

# Transcript of the Unbossing Podcast with Gary Hamel



## Transcript Info

This is the transcript of a Hifluence podcast with Gary Hamel (GH) hosted by Nick Van Langendonck (NVL) and Thomas Hubbuch (TH) from Hifluence ([www.hifluence.eu](http://www.hifluence.eu)).

Parts of the spoken text have been edited to make reading this document more enjoyable. Become inspired and inspire others with it!

The podcast can also be listened to on [spotify](#)

## Introduction

NVL: Congratulations on your new book. It is a must read for anyone working in organizations, not only the leaders, but I believe anyone: front line people, executives, anyone. We will not be able to cover the entire book.

## The Innovation Paradox

NVL: In the first zoom I want to do is on the innovation paradox. You also talked about this, that it was about 79% of CEOs that state that innovation is a top priority for their organization, and at the same time, 94% of those same CEOs state that their organization is not actually really good at innovating. So you got some kind of paradox. Are they really meaning what they are saying? Are they not following up with actions? Do they not trust their people in their capabilities? And the first thing we like to know is what are your thoughts on that?

GH: You know, obviously today most leaders understand how important innovation is. They know that it is the only guarantee of long-term customer loyalty. It is the only way to outperform a mediocre industry, often, it is the only insurance against irrelevance. So they get that. And yet they've been satisfied with half measures. I mean, a lot of leaders say, you know, we are serious about innovation. And I say, well, what does that mean? They say, well, we have innovators awards ceremony. We have a CEO slush fund to fund special projects. And so I say, well, yes, but have you really made this a core capability? So there is a little test we do, that we talk about in the book, three very simple questions that you can ask of every single person, people in the warehouses, in tech support, administrative assistance.

You just ask them three questions. First, has the company taught you how to think like a game changer? Have they invested in your creative capital, yes or no? Second question, do

they make it easy to to experiment with a new idea? Is it easy to get, let's say, 50 percent of your time and a few thousand euros to go try something new? And then thirdly, is it clear to you that your manager, your boss is accountable for this? Are there clear metrics? Do they talk about it? And does the innovation performance of your unit influence the compensation of your boss? Well, as you might imagine, when you ask people those three questions, the answer is no, no, no. I have not been trained. It is not easy. And I do not think my boss really is responsible for this so that I have to go back to the CEO and say, well, you told me you were serious, but I am curious, how do you use the word serious? Because this does not sound serious to me. You do not train, you do not make it easy. You do not hold people accountable. So I think we've been satisfied, as I say, for not really taking this seriously. And I think one of the challenges is, you have to look at every single system, process structure in an organization and say, how do you make this pro innovation? How do you make it support rather than frustrate innovation?

*For years, companies have spent time reengineering their operating models for efficiency and speed, we now have to reengineer the management model for innovation.*

Are we training people? Are we putting in the right metrics? Do we hold people accountable? Do we have an internal kind of Kickstarter or Indiegogo (<https://www.indiegogo.com/>) that makes it easy to crowdfund ideas inside of the organization? Have we built relatively small units where people's voices get heard? So it is a lot of work to reengineer a company. So innovation is something that happens, not despite the system, but because of it. And I think very few CEOs have kind of made that jump yet. And it is hard because almost everything that already exists in the organization is there to serve the cause of efficiency, alignment, discipline, but not the cause of creativity, innovation and so on. So it is a substantial challenge. But the bottom line is, as much work as your organization is spent, kind of keeping your operating model up to date and retooling that you've got to spend an equal amount, making sure that the management model supports everywhere all the time, relentless innovation.

## With Innovation, Control Comes in a Different Way!

NVL: Congratulations on your new book. It is a must read for anyone working in organizations, not only the leaders, but I believe anyone: front line people, executives, anyone. We will not be able to cover the entire book.

NVL: A top of mind question a leader might have is: "OK, but how do I control innovation in my organization?" If everybody has the skills and everybody starts posting new ideas and everybody starts doing this, how do I control it? If I have a separate innovation team that I can give targets to, I can control it and I can monitor it.

GH: You have just put your finger on exactly as you say. The paradox here, the control mindset does not work very well when it comes to innovation. What does that mean? That does not mean that you just do stupid things, but the control needs to come in a different way. You talked about setting up a unit and giving people targets. I see this all the time. I mean, one of the lies that a lot of management experts have perpetuated is that a larger organization simply cannot be innovative. The only way that it can happen is to carve off the innovation unit, put it in an incubator and accelerator, protect it from all those people in the core business. Those things do not really produce innovation. You know, the challenge in most companies is to radically evolve the core business. It is not about having something out on the edge. You have got to be innovating everywhere, not just in a few places, but where does the control come from? I would say it comes from three things.

1. You have to teach people how to judge their own ideas. Right? You have to teach people what a high quality idea looks like? Because you do not want people pursuing ideas that are not going to make a difference or are simply flights of fancy. So you need people, first of all, to self-edit their ideas and judge if it really meets a customer need? Is it really economically viable? Is it something we can really do with our capabilities? So you need that first filter so the organization is not inundated with kind of kind of somewhat 'stupid' ideas.
2. The second thing you can use is a peer review process. So it is not only what I think, but when I put this idea out and I am trying to get funding for it from my peers, are people willing to sign-up? Do they think it is a good idea? We built something like that years ago, the first internal innovation marketplace in the world for Shell. And it was called 'Game Changer'. It still runs. It has created billions of dollars of market value. We built this in the 90s. At that time, as it is today, anybody who has an idea, you do not go up the chain of command. You go to a group of your peers, a peer review panel. If they think the idea has promise, they give you a few thousand dollars to start experimenting and then off you go.

So first show these people, what a good idea looks like so they can self edit. Second, make sure that the funding process involves a peer review. So you have others looking at this idea, by the way, not your boss, because the problem in many organizations is, you might have a great idea, but if it does not fit with the immediate priorities or the prejudices of your boss, the idea dies. You will think how crazy it is! In most companies. There is only one place to go for funding for a new idea, and that is

up the chain of command. So that is like if in Silicon Valley there would be one venture capitalist and everybody had to go through that gateway. That is stupid. So you need multiple sources of experimental capital and you need peers doing this evaluation. And they will tell you whether this idea is a promise or not.

3. And then third, the last way you manage the risk is that you teach people how to do rapid prototyping at low cost. So the idea is, we are going to give you a small amount of money to go out and test your hypotheses, build an experiment, run a test, run a prototype, talk to smart people. But the goal early on is to maximize the ratio of learning over investment. Be very clear on your hypothesis. Think about how to test them at low cost, bring that data back, refine and then and then do it again.

So there are ways of putting innovation, at least in some kind of a container and putting some risk bounds around it. But that cannot be done using the traditional control measures or having a CEO that says 'I am going to give you the targets, that I will be the one doing a review every month' and so on. But that is the balance of being able to be both very bold in your thinking and experimentation, but also prudent in how you go about it.

TH: Gary, you were talking about this platform at Shell with the name gGame Changer in the 90s already. I assume that was a huge success, as you describe it. Can you talk a little bit more about that and would you recommend it, with your knowledge and experience today, still as a tool.

GH: Yes, I think absolutely, in fact, it is kind of interesting to me that so few companies have followed suit. I actually wrote an article about that 30 years ago or something. But here is the simple idea. Let me come back to the Silicon Valley moment, which has created more wealth per capita than any place in the world. It is not only here. Obviously there are other innovation hotspots around the world. But here, there is no CEO of Silicon Valley. There is no single person or executive committee that is deciding how much we are going to invest in nanotechnology and cybersecurity, in the cloud, in genomics... right.

So what you have here is three markets:

1. You have a market for new ideas, thousands, tens of thousands of business plans coming in every year to be seed companies.
2. You have a market for talent. So smart people coming, wanting to work on the next big thing, what is going to be the next Airbnb or whatever that is.
3. And then you have a market for experimental capital.

So institutions and angel investors all seek to fund great projects. When you think about it, Silicon Valley does not work by resource allocation. There is not somebody at the top

saying we are going to put this much money. It works by resource attraction. If you put up an idea and either attract talent and capital or a dozen people vote en masse for it, then good ideas move forward.

So what we did at Shell, and we wrote in this article many years ago called 'Silicon Valley Inside', it was a similar argument saying that:

*If you think about the primary reason companies miss the future is that they tend to overinvest in what is, at the expense of what could be!*

That happens because the resource allocation process is typically controlled by people who are running the existing businesses.

They are politically well-connected. They are in the budget meetings, they are in the planning meetings. They have these powerful arguments why you should give them more money and invest more in the business, in the status quo.

So, yes, I think it is a mystery to me why more organizations have not done that, because, you know, we just know that that old command economy, kind of the top down Soviet style resource allocation, there is almost no chance you will find the future that way. I will give you a quick little example. I was working almost 10 years ago with a Korean company. I will not give the name, but we had taught a bunch of young people how to think like game changers, and they were working particularly around new ideas with social technology. So this bunch of kids comes to me all excited. They said, Gary, we have this amazing idea. Like, you go into a bar or a club, you have your smartphone, you have your social profile geo-located and you can see who else is nearby. If you want to meet him, you can click. If they want to meet you, you go have a real physical meeting. It is amazing I said, that is cool.

Now we have to go get funding for that idea. So now this young team takes this idea to the executive committee, average age, probably close to 60, to get funding.

These guys first ask questions like: so if you are at the club, let me understand this and you are with your friends, why are you on your smartphone? That is not very polite. You need to just be with your friend no? You are like, everybody is on their smartphone, and so they are sharing thoughts back and forth.

A second question: why would you leave your friends to go meet somebody else? Why

would you do it? And what do you mean 'hook up'? What does this mean 'hook up'? Why would you go meet somebody else? So anyway, they did not fund it and a few months later, I think really about six months later, Marc Andreessen (top VC investor) and a few others funded Tinder.

*If it is the old goats that make the decisions, you will miss opportunity after opportunity.*

You cannot have innovation investment decisions being made by people who have most of their emotional equity in the old model. You need more people, younger people, people closer to the future, having a voice about where our resources go and what we fund.

## Breaking Free of the Status Quo

NVL: Reality is, Gary, that most of the members of top executive teams are 50 plus years old, and they might feel intuitively that the organization indeed needs to shift from efficiency at scale to adaptability and creativity at scale. Where should the pressure be coming from for them to make this leap and try to shift their perspectives not only on organizations, but basically on the world and how it is changing?

GH: You know, I think to be fair, I think most CEOs kind of get this now. The ones I talked to, they might not express it exactly how I would or you would. But I think most of them realize that their organizations are now up against challenges that lie outside the performance envelope of that old management model.

They know they are too conservative. They have too many layers. They are not moving fast enough. They are not daring enough, but they are really not sure how to change it. And you know, if you think how difficult it has been for many organizations to think radically about their business model, if you are in banking, publishing, hospitality or whatever, and you see all this changing around the world, I can tell you it is even more difficult to think radically about the management model because it has a huge impact on your own role and your power and your authority. And yet, I think a lot of leaders are there, but they really do not know how to move forward. And so I think three things are required to actually break free of kind of the status quo.

You have to start to calculate the cost of that bureaucratic drag in your own organization, i.e. the costs of that old model. And mostly we do not, we do not have any way of

benchmarking that. So you have to ask yourself, you know, the apathy, the timidity, the conservatism, the insularity, the politicking, what does that actually cost? So we built something called the bureaucratic mass index, the BMI, and it is free. If you go to [humanocracy.com](http://humanocracy.com), I think you will find it. Anybody can take it. But, you know, today companies measure customer satisfaction with NPS. They measure their environmental impact. You know, they measure all kinds of things. They measure quality. So you start to create a benchmark baseline. This is to try to understand how much this is costing to your organization, because that will give you some incentive to start to actually work on this.

They need new models, because most of us have grown up in and around organizations that all fit that old template. We have all worked with four or five or six layers where decisions are made at the top, strategy gets set at the top, and so until you believe there really is an alternative, you may not like the status quo, but you also may not believe that you can change it. Right. I mean, if you go back 10 years ago, maybe we did not like the pollution from combustion engines, but very few of us believed we could create electric vehicles. There was not really an alternative.

So the good news is there are a lot of alternatives and we talk about them in the book. And you know what? One of the best alternatives is in Holland: Buurtzorg, a home health organization. You look at a company like Buurtzorg to say, OK, they are delivering this, they are in a highly regulated industry in health care, delivering a complex service, with 16.000 employees and 2 managers. That is a span of control of one to 8.000, right? So once you have seen that, you cannot unsee it. It is like my head explodes, like, wow, there are other ways of getting control and focus, other than layers and lots of rules. So first is motivation. You have got to measure. Second, you have to believe there are other models to learn from, understand how they work.

The last thing is you have to have a migration path from here to there. You know, you cannot just blow up the old model and start the new model. And I think one of the dilemmas for a lot of CEOs, they want to believe this kind of plug-and-play here. Then just like some model I can take off the shelf and let me just call the consultants and tell them I want one of these agile things, and just come in three months and say, do agile on me and then go away.

Well, it does not work that way. If you look at these kinds of post bureaucratic organizations, like buurtzorg, all of them have been working on this for at least a decade. It has been a slow, exploratory, evolutionary process driven by this desire to unleash human capability at work. Everyone has built a model that works for them, but it is not going to work for everybody. So you have to say, instead of like some big top-down change



program, how do I start to encourage everyone across the organization to start experimenting, just like we experiment with new product solutions. Let us experiment with how we lead, manage, allocate, plan, on how you hack management, how anybody can start to build a hack.

But, you know, one of the things that really influenced me on this was open innovation. So today, Linux, which was the first real big open innovation success story. Linux is the most ubiquitous software in the world. It runs on all servers, on most mobile phones and so on. It has about 26 million lines of code created with 15.000 contributors and no management superstructure. But interestingly, Linus Torvalds, the Finn, who is kind of the original architect of this. He says something repeatedly that I think is very important. He said, when you are trying to do something that is complex and unprecedented, a massively parallel process of experimentation beats a top down design. You cannot take a few senior executives, they are not smart enough to design holistically the alternative to that old bureaucratic model, it has to emerge by giving people permission to experiment and asking them to start with some new principles like openness and meritocracy and say if we took this seriously, what would change?

First thing you need is motivation. You have got to measure. Second, you have to believe there are other models to learn from, understand how they work. Finally, start to experiment with how you lead, manage, allocate, plan, on how you hack management, how anybody can start to build a hack

I believe that as we look forward, the most effective change is not going to be top down. It will be socially constructed. And the way you solve these problems is in an open kind of way and that is why we actually built a platform to do this, because I could not find any of the existing software out there that allows you to bring thousands of people together to solve these complex organizational problems. If you are a leader and you really want to tackle this, start to measure the cost (1) and share that across the organization, challenge everybody to reduce that BMI number, (2) spend a lot of time learning from those new models. As you look at them, what you need to learn is less about what those companies do, than how they think. When we benchmark, we usually say, well, what do you do? And then you try to extract this one practice, bring it back and put it in the soil and it just does not work. So ask how they think. What do you believe? What is your passion? How did you get started? But that is very important to look at those models. And then (3) you start to give people in your own business permission to hack.

*If you are on the front lines, do not wait for somebody else to give you permission, just like do it. If you wait for bureaucrats to uninstall bureaucracy, you will wait a long time.*

You know, I will give you this one very quick little anecdote. So when Pope Francis, when he became pontiff in 2013. He said he was very bold. He said, I want to tear down the bureaucracy of the Catholic Church. And he actually called the Vatican bureaucracy: leprosy, which is a much stronger word that I have used anywhere. Right. He called it like this deadly disease. So somebody last year said, so Pope Francis, how is it going? And he said, I feel like I am trying to clean the Sphinx with a toothbrush, right, like he is not going to live long enough to solve it. Particularly when you start at 80. You might not have enough years left to do this. So my advice to the pope is you need more toothbrushes. And that is the same for a CEO. You cannot do this by yourself.

## Mistakes & Pitfalls

NVL: A question that we have is: If I am the CEO of a traditional food company and I want to head in this direction using the three tips that you just clearly explained, what is the biggest pitfall that I have to watch out for? What is the biggest mistake that I could make?

GH: I do not know if it is so much a mistake, but one of the challenges that I think you have to be very cognizant of is that there is no way to really reinvent management and build a daring, resilient, creative company without flattening the pyramid. You can get a lot of resistance from people who have spent a good part of their lives accumulating bureaucratic power and climbing the pyramid. This is how we index our careers. We go from team leader to unit head to vice president and so on. Telling those people that you want to flatten the pyramid, that maybe you are going to have one or two layers, that their role has to change from being manager to mentor, maybe scary.

*To reinvent management and build a daring, resilient, creative company, start by flattening the pyramid.*

And you will, when they try to kind of do this more top down, when they try to do it through their EVP and SVP and so on, people will say: yes, because you are the boss. They will kind of go, yeah, sure. But then they have a hundred ways of making you fail, of telling you all the reasons this cannot happen. You know, we have compliance issues that people

do not have the capabilities to do this. So they will find all kinds of excuses. They will slow it down. And a little bit like the pope, you just will not have the time to do it. So I think that the biggest mistake leaders make, is not recognizing that you have to make this bottom-up, that you have to engage the entire organization in doing this. When we did something like this with Adidas in North America, their North American division of Adidas, we went to three thousand employees and we said we need to build a pro-innovation company.

What needs to change? We taught three thousand employees about experimentation and transparency and meritocracy and so on, and we said, if we are serious about this, what would we change in our management model? We have more than 4,000 management hacks that were created and then they turned the best of those into experiments and so on. So if you try to do this kind of top-down to the old structure, it is very hard as a CEO.

But let me also say this. What we know is that when you make this move, everybody's job gets better. So initially, I think a lot of the managerial layers are going like, wow, I am going to lose my authority. I am going to lose my power. How do I know what my career is like? But here is the interesting thing: Gallup data, poll data says that managers are even less engaged at work than their employees because very few people like being a micromanager.

If you are a parent, the happiest thing is when your kids start to make good decisions on their own, right, where you are not trying to put guardrails and protect them and watch them just like they have grown up, they can do this. And it is amazingly a positive thing as a leader to see people grow, to see them take more responsibility. But it is a hard process kind of getting through there and de-bureaucratizing yourself and getting out of those old patterns and habits.

We tell a story and I do not try to tell it here now, but we tell the story of a wonderful bit of work going on in Michelin. The French tire maker, where it started with front line supervisors, but they have spent the last 10 years with people learning how to give away their power. Everybody's job gets better. As an unboss, you get to work on more interesting problems, right? You see people grow. You are no longer having to solve trivial operational problems. Right. It is a journey. It is a process. And, you know, I watched Haier in China go through this when they flattened their organization. They divided their organization into 4,000 micro enterprises. And in that process, 11,000 managerial jobs went away. They will never come back. But they did not fire all those people. Those people went to work in cute little micro enterprises. They started to be able to be entrepreneurs and, you know, and it was liberating for many, many of them are no longer stuck in the middle and play those

managerial kinds of roles. So If you really want to do this, you have to go to the whole organization. You have got to get them engaged. And what you will find is that, when you start to have 12 or 100s or even 1.000s of people say, hey, we can change this, we can do this, there is no small group at the top that really can stand in the way. They are either going to get on board or they are going to leave, but they can no longer become the gating factor in the change process itself.

## Pressure Points to move to Unbossing

TH: Do you see pressure coming from the HR department?

We cannot hire the talent anymore which we need, or if you hire the talent and leave us after 4 months... Like this I do not want to work, or is it coming from finance, who says, all the revenue is coming from products that are 10 years old or more. Where is the pressure coming from?

GH: It is all of these things, you put your finger on them.

First it is coming from customers, their expectations are changing so fast today, many organizations are struggling to keep up with them, you see new digital banks like N26 coming up and so on.

*If you cannot proactively redefine customer expectations, if you do not have an entire business that is built from the customer backwards, you are going to lose.*

If you look at the underlying pace of change in our environment, there is no CEO that will not understand that his organization will need to change faster than it is. So many new technologies, so many new opportunities, they certainly feel that pressure.

They definitely feel the pressures from new entrants that are redefining industries and so on. There is a great external pressure as you say. There is also pressure coming from the next generations that are coming into the workplace. The young people that are coming to work today, this is the first or maybe second generation in history whose primary reference point is no longer the pyramid.

If you are an old guy like me, or not so old; school, business, government, religion,... it was all hierarchy, now you have kids coming to work grown up on the social web and guess what, if you have followers on the web, they chose to follow you, there is no trickle down

power. If you are on the web or on YouTube, nobody asks you 'did you go to film school'? Nobody is asking 'did you guys go to journalism school'? You just have to create great content, that is all the followers ask. Judge me by my work.

*Young people today want to work in organizations that are built around the same values, where every idea gets heard, where peers rather than a boss decide what is good and what not.*

Where you only have influence when you have willing followers. And if your organization is not built around those values, you will fail to get the best people.

For all of these reasons, there is enormous pressure, I am very sympathetic to CEO's these days. Unfortunately, for many of them, particularly in larger organizations, under these pressures they have tried to use easy roots out. And the easy roots out are: let me merge with a big competitor, and take the consolidation gains and see if I can, whatever, or even better, let me merge with my big competitor so I have more political power in Brussels or Washington or elsewhere and I can influence the regulators, and tilt the playing field to my advantage or they may say, let me do massive share buybacks, so at least I can create the illusion of improved earnings per share, buy just reducing the denominator of having fewer shares through financial engineering, there has been an enormous amount of this over the last years of this. There have been 2,5 trillion share buybacks, there have been very large companies using hundreds of millions to buy back their own shares, because they do not know how to unleash the innovation capacity inside their own organization.

It is not that reengineering your company, doing entrepreneurship at scale is so hard, but very few leaders have really tried it and they do not have a model, so they revert to the things they already know how to do. Let me do a deal, let me do some financial reengineering, let me take some cost out, ... those things will take you so far. But most organizations have run out of road there, there is not much more else you can do and this is why ultimately I am optimistic, because I do believe that there are these pressures and we will try to avoid them as long as we can, but kind of ultimately, human beings are pretty good. When we finally have to, we will invent something better. We will do that, I have no doubt.

*There is this new generation coming to work, they are pressuring the system.*

The other thing that is very exciting is, we now have new tools. If you go back even a decade, certainly more than that, there was no way of bringing large numbers of people together to solve complex problems. Now you can do that thanks to all those new collaborative tools. Think about how amazing this is, the group of researchers in the Atlas project, 5000 people worked on it, there are more than 5000 names on the paper, you simply could not have done that 10 years ago.

All across science, whether it is the human genome project, or the human brain project, you now see people coming together at scale solving these super complicated problems, we now have the tools to do this inside organizations, across organizations, so I am super optimistic that this will happen.

It is going to happen.

## Final Thoughts

NVL: It is not a question, if this is going to happen but rather the question of when you as a leader are going to start this transformation, and hopefully after reading your book, or listening to this podcast, the answer will be: tomorrow!

TH: It is an amazing talk which we could just prolong with a couple of hours or another episode. It is great stuff. This is off course also a talent to bring this story line over and to bring over the why like you do it.

GH: I have the honor of working with lots of renegades around the world. It is not my thinking, it is many many people I talk to, you guys (at Hifluence), are at the forefront of that, you are doing it for real in the organizations you work with and influence! In the end this is one of our challenges; to free the human spirit at work to create this kind of organization.

Here we are in the middle of the pandemic, what you have seen here is that the large hierarchical organizations, our health care organizations are government bureaucracies have struggled, I do not blame them, you cannot, when you have a problem that is very complex and moving very fast, there is just no way that bureaucracy works, one of the Italian health care leaders said the virus moves faster than our bureaucracy and that is with anything else too.

What you have seen in this terrible pandemic, you have seen ordinary people improvising, creating networks of nurses, physicians, learning, sharing best practices, bringing data together, improving protocols, as terrible as it is, it has been this incredible example of

human resilience and ingenuity. It is not the only challenge we confront. We have climate change, we have ethnic strife, we have cyber security issues, mass economic migration, and so on, no longer can we afford to waste any human capacity.

*As a species what we have to figure out is how to leave the old models behind us, how to unleash all this latent capability in our organizations!*

# The Hifluence Unbossing Podcasts

This podcast is brought to you by Hifluence and is part of a series of unbossing podcasts.

**Hifluence** is a pioneer in unbossing organisations worldwide. It is our mission to inspire, guide and support leaders in shaping human-centred organisations. We focus on those who believe in customer obsession and the infinite potential of engaged employees, but do not know yet how to approach such a journey, where to start or how to scale.

## About our podcast guest:

*Gary Hamel* is on the faculty of the London Business School and is a cofounder of the Management Lab, an organization that builds technology and tools to support breakthrough management innovation. Hailed by the Wall Street Journal as the world's most influential business thinker, Professor Hamel's shares his thoughts on innovation, scaling creativity and so much more.

His latest book *Humanocracy*, which he wrote together with Michele Zanini, deals about creating the organizations as amazing as the people inside of them. This was the main source of inspiration for this podcast. We want to thank Gary for his insights and for having made the time to inspire us!

## About our podcast hosts:

*Nick Van Langendonck* is a force of nature when it comes to inspiring and motivating leaders, teams and organizations. the founder of Hifluence, a consultancy firm specialized in unbossing organizations and liberating potential. He is also co-founder of Pebble, an incubator and investor for unbossed SME's. He is also a guest lecturer at the University of Antwerp and Antwerp Management School. (nick.vanlangendonck@hifluence.eu)

*Thomas Hubbuch* looks back at a successful career of 14 years as CEO of Sucre Tirlemont, Thomas achieved outstanding performance together with his team of 1000 people: development of an international sales success with Belgian sugar specialities and the creation of the world's most technically advanced bio-ethanol refinery. Sucre Tirelemont was voted Belgian's company with the best reputation! Liberating the full potential of his teams was the major ingredient of all these successes. This made Thomas a dedicated Unbossing, joining the Influence movement as a partner with all his mind and heart! (thomas.hubbuch@hifluence.eu)

© All rights reserved