doesn't count.

Really powerful, like that analogy. Okay. Final one week four is, is actually, this is your first AI governance report talking to the board. So again, doesn't need to be comprehensive.

It literally is, we've just started, here's what we found. So the whole point of this is to actually start creating some visibility, creating a rhythm. And then once your board can see what's happening, you can start to get that governance in place. Up until then, it's probably a bit more like guesswork.

So there's some easy things on there.

Absolutely. And it's not about perfection. It's really about being intentional, starting to have the conversations, especially those risks that we found before that aren't getting talked about at all.

And that's the difference between organizations that are governing for AI and those that are just talking about it.

So if you do take one thing away from today, take these six questions and put them on your next board agenda and have the discussion around them.

Okay. We're just going to fill these in with a bit of stats. So the first one, and we talked about it on the previous slide, do you know which tools are being used and by who? And that's across your organization, right? And remember that twenty one percent of the respondents told us that they have got no idea.

Yeah. And number two, what data is going into those tools? Do we have clear rules around what we must not do? Only thirty seven percent remember have clear data rules in place. And remember, it's also, it's not just the AI tool that we're governing. It's also our data privacy regulations that really there's some changes coming at us in December of this year too.

Yeah. Question three, we've talked about who's accountable. Are they reporting to the board regularly? Just make sure that's an easy one to solve.

And risks. Have we explicitly discussed the risks? Which one haven't we? We've got a list of thirteen through the survey, data privacy, shadow AI, directors liability, vendor risk, permission drift. If you haven't discussed them, now is the time.

A hundred percent. Then next, again, it's always me on this topic. It's the, are we treating it as a technology issue or strategic governance issue? Because the answer to that question is literally going to shape everything. So make the right call, put it on your strategic agenda.

Absolutely. And question six, which we added after we saw the data today. Have we discussed our exposure as directors, including personal liability and D and O coverage in the context of AI? Only seventeen percent have discussed liability, eight percent have discussed insurance. So if your D and O policy has an AI exclusion clause, it may not yet, but please make sure that you're keeping across it. If you haven't read it, that's part of your homework.

Yeah. And equally, when you're coming up for your renewal of your policy, whether you get direct with an insurer or with a broker, it's a really important conversation to be having with them. Again, all the boards that I sit on, that's been part of our broker conversations for our renewals recently.

So if you can't answer those six questions, don't be surprised. Again, based on the survey results, most people wouldn't be able to, it's not a criticism, but that's what you should be putting on your agenda for your next board meeting.

Sure.

Would you like to talk about the white paper that you both authored recently? Is this will be Sure. This will be included as a downloadable resource for everybody that's attended the the call today. So would you like to just give a quick overview of what that was about, Helen?

Sure. So Sean's just sneaked this slide in. So very off the cuff. So Alexey and I, probably about two months ago, finished writing this paper, very much looking at as a board, what do we need to be AI enabled?

So that's looking at the governance frameworks, what the tools we can be using are, how we can make sure that we are thinking about AI really strategically and well, some of the things that we've discussed today in here, but, yeah, it's a really wide ranging report. I think it's really interesting. And it's everything from how you're looking at your vendors, how you're looking at your organization, how you're strategically approaching it. Missed anything, Alexa?

No. I think that's that's very good. There's also a too long don't read. Oh yeah, there is. Yeah.

Okay. Questions over to you ladies.

I'm just gonna move my Very good.

Sam, I've got a question from, I think the first question there is for you. Sean, do you want to touch on that BoardPro AI enabled?

Yeah, the question is what does BoardPro have in mind for making its offerings AI enabled? We have a lot in the pipeline and on June sixteenth, mark the date in your calendars, we have a very special announcement and a special webinar where we'll be talking about our complete new AI suite of capabilities. So June sixteenth, mark it in your diary.

So the question from Trish, can you please give us examples of where things have gone wrong with AI use in not for profit organisations? I don't have any specific examples top of mind, but I think it is just being aware of the risks of things that can go wrong. And even when you're applying, you know, some of the things that have gone wrong at a commercial level. So for example, the Deloitte hallucination example, Those kind of things can happen inside an NFP organization. When you're looking at any of the risk in our data risks and data privacy, if we're putting donor information, into a large language model, that could expose us as an organisation to the data privacy issues.

And question from Chris.

Does one go for AI education as this appears to be where the big gap is?

It's a huge gap. Very good.

Huge gap. I'd say a couple of things. So both Alexei and I deliver training for boards specifically on this. So either as a one off or as a series of training sessions into your board.

With BoardPro, there is also an AI master class that I recorded for them last year, which is downloadable on demand. And I'm sure Sean will say that he's gonna do some discount for anyone who's on this course. He'll send that out with the email afterwards. Thanks, Sean.

But also later this year, Alexei and I are launching, it will be an online, a really comprehensive training session around training program around AI. So watch this space.

And governance, AI and governance.

Oh, sorry. Yes. Specifically. And D and O stands for directors and officers. So it's the liability insurance. So if something goes wrong in your organization that you're covered personally.

AI audits, a couple of different things. So there's anonymous surveys of staff. You are relying on them to tell you the truth. But also, potentially pulling any billing data from finance to audit any AI SaaS subscriptions. Getting IT to scan network logs for unknown AI domains as well. There are tools out there like Cloud Eagle that can actually specialize as well in shadow AI visibility as well.

What is involved? How I think that we've got that one as well. How is an AI tool audit done?

December privacy regulation update. So that December privacy, it's already legislated. So the date in Australia, thank you, Helen. The date in December is any decision that we are relying on AI to support with where it includes like employee data.

There are really serious consequences where we're not disclosing that. So we need to make sure that we are understanding those changes, that we're understanding where we're relying on AI for our decision making as it relates to our people and our customers and any privacy information and making sure that our privacy policies are updated in how we are using data with our AI.

Beautiful. Do you want us to keep cracking Sean or are you running out of time?

No, have time. Carry on.

Okay. Cool. Cool. So can the resources from the webinar there's actually two webinars Sean. So if you can maybe attach both of those to the resources provided, that would be very cool.

Will do.

What types of organizational data should not be AI access? That's a really great question. And one of the things that I teach when I'm doing any AI training is it's almost like a red, amber, green system. So if it's publicly available information and it's, you know, it's open, great.

Load it up. If it's customer data, if it's your next strategy, it's your new competitive edge, don't go there. And always think about whenever you're putting something into AI about how you can anonymize it and make sure that it is generic. So, like, never put you.

No, let me rephrase that. If you are in a portal that is designed for it, you can put your board papers into it, but don't take a screenshot of your, board papers and then just load them into your free chat GPT model, because you're then just putting all of your information out to everyone.

Yeah, absolutely. What if staff and volunteers don't want to use AI? Should this be discussed? I definitely think it should be discussed.

You know, that's part of, you know, creating a safe environment for people to experiment and learn. They might find, you know, different use cases, just helping guide people, on, you know, practical use cases, how to use it. And that it's not as scary as they might think it is. Creating a safe environment for us to be leading by example, showcasing use cases that are relevant to staff and to volunteers, particularly where there are organisational use cases that are relevant to them.

Question from Carla.

Yes. Yeah. Good question. I think it depends what type of model you've got. If you're in a paid protected model, I think it would be okay.

But if you're using a free model, I definitely wouldn't be putting a whole load of information into there. The other thing you can always do is you can get AI to create most of it, and then you can drop it into PowerPoint and add the names afterwards. So you can get it to do the heavy lifting to create the poster that looks beautiful, and then you can just pop the names in afterwards. Again, we didn't talk about is always refer back to your own organization's AI policy if you've got one.

I think the other thing is permissions. Are they aware of that? And do they give their permission to have their names? And especially if you've got a likeness or images going up in there related to that name too.

Question from Diana.

What traps your directors?

Oh, I like that. Don't be mean, think is probably the main one. You know, don't don't use your AI to to come up with the things. But equally, two real serious elements on that. One is as a director, don't be putting your board papers, as I said earlier, into a public model that's not got the privacy pieces in space, in place.

But equally, you know, the whole point in fact that the course I was doing this morning, which was on cognitive orchestration, which is actually deliberately using AI to stress test your thinking and look at things from other perspectives. And, you know, I had chair listed companies and CEOs on that program. And that's exactly what I'm teaching them to do is how to use AI to think of the different questions because it's much better to stress test it now and do a pre mortem

than it is to find out that it's failed six months down the line when you've invested a whole load of money in it.

Yeah. I think the other trap as well is the same as any board level, you know, not trying to get too into management's territory. You know, how do we stay in that governance line as we are asking questions that should be oversight rather than in the weeds.

Oh, and I've just seen you've done a follow-up. Was thinking of avoiding cognitive biases.

I think you should use AI to help you get over cognitive biases. I think that's a really strong strong use case for it.

Yeah.

Alrighty. Let's wrap it up, team.

All good. Very good.

We're out of time.

So please feel free to connect with our presenters on LinkedIn, everybody. If you'd like to be put in touch with Helen or Alexei, I highly recommend you get in touch with them if you're looking at adoption throughout your organisation. Please indicate your interest on the survey at the end of the webinar as you exit. We also have some fantastic webinars coming your way over the next two to three weeks. So keep your eyes open and check out our webinar schedule on our website.

So you'll receive an email from me. It'll be tomorrow now which is Friday our time which will include a recording of the webinar today, the transcript, the all important slides, the white paper, and of course the Pulse Survey Report which has just been released this morning. So you'll receive a copy of that.

All of this will be hosted on the webinar library of our website within the next forty eight hours if you miss the email.

If you're considering board management software for your organization, then obviously we'd love to hear from you. But better still, why not try our free thirty day free trial? It's really simple and straightforward. No credit cards required in order to get started.

So really straightforward there. So thanks again for your attendance everybody. I hope you enjoyed the session. Thanks Helen and Alexei for both being the author of the survey itself before we put everything together.

And then the final report as well. Was a great work. Thank you.

Look forward to seeing you all at our next webinar, everybody. Don't forget the short one minute survey as you leave. It really helps us craft this great program for you. So have a great day everybody.