FUTURE SIGHT PODCAST

Ep.24: The Future of Work

Future Sight Podcast by Capgemini Invent

As business and technology move forward at a rapid rate, it has become increasingly important to explore new ways to adapt and grow for the future. This podcast is your guide to that future journey.

Join us as we explore a new topic in business, technology, and transformation. Find out more about the challenges businesses are facing today and what they can expect in the future. Listen to leading industry experts as they break down need-to-know, actionable approaches with strategic insights and provide tangible takeaways.

Listen to more Future Sight episodes here: https://www.capgemini.com/podcasts/future-sight-podcast/

2

Episode Transcript

Ollie Judge: This is Future Sight, a show from Capgemini Invent. I'm Ollie Judge. On this show, we explore new ways for you to adapt and grow for the future of business.

This is clear that the workplace is shifting towards different models of working. Over the past few years, many businesses have changed how and where they work. And with much of the world now experiencing the realities of working from home, many have begun to strategize around the future of hybrid working. For many, the hybrid model was a relatively new phenomenon, but it is a model that has successfully worked for many businesses over the past few years.

With the workplace of the future looking increasingly decentralized, there has been much discussion about research into what the future of work looks like. Some believe that hybrid working is an unsustainable solution to a temporary problem while others believe that a flexible approach is the way forward. To find out more about both of these perspectives, we spoke to one of our experts in the field – Claudia.

Claudia Crummenerl: My name is Claudia Crummenerl. I'm a Managing Director at Capgemini Invent for a team called "Workforce & Organization".

Ollie: And Professor Dr. Peter Cappelli.

Peter Cappelli: Hello, my name is Peter Cappelli. I am a professor of management at the Wharton School. I also direct our Center for Human Resources.

Ollie: Claudia, I'm going to start with you on a bit of a temperature test: what role does the office currently have in the environment that we're sitting in at the moment?

Claudia: Maybe I start with an opinion that Capgemini has. Because I think we clearly say that the office is not dead. We're not a hundred percent remote working company. Our culture depends on people meeting and innovating in some of the offices. It will be different. So, we will use the office space for different things possibly than we used them in the past.

And we will have more flexibility for people and more autonomy for people to decide when they want to come to the office. So, I do think there's still a strong need for an office. I also see the tendency that we're not going to a central office in one city, but that we need more local representation. So, say for example, in Germany, we have offices in the large cities, but we're missing out on some of the spaces in the medium-sized cities where we still have a significant size of employees.

So, employees will not travel an hour, an hour and a half or something like that, to go to the office and meet with a colleague on a regular time, but they would want a representation nearby where they'd work, where they live, in order to have a different space, meet some colleagues or dial into meetings or whatever it is that they want to do at the office.

Ollie: So, Peter on your side: you're in America, which is very different and big cities hold a lot of value. And it's where people congregate and the opportunity for more like, let's say distributed working is a little bit more limited because you need the transport connections, like people aren't going to be able to make it into the right places at the right time.

What are you seeing on your side? Does, is the office still what it was, or are people pivoting a little bit? And what does that look like on your side?

Peter: So, most of the way we manage people is governed in white collar work, is governed by offices and the issues of the architecture and how you can use them in part to pass along organizational culture, and to monitor employees and all that sort of stuff.

So, the only reason we're thinking differently about this at all is we've just gone through this, you know, incredible period of pandemic, where we were forced to shut offices down and people worked from home. So, we have this kind of forced experiment. It's not that anybody thought it would be a good idea to work from home. We just had no choice.

And the interesting thing is most employers seem to report that things went okay. And a lot of employees seem to like it better, but not all. One of the things we forget looking at the survey data on employees, at least from the US, is a pretty small percentage of people really want to be permanently remote.

So, there was a survey a couple of months ago: 8% want to be permanently remote, that is there's no office for me; 37% said they wanted to go back to the office and majority, but not by a lot, want something in between. And so, when we talk about hybrid, that's the story, right? It's something in between everybody in the office or everybody at home.

Claudia: I think it's interesting what you say though, that the data shows that employees aren't all like fully in favor to completely work from home. We have the same kind of data. They're even more worried to work only from home because it means that they can less differentiate between private time and work time.

They can, they have an issue also again, not like you get these 30-minute calls, one by one. That's actually for them most stressful to work from home. So, I can see the same effect in the data that I've seen from Capgemini actually.

Ollie: It is clear that there are lots of ideas surrounding the future of workplace. We can see that there are some distinct opportunities arising out of the weaknesses of an office. For example, it might be much more efficient to organize remote meetings with clients from all over the world than an in-person meeting. But with opportunities there also comes risk. How come those opportunities become a bit of a challenge on the other side?

Peter: So, if you're going to have virtual meetings rather than travel, it doesn't mean you don't need an office as a base, and you could do virtual meetings from the office too. Do we need more of that? That's an interesting question. I've thought at various times in the past with new technology, that it would eliminate the need for travel and it never has.

All these communication tools and things when they come in, new ones, one of the things that seems to have happened is that we've discovered we actually have a greater need to talk to each other. And, are we going to get so good at technology that we don't need the face-to-face conversations anymore? Read the body language, meet people, all that kind of stuff?

It's an interesting question, right? We're not there yet, for sure. I think when we talk about, at least the US expression is "Zoom fatigue" because so many people use Zoom, how tiring it is to be on these virtual meetings, as opposed to face-to-face meetings! Some of that may just be limited by the technology right now, the fact that it's very small pictures of people, and you're trying to read their facial expressions on a one-inch screen.

Maybe it's that, maybe along it will get better. But I don't think we've heard anything here or seen anything that says that working from home is necessarily better.

Ollie: So, I'd like to build off that slightly that in the minute that you said that, I have found five research-backed reports that say that people are happier and more effective from working at home.

And I would like to drill into that a little bit more. So, I actually think the US attitude is a little bit different from the European attitude on how all of this works. So, I think there's an element of being present and showing your ideas and all that kind of stuff. Whereas, at home, you don't get to do that.

Peter, you've kind of surfaced that, that the social interaction there. I think what's super important though, is giving people the room to find where they work more effectively.

So, Claudia, a question that I'd like to ask you is: if we're talking about hybrid environment, how do you begin to measure, how do you begin to gauge and how do you begin to understand how your workforce works more efficiently? And how do you create a sort of a level playing field for the people that may be potentially work in the office or potentially work better at home? Where do you find that middle ground? And then how do we begin to move forward from there that we can actually have productive conversations?

Claudia: I attempted not to really answer your question, because I think that it really overplays with the typical consultant answer. It depends really, because the thing is, there's a lot of studies out there that say, presumably productivity has risen.

The question is why is that? Or, and there's also studies like you just Googled, that employees might be happier, but also the question is why is that? What do they like about the hybrid ways of working? I think when looking at why do people like hybrid ways of working is they have more autonomy than they used to have.

So, when I started working, actually, there was still the system where you have to stamp a card when you enter the building. You basically register your time. So, it's a very different kind of control of how presumably productive you are based on presence time in an office. And I think that has completely changed.

When you measure the productivity, or when you measure work, it's moving away from time spent somewhere in front of somebody to assess on whether you've done the work. But also, that at the same time, the challenge when you work in a hybrid or in a remote environment, because I see that a lot of the leaders that we support, a lot of the clients that we support, struggle with: how do I know that the employee is doing the work? How do I know that he's doing fine when he is coaching? How do I measure the outcome if we're not being together and that kind of thing?

And I've seen really good examples of how to build trust, how you go to an outcome based, a conversation about what really needs to happen rather than "I wanted to control what you do". But I've also seen some really perverted ideas about how you want to control productivity by installing applications on your computer to measure how much time you spend on a certain application, how many other windows you've opened and stuff like that. So, it all really depends.

And I think that's the tricky part. When you say hybrid working, there is no one size fits all. And that's what's making it complicated for employers. To go back to what Peter said earlier, that it's like we have yet to determine whether this model is going to work for employers, because for them it's really hard.

They want, if they have a large-scale number of employees, they want standards in order to make sure they can control processes. They can drive and process this efficiently. And with hybrid working, it all depends on the flexibility and the individual arrangement you have that fits through your company culture. And that's kind of a bit of a paradox that they have to solve.

Ollie: One of the obstacles to a hybrid workforce is that there is a worry that it will create a divided workforce. Those who work from home and those who work from the office. I asked out to Peter of what he thought the divides might look like.

Peter: There is a lot of research that's been done on this topic. And that research is about people who worked remotely. And it's unfortunate, but nevertheless overwhelming, that for the people who are out of the office, they might like being out of the office, but their careers stall. And the reason is compared to their competitors in the office, they're not as close to the action. It's easy to forget those people.

And there are lots of quite objective studies that show that they don't get promoted, as often. They don't get the wage increases. They are less engaged. They're less than committed in what they do. Now, the point there is to recognize that the pandemic experience was pretty unique because we were all at home from the offices.

And what we're talking about going forward is something different. I don't think anybody's talking about all employees will remain home. We're talking about giving people a choice. And once you give them a choice, then you're quite likely going to create two different sets of employees. You got people in the office or in the office more.

So, if you look in the US for example, there's this big divide between the tech companies in Silicon Valley who are doing programming work, which is very much individual-based work. You don't really need a team to do a lot of that. And they're saying, okay, fine: work from home. And you see the bankers in New York were saying, this is project-based and it is something that we need to do face-to-face. That's the way the work works. We want everybody to come.

So, the big variation in that case is easy to explain, right? The work is different, then in some contexts it's fine to be remote and in others, it's not, right? So, if you're talking about hybrid, which is just something in between and the big definition I think you were asking about before is do employees have control over when they can work remotely or some control?

Ollie: But it seems that while Dr. Peter may be right in the US, that there is a fair stratification of the workforce into those who are productive in the office and those who aren't while working from home, there are differing opinions about this in Europe.

Claudia: But don't you think that (at least that's my observation here in Europe or let's say for Capgemini), I think a lot of the conversations that I have with in the recruiting space, when we look at why do you want, do people

want to join an organization? It's actually, they're requesting this kind of hybrid work. So, for me as an employer, it's a mandatory policy that I need to offer in order to make sure that talent is convinced to join my company.

They want this kind of culture. They want this kind of flexibility, and they will choose an employer otherwise that gives them that autonomy to decide.

And the second thing that I see as... at least our CEO is getting all sorts of nice ideas in this war for talent, or when we talk about specific skills that we're looking for, to look at alternatives for from where can we get this kind of talent, whether we look, especially in the tech area. I mean, you've got... you're missing cyber analysts, you're missing data analysts, you're missing some of the cloud specialists, the web. Where would you get them, if you don't get them for example, in Germany or UK? If you have a hybrid working system, you could get them from anywhere, which is kind of appealing as an idea!

I agree with you. We haven't fully sorted out how that would then work, technically. So how does that work in terms of infrastructure for work in collaboration, HR policies, then how do you, how do you make sure the staffing is efficient?

So, there's still a few things to figure out, but there are some appealing arguments. At least those two that I see popping up that would make it attractive for an organization to get.

Peter: That's the argument: will the labor market demand it? And on the one hand you might say, labor market demands all kinds of things, that people want higher wages, they don't get them.

The question: it's happening. And I think in the US is their employers are looking to see what their competitors are going to do, and they're not going to do it until their competitors do it. And the evidence right now is that frankly, they're slowly bringing everybody back and not making these accommodations.

But if you look in Texas, for example, two thirds of the office workers are already back in the Texas cities, Houston, Dallas, San Antonio... and they haven't made very many accommodations. I don't think that's a great thing, by the way. I'm not arguing that's what they should do.

But I think that is the question: will employees demand this? Will they be willing to take a pay cut, for example, or take less to go work someplace because it's remote?

And you may know this story in Silicon Valley, the companies that were offering remote work are now walking it back by trying to make it expensive for you to work from home. They're saying, okay, you want to work from home? That's great. We're going to pay you 20% less. That seems to be the figure by the way is 20%. Right? So, are they interested in doing this enough to take less money for it? That's an interesting question.

Ollie: This point around pay scale adjustments has always been a contentious issue.

In August, Google came under scrutiny when the internal salary calculators, which are used by US employees to see how a potential relocation or work from home arrangement may affect their salary, were seen by reporters. It discovered that long commuters would be disproportionately affected by work from home pay cuts in comparison to colleagues who had similar arrangements but lived closest to the office.

Google stated that their rates of pay have always been adjusted based on location, but is this a trend that is occurring globally?

Peter: The problem is: are the employers setting their policies based on what is objectively fair or are they playing the market? And I think what they're saying, their CFOs are asking them to do this.

If we're giving people this benefit, what are we getting from it? And the response, at least in these companies in California, believe me, I don't think this is a good idea. But this is what they're doing. They're saying people are willing to pay a price for this and so we'll try it out. We'll see what price they're willing to pay. And right now, they're asking for 20%.

Claudia: But you stepped up a question that pops up. Because I'm really surprised. I was preparing a bit for our conversation. I'm really surprised by the big difference between the US and some of the European trends.

Because I would say in Europe and in Germany and France, there's almost no company that doesn't deal with, how do we allow or make a hybrid work possible? And it's less coming from, you know, from the business case that the CFO is asking for. I do see the same thing because the real estate cost that's been kind of the trigger

6

that probably has been, or the carrot that people have been waiving with and the reduce in the travel costs and things like that.

But there's a real tendency to do this out of a better employee promise, better employee sustainability. So, a lot of the conversation now, the work climate summit is going on, is piggybacking on that thing. This is actually the most sustainable way of working. Why you say like that... I can understand that the companies are kind of dead-locked and they're waiting for the other company to move, to see whether the trend is actually maintaining or staying. But I'm surprised by the difference between the continents.

Peter: This is not unique to this particular problem, right? US employers have never been as concerned about their employees as European employers are. And that is underpinned in part by the political context. So, European governments are much more supportive of employee ease than US employee as US governments are, particularly at the state level.

There's an issue of power in this. And employers have the power in the US, overwhelmingly have the power, and they're not necessarily thinking about what will make sense for the employees. I think it is important. And maybe in this podcast to make the arguments about why it might work for the employers to be paying more attention to what the employees want.

They can replace my job by hiring somebody in the Ukraine or somebody in India, because there's no visa issues. If they're your employee in India and they're not working in the US so that's not going to help US employees much if they go in that direction.

Retention: would it help it? It very well might. But on the other hand, once everybody can hire people remotely and moves in that direction, it's just as easy... it's easier to lose your employees as well. And you got no comparative advantage by giving them remote work if everybody else would do the same thing.

Ollie: One important point that Dr. Peter has highlighted is that as companies that open up their talent pool to remote workers in their locality, country, or indeed abroad, this increases competitiveness. Not just in pricing, but also in talent. How then can businesses strike the balance between retaining talent and keeping turnover low? Attracting the best talent in a non-localized jobs market, all while maintaining a centralized office.

Peter: I think as we were saying before, there's some jobs which are individual contributor roles. And so, we forget that this is not a new thing. Twenty years ago, IBM got rid of 40% of its offices and pushed that many employees out to work remotely.

It's not a new thing. They were people who were individual contributors, mainly they were consultants that are doing the kind of work that Claudia, your colleagues do in the IT world consulting like customer service.

You've always been able to do that. And that's not a particularly new thing. The issue is more about those jobs which are not individual contributor jobs; not outside salespeople who really never needed to be in the office or consultants who only occasionally needed to be in the office.

The big change is everybody else. The people who were in offices before. And what we don't really know very much about yet is what happens to arguably the great majority of office workers, for whom it is important to interact with other people. And project work is largely what they do. And in that context, being able to find individual contributors who you think objectively might be better is not really the whole story.

There are a lot of individual contributors who don't make good teams. And there is some stability to teams, once you get them up and running. It's important to keep them running. And just trying to throw together a bunch of individual contributors and hope things will work doesn't necessarily work very well.

So far, the constraint on that is so much work is not individual contributing work. But if we think we're going to try to keep breaking that down, I'm not sure that's good times for employees if we go in that direction.

Ollie: Three benefits for hybrid, three benefits for the office.

Claudia: I think humans are social beings, and I think the social contact is something people desperately miss in with the Zoom fatigue and sitting behind a video on a computer.

So, I think that's the core benefit – socializing with people, meeting people, because we as a species are social animals. Secondly, I do think the office is kind of the vehicle to the glue of a company, which is the culture. You cannot transport that through video that much. And that's what we've seen when you look at onboarding or retention in parts.

So, I think it's important to feel the company culture, to be part of something bigger, not just sitting in front of a computer. So, to really dive into that culture that can benefit.

Third, it does allow you, maybe that's more than an individual note. It does allow you to separate a little better your work and your private time. Because I think right now the biggest downside is that this is blurry. And to compartmentalize that in times may be helpful to distract and to the peak and burnouts that really separate those two lives a little bit better, to do that from time to time.

Peter: But if I could maybe begin with the big caveat at the beginning, and that is, what complicates all this is people want quite different things depending on their lifestyle.

Let's say you're a new employee getting started, what's the importance of the office to you? It's everything. If you could imagine being right out of college and you get a job offer in central London, or you get one in New York City and they say, you know what, you don't have to come into the office. We want you to work from any-where you want. They want to be in central London. They want to be in Manhattan and they want to be in cities.

And particularly at the beginning of your career, it's crucial to meet people. It is crucial to understand how of-fices office work operates, even if it's not going to be in a physical office context.

I think the other reason why we are thinking so much about it is because of the benefits of not commuting for lots of people, right? It turns out that surprisingly that the data in the US shows that we aren't completely reduc-ing our car time when we're not commuting by car into the office. So, we ended up driving more time when we're at home when we're not commuting, that's obviously a nice thing.

And especially for people who have caregiving responsibilities, it's much easier to be able to deal with kids where the schools are closer to your home, and your work is often someplace else.

Ollie: In the traditional office environment, there's a lot of emphasis placed on the skill transfer between senior employees and juniors. Seniors transfer industry insights learned over possibly decades and juniors transfer in-novative ideas and new ways of thinking.

One of the primary concerns for employers when it comes to hybrid working is how we can appropriately onboard and up-skill new entrants into the workforce and how we can make sure that the people with those sen-ior skills who may not necessarily be able to come to the office are involved in that process.

Claudia: I think we've learned quite a bit through just experimenting. I mean, from one day to another, we have to do everything in Teams or Zoom. And so, you just need to try to figure it out and allow that time to do that. What we've learned is that you need to take people along and make sure that just because they're maybe qui-eter, is they still have access to that to the team and to the knowledge.

That was the thing, the challenge, when you have people who are in different locations and you don't really know what's going on; when they're in the office, you can see whether they feel comfortable, whether they're contributing or not; if you don't have the camera on or things like that, it's more difficult.

So really take the time to make sure everybody in the meeting or everybody in the team is on the same page. I think just by accident, I said another thing that I would add, I think the camera helps tremendously to make sure there's this basic rule – "cameras on," depending on not depending on whether you feel ready or not.

I mean, you don't need to have your most, prettiest camera face, doesn't matter, but it's just seeing each other at a different kind of proximity that you otherwise don't have. So, you could follow more and help people more along. And I think really these purposeful conversations around, what do you need in terms of skilling?

Because there's no standard, right? Things may not work. Infrastructure may not work because of different rea-sons. Why? I mean, we had conversations around new problems, like where do you sit into that if it's not working, that the bandwidth is not working. You need new infrastructure, or like at least different Wi-Fi connection of some sort, you would need a screen, or you don't have a table at home that allows you to sit properly.

So, we had newfound health issues because people were sitting at a kitchen table the whole day, right? So, it's really taking people along on that journey and really literally caring, I would call it, for what the situation is, is the key to learning on that.

Ollie: Sorry, which I feel is valid. And I feel like there is a big gap that we've learned to overcome thinking about that.

Was there any opportunity for actually more access within a company to be remote? For example, like Capgemini is a multinational company. You have, I know that, on a regular basis, I deal with people in London, France, Germany, New York, all kinds of stuff. During all of this, was there more of an opportunity to actually share contacts that would potentially be out of reach of people that would have been in the office at the time?

Claudia: Oh, I think it's actually quite the opposite. So, what you can see is that you deal with people that you have a relationship with before. So, I see a little bit more, more silos or new silos in, instead of like… when you were the office, you run into people. You have kind of a coffee chat. And though those might be people that you not necessarily see by your reporting line or by your team structure, and so forth.

So, I can actually see the opposite effect, that you've really good conversations with people. You have a regular connection with, through the project, through your reporting line or whatever it is, but this random bumping into people like in a hallway of a larger office, that doesn't happen. And that's why some of the connections that you would have in between some of the functions or teams doesn't happen that much. So that's something to watch out for it to make sure that this random meeting and collaboration that then leads to new networks that leads to maybe new ideas.

Peter: Again, this is something that, we have tried some of these things before. Telework is not a new idea, and we've done this for about 20 years in various forms. And the great complication here is it's one thing to think about how you might redesign the whole organization to function differently. It's another, if we are thinking about hybrid, which means we're still going to have people in the office, but we'll just have some people remotely and some people more remote than others.

And so, then the question is: how much can you change the way the office operates to accommodate those people who won't be there? One of the things we know from telework is that it puts a big burden on the supervisor to manage people who are, partly because it's just different, the way you have to manage remote workers, you have to do more outreach to them.

You have to provide a lot more information to them about things that you are seeing in the office. We have a pretty good idea how to do it in answer to Ollie's question. They just have to convey a whole lot more information. They have to schedule regular check-ins with their remote workers and all that stuff helps a lot. But you got to do that for your remote workers, and then you got to do something different for your in-house workers.

Claudia: I fully agree. I think that's one of the crucial challenges for making hybrid work work, besides some of the benefits we talked about earlier, right? So, Peter, I think you said like, is it attractive for the employer?

I think there's a huge challenge,. if you decided to go down that road to really go on and support the leaders in driving this. And the companies that we see that do this successfully, they spend a lot of effort and a lot of money into leadership enabling, on really making sure they understand, they know how to do this, they know how to manage those, those two feet of people that are in the office and or that, that remote kind of also looking at the biases because you tend to have a bias with people, or you tend to maybe favor people that you see regularly in the office versus somebody that you only talk to over the phone.

So, to really deal with some of the issues that come with that, that is one of the crucial things to do when you go down that hybrid organizational road.

Ollie: Well, hybrid working has become the norm over the past 18 months. Is it sustainable? If workplaces of the future are going to be hybrid on a cellular level, how can these be an equitable offering to both employers and employees to sustain levels of productivity and enthusiasm? Or will the balance tilt back towards the offices as we move into 2022 and beyond?

Peter: I think we can do all kinds of things in organizations if we want. If you think about it a year and a half ago in March of 2020, if you had told me that we're going to close all the offices in the world and they'd be shut down for a year and a half, I would have thought we'd be living in caves and burning our furniture for heat.

It's astonishing that we were able to make all this work. We could certainly do it. The question is there a will to make it happen? And I don't see that right now. So, I've seen surveys on the views of executives versus the views of average workers on this. And there's a pretty huge divide, right? The executives much more want to bring everybody back to the workplace.

They're not paying a lot of attention, at least in the US, to what employees are telling them. They're not reaching out and trying to get feedback and stuff. So, is there a will to do it? And I think that's the question. I'd say at the

moment, if I were to bet in the US, the will isn't there. Now, could it be pushed along if they saw compelling reasons like their competitors in other fields, in their industry are doing it? Probably.

But I think that's the problem. It's not really, can we figure out how to execute this? We could figure that out. The question is, are we willing to pay the cost to do it? And do we care enough about it? And that's not surprisingly, that's always the big question. Never a technical problem, or almost, there.

Claudia: Yeah. And I think there's a personal view. I mean, if I ever have to dream, I obviously also enjoy the autonomy the hybrid work is bringing. And I do think what it does have some benefits that I see in my personal life. I think it is going to take some time until we figure out how long and what it takes and how does it really work.

Because there's besides some of the organizational issues that we touch on how do you make it attractive for, for the management of an organization to do this? How do we create the policies for hybrid work?

I also see some policymaking issues. So, the biggest stumbling block, for example, for hybrid work in Germany or in Europe is taxation. How long can you be in a different country? So, I think in Germany, also not just from the tax, but also then from a health, like insurance perspective, it's two weeks that you can be out the country. So, it does pose completely new questions to policymaking and how we organize.

So, I think it's a little bit more complex than we're just now, like in the last year is, we all worked remote. And I also agree, with you Peter, in saying like, is it attractive to potentially expand the war for talent across your country borders, right? So, that is going to have a huge impact, when you can say all of a sudden you can get the same kind of talent from, I don't know, India or so, and they have European contracts or US contracts and kind of directly compete with your local workforce. So, I think there's a few more things to work out until we can make that happen.

It's certainly a really good dream. And it sounds very tempting to be able to staff talent from anywhere to anywhere, but how does it really work in practice? This thing is something to figure out. I do think that this is the route we have to at least consciously elaborate. So, to try to support some of that and to go down that route. That's the firm belief that I have.

Ollie: For now the future of work is undetermined. Businesses have already overcome many challenges in how and where they work, but still there remain uncertainties that are as yet unseen. But in that uncertainty, there are just as many opportunities for innovation and building the workplace of the future. With all that progress we've made towards building mixed environment workplaces over the last 18 months, there seems to be a long road ahead to implementing a flexible hybrid workforce.

In the next episode of the series, we're going to be delving deeper into the challenges and opportunities facing the future of work. A big thank you to Claudia and Dr. Peter. If you enjoyed this episode, don't forget to subscribe on Apple Podcasts, Spotify, or wherever you find your podcasts.

This has been Future Sight, a show from Capgemini Invent. We'll see you soon.

10

About Capgemini Invent

As the digital innovation, design, and transformation brand of the Capgemini Group, Capgemini Invent enables CxOs to envision and shape the future of their businesses. Located in more than 36 offices and 37 creative studios around the world, it comprises a 10,000+ strong team of strategists, data scientists, product and experience designers, brand experts and technologists who develop new digital services, products, experiences, and business models for sustainable growth.

Capgemini Invent is an integral part of Capgemini, a global leader in partnering with companies to transform and manage their business by harnessing the power of technology. The Group is guided everyday by its purpose of unleashing human energy through technology for an inclusive and sustainable future. It is a responsible and diverse organization of 270,000 team members in nearly 50 countries. With its strong 50-year heritage and deep industry expertise, Capgemini is trusted by its clients to address the entire breadth of their business needs, from strategy and design to operations, fueled by the fast evolving and innovative world of cloud, data, AI, connectivity, software, digital engineering, and platforms. The Group reported in 2020 global revenues of €16 billion.

Get the Future You Want | www.capgemini.com/invent