

## Minutes of the 2022 AGM of the BCS IT Leaders Forum held on 29 November, 2022.

### Attendees:

David Miller	Gordon	Phil B
Phil C	Ian G	Shakeeb Niazi
Jon Leeson	John M	Stephen Castell
Jon Hall	Karl Smith	Bord Kwan
Andy Fenton	M Iqbal Boolaky	Doyin Talabi
Chris Fowler	Marek Suchocki	Desmond Alvares
Dan Perry	Matt Taylor	Greetings from Milan
Eddie Uren	Michael	Jacqui Hogan
Desmond	Mike Broomhead	Hans Bathija
Gill Ringland	Mike Saunderson	

1. Welcome from the Chair.
2. Last year's minutes. No matters arising.
3. The Chair's Report

### THE 2022 COMMITTEE:

David Miller (Chair)	Jacqui Hogan
Phil Crewe (Immediate Past Chair)	Dr John McCarthy (Cyber Security Lead)
Paul Chung (Treasurer) *	Shakeeb Niazi
Norman King (Inclusion Officer)	Prof Algirdas Pakstas
Matthew Taylor (Early Careers Advocate)	Christos Stavroulakis
Jonathan Leeson (Events)	Adrian Steel *
Ian Golding	Haiyan Wu.
Prof Jon Hall (Academic Liaison)	

\* N.B., prior to the end of the year Paul Chung stood down, and Adrian Steel stood down during the election process.

### WE HAVE CONTINUED TO EVOLVE

David said that it is important to see what has been achieved as part of a continuum. We started with the name change to The BCS IT Leaders Forum in 2020 from what it was before, we held the first BCS IT Leaders Conference in 2021, and we adopted a "Refocus, Re-engage, and Influence" strategy at the start of 2022 with the emphasis on professionalism, member engagement and industry leadership.

In setting this strategy we re-imagined what member engagement means post Covid and introduced working groups on topics that you had suggested at last year's symposium. Since their launch, you have been telling us that engagement such as this makes membership more fulfilling and we know that people generally like to get the leadership perspective on important issues.

We are still learning what works best and will consider a range of different formats but in just a few months we have launched 6 IT Leaders working groups that have so far involved more than 80 people and on the back of that we have already published 2 opinion pieces so we feel that we have made a good start.

## THE YEAR AS A WHOLE

January. The Members Symposium after the AGM was the source of all of the 2022 working group topics; we also completed our pilot Working Group which considered the future of our IT management methods which also featured in our 2022 conference (see below).

February. Held our 2nd BCS IT Leaders Conference: The Future of IT Leadership. We also launched the Software Risk and Resilience working group now entering phase 2.

April. The Future of Work event with Hema Purohit of Microsoft and Nigel Bingham

July. The Mass Migration event, the Cloud effect.

August. Launched four more working groups: Nurturing 'Leaderpreneurs', IT Leadership Modules for Education, The Future CEO, and Early Career Leadership Appreciation and Mentoring.

November. Held a Software Risk and Resilience round table discussion joint with the National Preparedness Commission. Also in November we held The Digital Divide event joint with the Entrepreneurs group.

December. A Software Risk and Resilience event where we will be asking what's next in terms of where we take this.

So quite a busy year but we have also been busy in the background making improvements to our internal processes.

## WE LAID THE GROUNDWORK FOR 2023 ... AND A MORE SUSTAINABLE FUTURE

Created rules of engagement for working groups to make administration easier as the number of working groups increase.

Carried out internal and external communications improvements because we are now doing more and so are needing to communicate more - and we need to make it clear what we are communicating about.

Agreed a process for white paper submission and publication.

Reviewed our membership criteria in the light of the changes to those for Fellowship

Changed our arrangements for regional events

Cleared our historic non-BCS member list because this had become something of anomaly since the BCS changed the way that they managed their membership records.

Finally, because during the year we had lost a few committee members through illness and pressure of work there were fewer people taking on more responsibility, we changed our constitution so that we are more aligned with Member Group Rules. This gives us new freedoms including allowing us to co-opt committee members, i.e. in addition to the 15 elected members, and to set up sub-committees. Thus, by changing the constitution we have ensured greater future flexibility.

## OBJECTIVES FOR 2023

The 2023 objectives are summarised by the words: INFORM, INVOLVE, and INFLUENCE.

We inform through events and conferences. This and networking is often why people join and we mustn't disappoint. Our aim though is to reach more people and have more face to face/hybrid events instead of wholly virtual ones.

Whilst 2022 was focused on member engagement, in 2023 our aim is to turn that engagement into involvement - not just in events and working groups but in helping us to

develop The BCS IT Leaders Forum itself and this is another reason why the changes to our constitution were necessary.

If we want our efforts to be useful, we must, where appropriate, influence others - others in the BCS and others externally.

Internally: The IT Leaders Conference is an example of how we have influenced something internally within the BCS. It is now part of the BCS programme of events helping the BCS to engage with IT leaders across all industries, to position BCS as a partner for businesses not just IT professionals, and to increase awareness of the BCS offering across all sectors. We wholeheartedly support this and our involvement will continue.

Externally: An example of how we are influencing others outside of the BCS is through Gill's Software Risk and Resilience Working Group. Here we are currently working with the National Preparedness Commission, and The Digital Policy Alliance. We will be looking to increase our external influence and will work with BCS HQ to do so.

#### MEMBERSHIP REPORT

As reported last year our membership fluctuates in line with BCS membership/renewals but compared with this time last year the membership is down whereas the LinkedIn membership just builds unless people remove themselves.

Total ITLF Membership:	2043	Change on 2021:	-8%
Total LinkedIn M/ship:	1684	Change on 2021:	+1%

The Total ITLF membership is made up of 23% of all FBCS members and 4% of all MBCS members. Overseas members represent 10% of the ITLF membership.

#### TREASURERS REPORT

Looking at what has been achieved you can be forgiven for thinking that it has all cost a lot of money, but it hasn't.

Budget Year	Budget	Actual
2021-2	£3,355.53	£119.50
2022-3 to 31/10	£974.28	£0.00

The consequences of Covid have impacted our plans (and continues to be felt) and the recent strike action has further prevented us from arranging face to face events - all of which underlines the importance of our member engagement strategy.

#### ELECTION REPORT

Three committee members had come to the end of their 3-year term and an additional committee member had stood down, then later another who in fact stood down when the election process was under way. A total of five places had to be filled but initially the election was called when it was clear that we had nine candidates bidding for the initial four committee places. There were 75 valid votes recorded for the nine applicants and Chris Fowler, Jon Hall, Jacqui Hogan, Karl Smith, and Gordon Thompson were duly elected to bring

the committee to its full complement of 15. So that's three new members and two who were re-elected.

Congratulations to those five and a warm welcome to those new people. To those who were unsuccessful, don't worry, I am sure if it's appropriate we will be calling upon you to help in the future.

#### THE 2023 COMMITTEE

Dr David Miller (Chair)	Jacqui Hogan (re-elected)
Jonathan Leeson (Vice Chair)	Dr John McCarthy
Norman King	Prof Algirdas Pakstas
Matthew Taylor	Karl Smith (new member)
Phil Crewe (Immediate Past Chair)	Christos Stavroulakis
Chris Fowler (new member)	Gordon Thompson (new member)
Ian Golding	Haiyan Wu.
Prof Jon Hall (re-elected)	

#### SOME SPECIAL THANKS TO:

Jonathan Leeson, who ran the events during 2022 and who has agreed to become the Vice Chair for 2023.

Phil Crewe, who supervised the recent election which turned out to be quite a large task.

Shakeeb Niazi, who failed to get re-elected but who manages the Nurturing "Leaderpreneurs" working group and who has championed the Digital Divide initiative. He will not get away quite so easily and he has already agreed to continue to manage his working group.

Jonathan Leeson, Matt Taylor, Jon Hall and Gill Ringland who have also been managing working groups.

Finally, we must not forget all the staff at BCS HQ who have helped us with all of the extra things we have been asking of them during this busy year.

4. AOB There were no items raised during Any Other Business.

END OF AGM

#### THE 2022 MEMBERS SYMPOSIUM

David Miller introduced the symposium by saying that if our 2023 objectives were to Inform, Involve, and Influence, then we needed the help of our members, starting now. The purpose of the symposium was for members to put forward ideas for events, topics, speakers, working groups, etc. To lead this discussion David introduced Jonathan Leeson (Vice Chair).

In response to a question from Dan Perry, Jonathan invited those leading a working group to briefly say what they were doing and to invite questions, and in response to a question from Mike Broomhead, Jonathan stressed that all groups were open to further involvement if there was an interest.

Jon Hall summarised his work on leadership modules for universities to improve the standard of IT leadership and the appreciation of the leader's role in organisations amongst university students before they go into business. Jon explained that the ultimate goal is to get the BCS to accredit our IT leadership module at levels 6 and 7. Michael suggested maybe a summer camp on IT skills, for board members based on the 'IT Leadership modules for University Courses'

Karl Smith asked about our intent if we can assume that the BCS would provide the voice of technology to the UK media, government and be an insight engine and drive many conversations around both IT and British Culture with IT. Jonathan confirmed this to be the case with us contributing a leader's perspective on the issues of the day through the Influence component of the '3i' objectives for 2023. The question is what should we focus on and how do we make a difference?

Gill Ringland summarised the output from the Software Risk and Resilience working group. The work will be presented at the event on 6 December but there is a big impact on productivity arising from software risk and our lack of resilience to this. The work gives rise to three separate avenues we need to explore. The first is to raise the awareness of the problem amongst policy makers and people in government to change the agenda. The second is working on resilience with risk managers. Thirdly working with IT leaders and boards to ask the right questions about software risk and resilience. A more formal approach around phase 2 will be raised on 6 Dec.

Stephen Castell said this gelled with much of the work he had been doing as an expert witness and emphasised the importance of the possible serious nature of the consequences of software failure. This working group is unique, in his experience, in trying to look at the consequential impact. And why is this important? We know from Post Office Horizon that hundreds of people's lives can be blighted over 20 years of civil prosecutions all based on a faulty system. We can map out from that in all kinds of industries and directions. We can confidently predict, though we don't want to do so, that there will be a large scale impact as a result of some kind of software failure, and possibly in the near future. We've got anecdotal case studies in our think piece about various other disasters and if we escalate that to the whole economy, as everything becomes more and more interdependent with interlinked computer software and systems, there will be a catastrophic cascade failure that could affect millions of people's lives. Nothing is being done by anybody that we can really see to actually look at that and really stare it in the face and say, "What the heck do we do about it to prepare for it, to put in protocols, whether at the individual level, the corporate, the national, the governmental level to address that almost inevitable large scale failure, large scale impact, of a large scale systems failure. That's the emphasis I see for this working group. A lot of the other stuff is very very important but has already been covered over many years, well or not, we don't know, but we can have a view on, but that's the difference with this working group as I see it anyway and why I get very excited by it.

Gill continued, thanks Stephen, yes, and this is why we are pleased that the National Preparedness Commission want to pick this up and they will be looking at how they can get this on the agenda of the government cross party committees in the House of Commons and House of Lords.

Jonathan thanked Gill and said that this was a great example of a very active group and the IT Leaders Forum was pleased to have helped move this issue forward. There are probably other ideas out there so please raise them with us.

Karl commented that by joining risk, resilience and continuity the topic has really moved towards work orchestration with tech like ARO that includes non-digital technologies - sounds like an interesting project. There was also an interest from Phil B in joining the project and Gill responding saying that the three second phase projects would be starting soon and that new participants are welcome.

Gordon Thompson said that he resonated with what both Gill and Jonathan had been talking about but felt that in business there was an opportunity to go further in terms of educating board members. There needs to be more digital literacy on the board. Not by telling them what to invest in but in influencing CEOs and CFOs by telling them what IT is and what it can do for their business. Another avenue worth exploring is in data security within that software risk and resilience. Its no longer kids in their bedrooms its terrorist organisations, organised crime, and rogue nations that are really trying to get under the skin of things and hack industries for political ends or financial gain for themselves and board members must be receptive to this. Gill's view is that cyber exploits vulnerabilities in software and we hope to align with the software people working on cyber. The board position was discussed at the round table. Its maybe not appropriate for all CEOs to have been CIOs but one view emerged that got a lot of nods. Board members sometimes have finance qualifications, sometimes they have legal qualifications. If they are finance guys they think they can have a sensible conversation with the legal people, if they are legal people they think they can have a sensible conversation with the finance people. Whichever background they have they ought to be able to have a sensible conversation with the IT people and so that's the sort of measure we ought to be thinking about. Jonathan commented that there are other specialist groups withing the BCS, e.g. security, but it is the IT leadership perspective that particularly interests us and maybe there is the potential here for another working group? Gill touches on it, and I touch on it as well in the Future CEO but maybe it needs more emphasis? Jon Hall said that software didn't appear on corporate risk registers. It has been forgotten and we need to learn to talk up to the board as well as the board talking down to us but that means talking to them about things they care about and they don't care about software and yet it is the basis of how we run most businesses these days and so we must develop that dialogue.

Dan Perry asked in the chat if by IT we included all things digital and data, etc? The answer was an emphatic yes. Dan argued for a moderated discussion with the board (or council in his case at his university) which brings a balance of benefit, and resilience, and risk rather than scare tactics. It was said earlier that cyber exploits vulnerabilities in software, but I don't think that's the major risk in cyber its people and their vulnerabilities.

Mike Broomhead, also in the chat, commented that this had been really well explained re legal / finance / IT by Gill.

Matt Taylor summarised the work of the Early Career working group. The aim is to see how we can best act as advocate and mentor for people who are in their early years of their careers and aiming to be IT leaders, and people who have just become IT leaders and need

some guidance and mentoring. The working group consists of senior IT people with consulting, public, and private sector experience. What we want to do is help individuals through one-to-one mentoring or provide group events to do this. There is a view that the working group may also need to include non-IT people to understand what they are looking for in future IT leaders to support their business. What is clear is that IT careers have broadened over the years and so there is a need to have a broad range of experiences to assist people who are mentoring. It's very difficult for people starting out to understand what IT covers these days (and the career choices) and therefore what it means to be a manager, including soft career topics such as employment law, property management, contract law etc. and so there are lots of people we need to involve in our working group. To achieve this we discussed the organisations we may team with to achieve our aim. The second part of the task is to target and identify who we wish to work with. The two actions are to identify the organisations who are best placed to provide the mentoring, and to identify those who need it in order to fulfil most people's passion which is to ready the next generation of IT leaders. We are always happy to accept new people into the group who can help us to broaden our understanding of what is needed.

Shakeeb provided an overview of the Nurturing "Leaderpreneurs" working group. It's about business resilience and, in that context, IT Leaders being more entrepreneurial. It's one of those things that allows IT leaders to have a voice on the board. How do we drive IT leaders up the food chain and on to the board? IT leaders should become MBAs to give them the skill set in order to align technology to the business drivers. We are often being told what to deliver and the budget for it its usually too little and too late. Unless we are part of the process of taking the business forward and influencing the business direction then we are playing catchup and, even then, maybe ending up with something entirely inappropriate. New technologies are coming along all the time and businesses need to understand the opportunities that these present.

Jonathan spoke about The Future CEO working group that he leads. It's clearly intertwined with what has been said so far and there is some commonality amongst these working groups. That doesn't mean that there is duplication because we are all coming at it from slightly different directions and the people we are trying to influence may vary as well. This working group is asking what are the skills that a CEO will need in the future? We are looking at it from an IT perspective but its not just about IT. We've been saying that IT has become core to most businesses, so what skills are needed to be successful in the CEO role. Where IT is the way we do business, the old manual method may not be an option.

As Michael said in the chat, an IT risk is a business risk - if it fails reverting to quill and parchment may not be desirable or possible. Gill Ringland responded, "Yes Michael, that is the big change that has happened without many people realising it."

Karl Smith: "The business used to use IT as a channel now IT is the business with (IT) products and services".

Jonathan Leeson continued, take digital payments as one example, if you lost your digital payment processing most companies would lose an ability to receive payments immediately. There's a lot of diversity within the group so we have the ability to consider this from the perspectives of many types of business. At the moment we are talking to ourselves and we are agreeing because we are all IT people so now we must consider who we need to

influence in order to bring about change. If you are interested in getting involved then perhaps you can help us. You may be able to influence other groups as well. We are also working with CIONet, another IT leadership group with the same concern to make things happen. We are already talking to them about a joint event next year. Maybe you are a member of another group that would like to get involved?

Mike Broomhead said that he was also a member of the Enterprise Architecture Specialist Group and he believed that teaming up with other groups can be quite effective, especially where there is a common interest. The architecture group is currently thinking of changing its name to architecture and strategy to broaden not just enterprise architecture but to reach some of the higher level solution architects out there so could there be an opportunity for that group to work with the IT Leaders Forum?

David Miller responded by relating how he had used architectures in strategic planning roles and in communication with the boards of directors and even used architectures as the basis for company restructuring. Having said this he didn't want to drag leadership down some architectural rabbit hole but agreed that there is probably an opportunity to work together on something. Mike agreed that it was like a Venn diagram and we should work on the area of overlap. David asked if this was a potential event on the role of architectures or a working group to explore how architectures could be better exploited. Jonathan suggested a conversation on LinkedIn to gauge the interest. Mike would post something on LinkedIn.

Chris Fowler said that the groups we had were really interesting but maybe putting a poll onto LinkedIn to ask people for their suggestions would be useful. Jonathan agreed that surveys were always a good way of getting insights.

Stephen suggested we set up a group to look at the honesty of software development. He stressed that he wouldn't have the time to run it but it does play to the BCS mantra of "good for society". He sits on the committee of the Law Specialist Group. At the moment there are Law Commission consultations going on around digital assets, decentralised autonomous organisations, the FTX cryptocurrency collapse, whistleblowing in software engineering, there is the online safety bill going through parliament at the moment with lots of amendments being made to it. There are even suggestions that software is being written with fraudulent content (and intent) from the start and this is going to become a major issue. What are the ethical and professional responsibilities not to do so. It is already clear without giving too much away that many of the crypto currency exchanges have been asking coders to write what one might call, and I don't want to allege that because I don't want to libel anybody, fraudulent software to deliberately deceive. Now I have not come across this before. IT people have generally been basically honest. It's bad enough trying to design software without bugs in it but to be accused of deliberately putting bugs in it is almost nonsensical. There's a working group there for us, I think. I don't know what we call it (not ethics!) but I put the thought on the table if someone would care to pick it up.

Andy Fenton as an interim CIO was often asked to develop an IT strategy, or a digital strategy, or a data strategy, or a cloud strategy, or other strategy of some kind but he notices that there is not a strategy specialist group. Maybe its covered elsewhere but the topic would interest him. Mike Broomhead pointed out that there is a proposal to rename the Enterprise Architecture Specialist Group as the Strategy and Architecture Group. Andy



said that it was a part of the Venn diagram but what he presented to boards was how IT can enable the organisational strategy which is partly architecture but also about twenty other things. This may be a topic worth picking up and it would be good to work with the architecture people on this.

David explained that whilst many of our members are also members of other specialist groups, we do experience difficulties in reaching out to members of other groups who are not members of the ITLF and who may be interested in attending one of our events. In these situations we have to go via the chairs of those other groups and access to the chairs is via HQ.

David also asked if there were topics other than those that we had discussed so far today that interested people or people that we should invite to speak.

Karl Smith asked how often the groups let the world know what's happening and that he was happy to help with this since it's how I became an influencer. Thanks Karl, how we promote and extend is a key area.

Michael asked, "How would I reach the forum in the future?" Jonathan Leeson: You can join the IT Leaders Forum on LinkedIn and members receive regular emails from the Chair. Karl Smith added that there is an EventBright list for all BCS events.

Shakeeb suggested a social media team that could work on behalf of all working groups to promote what they were doing. Also, he supported extending this to the wider IT community not just to BCS members or to ITLF members.

Dan Perry asked, "Do we have relationships with professional bodies in different areas such as ICEAW/ACCA etc?"

Andy Fenton was interested in contributing to a number of groups but was concerned about how much of his time would be taken. Jonathan explained that as little or as much as could be spared but information could be supplied offline if virtual meetings were difficult.

David Miller said that it was recognised that everyone was a volunteer but we did want to make use of people's knowledge, to tackle issues that are important to us, and to provide opinions. People are interested in our opinions: we don't have to provide academic arguments to arrive at proof. Where are we headed, what are the issues of the day, what do we think ought to be done about it? Let's give some direction to the things that we know need to be addressed. We clearly need to give thought to these issues but its not immensely time consuming. It's about forming a consensus view amongst a number of us that have an interest in the topic. Please don't be frightened of being asked to help.

Jonathan and David said that everything that had been said had been noted and thanked everyone for their contributions.