

ACN VIEWPOINTS

Artificial intelligence and the board: what audit committees need to know

August 2025



As artificial intelligence (AI) reshapes the business landscape, audit committees must develop a degree of AI fluency to keep pace with evolving risks and opportunities. From generative tools to predictive analytics, AI offers a broad range of capabilities, but not all are equally suited to every business. Organizations must strategically select tools that align with their goals, capabilities, and infrastructure. Boards play a critical role in ensuring that AI is implemented responsibly and strategically, with an eye toward long-term value.

From March to June 2025, Tapestry Networks convened six in-person meetings of its US audit committee networks, bringing together audit committee chairs of large public companies to discuss AI. Multiple guests—including executives, academics, and technical experts—offered their insights during the meetings.

For a list of reflection questions for audit committees, see page 10. For a list of participating audit chairs, see Appendix 1 (page 12), and for a list of guests and their biographies, see Appendix 2 (page 16).

This *ViewPoints*¹ covers key themes that emerged from the meetings and related conversations:

[Technology tools deliver the most value when aligned with business strategy](#)

[Rapid change prompts deeper board engagement across functions](#)

[Oversight responsibilities are shifting as governance policies evolve](#)

[Audit committees are encouraging curiosity and exploring how to support innovation](#)

Technology tools deliver the most value when aligned with business strategy

Companies are increasingly integrating AI into core business processes, though they are at different stages of their AI journey. *“It’s happening in pockets; we are not far away from it being the standard way of working,”* said Stacey Stewart, chief information officer at Dexcom. Some companies are deploying AI agents across workflows, while others are just beginning to explore potential applications. While most current efforts focus on operational improvements, audit chairs noted that broader strategic implications—around governance, risk, and value—are beginning to surface.

AI is already part of the business landscape

AI has been around since 1955, when it was first imagined as machines replicating human thought. It has progressed from rule-based systems to machine learning. Today, companies are entering a new phase: small-language models that can run on personal devices and large reasoning models that begin to form “world models”—systems that infer how the world works by identifying patterns in language, much like humans do.

During this early transition period, the key question is not where AI *can* be applied, but rather where and why it *should* be applied, especially when not every task or function is ripe for automation.

Audit chairs discussed several key steps to oversee successful implementation:

- **Identify a problem space.** Andy Quick, chief AI officer at Entergy, emphasized the importance of defining the right “problem space”—a challenge or opportunity where AI can create real value. This sentiment was echoed by Harald Schneider, global chief data and analytics officer at Equifax, who advised members to *“start with a business problem that’s worth solving.”* For many companies, operations is an area of significant potential. *“There is significant potential for AI to automate time consuming, manual processes. For example, any process that has to do with document processing is a rich opportunity for AI—extracting information, classifying it, summarizing, etcetera,”* Mr. Schneider explained. As organizations gain confidence with early use cases, they’re increasingly expanding into new areas such as customer-facing uses cases to enhance customer experience.
- **Understand the types of AI capabilities available today.** AI is not a single tool but rather a suite of technologies that businesses can apply across a range of needs. Steve Weber, partner at Breakwater Strategy, outlined four categories of AI applications that companies are exploring:
 - **Foundation model-powered software as a service:** prebuilt software products, like Microsoft Copilot or Salesforce Einstein, that embed AI into

commonly used tools for productivity, analytics, and communication

- **Agent-driven automation:** intelligent agents that can perform multistep tasks on behalf of users, such as pulling data, scheduling actions, or interacting across platforms
- **Sentiment analysis and communication:** tools that can assess tone, intent, or emotional signal in language—used for customer feedback or employee engagement
- **Digital twins:** AI-generated models that replicate real-world systems (like supply chains or manufacturing processes) to test scenarios and optimize performance for simulation and experimentation

Mr. Quick noted that real value often comes from layering these tools around a clearly defined business need. *“The best application of AI is when you apply multiple digital tools to solve a problem,”* he said. Mr. Schneider agreed that no single use case dominates AI value creation: *“There is not one perfect use case, but it’s the combination of deterministic analytics, traditional predictive analytic and Generative AI that ultimately creates a big impact. The key is to work backwards from real business problems using available data and a combination of these analytical tools. Ideally there are tools and analytical platforms that allow data scientists to do this work in a repeatable, reliable, and scalable fashion.”*

- **Weigh the trade-offs between off-the-shelf and custom-built solutions.** Companies should conduct a cost-benefit analysis to decide whether to build or buy. While off-the-shelf tools may offer speed and simplicity, many fall short on reliability or integration. *“A lot of people are selling solutions that just aren’t 100% there,”* Mr. Quick cautioned. For some, building in-house is the right solution. *“We leverage the same Box solutions we provide to our customers,”* noted Olivia Nottebohm, chief operating officer at Box, who cited applications across editing, workforce optimization, supply-chain analysis, and computer vision. Data privacy is often a driving factor. *“We established an internal cloud tenant due to data security concerns,”* said Dominic Keller, vice president of IT at Transocean. While custom tools reduce data leakage risk, they do require high-quality data and consistent governance across the organization.
- **Establish disciplined data practices.** In a December 2024 EY survey,² 83% of senior leaders said AI adoption would accelerate with stronger data infrastructure, and 67% reported that weak data foundations are actively holding back the business. As Mr. Quick told members, *“It’s all about data. Good data is key to a successful AI application.”* However, boards continue to have concerns about both the collection and quality of data. *“I don’t believe that anyone has their data together,”* one audit chair noted. The discussions highlighted four principles to follow in establishing good

data practices:

- **Put governance first.** *“Having a governance program around data is paramount,”* said Hari Jayaram, chief information officer at Applied Materials. Data governance allows companies to have appropriate oversight and may also provide a competitive advantage: *“Companies that have strong data governance are able to realize opportunities more quickly,”* Ms. Nottebohm said.
- **Tend to unstructured data.** Even today, companies hold a significant amount of data that is difficult to work with. *“There is real return on investment in having a data strategy,”* Ms. Nottebohm noted. *“With AI, companies can access the value of their unstructured data, which makes up 90% of most companies’ content. Previously this was much more difficult. AI plus unstructured data represents a transformational moment in the industry.”*
- **Limit access.** Companies should limit which employees have access to enterprise data. *“It’s important to implement a clear strategy for who has access to what,”* said Ms. Nottebohm. Mr. Keller shared the strategy at Transocean: *“The dataset used is the one in our internal systems. We don’t allow anybody to update it or change it.”* Similarly, AI tools should be granted access only to the data they need to perform a specific task. *“AI is like an intern; you’re not going to give an intern all your data,”* an audit chair said. *“We need to apply our own judgment as to what information we want to give it.”*
- **Educate employees.** Companies must not assume that employees understand the risks of improper data handling. *“Sometimes the challenge is generational,”* noted Chris Hoofnagle, faculty director at the Berkeley Center for Law & Technology. *“As this new workforce comes in, they are accustomed to sharing all sorts of info; it doesn’t occur to them that they shouldn’t be copying and pasting company information into ChatGPT.”* He urged members to invest in education and training: *“Companies need to ask themselves, How do you train people to make sure they understand the damage that could be done to the enterprise? There should be a commitment to teaching employees how to properly use data and the related AI tools.”*

AI is an accelerator tool for audit committee members

Audit chairs shared a range of personal and organizational experiences with AI. While most members said that their audit committees have not formally adopted AI, many are using it individually to streamline routine tasks.

"I use it to take meeting minutes and summarize them," one member said. "I used to get the drafts of the minutes weeks after, and now I get it 10 minutes after." Others are applying it to document analysis, meeting prep, or internal operations. Still, not everyone is comfortable introducing AI into sensitive board settings: *"We don't want the recordings to get leaked,"* one audit chair said.

Rapid change prompts deeper board engagement across functions

AI is moving quickly from experimentation to enterprise-wide impact, forcing boards to engage with its broader implications. *"Everyone in the company is getting familiar with it; it's not just technology people,"* one audit chair observed.

Members discussed a few key themes emerging from this shift:

- The right guardrails are essential to managing risks.** When it comes to AI, audit chairs have been concerned with several risks: bias, fairness, data quality, and privacy. In recent discussions with members, Mr. Weber said that these risks *"have lessened, but issues still exist."* Ms. Stewart mentioned the growing cybersecurity threat: *"We also need to be aware of the threat from the nefarious actors out there that are also leveraging AI technologies,"* she told members. In response, audit committee members are focused on setting effective guardrails. *"In my boards, most of the conversations about AI are around putting guardrails in place,"* said one audit chair. Mr. Quick added that *"there are unique risks associated with GenAI that need a different set of oversight and control,"* and he urged boards to assess whether their governance structures are equipped to address them. Risk mitigation strategies include employee training, board-management alignment, and technical testing (such as penetration tests). *"Risk should be assessed on a regular basis,"* Mr. Jayaram advised. *"Because AI is moving at such a high speed, you need to move with it."*
- Boards see potential not just to automate but also to explore completely new opportunities.** As boards weigh new risks, many see AI as an enabler of productivity, creativity, and competitive advantage. *"We are mainly seeing*

READ MORE »

North American and
European Audit
Committee
Leadership Networks
**ViewPoints: AI in
2024: Insights from
Leading Audit
Committee Chairs**

productivity enhancements, but we want to go beyond that,” one audit chair observed. “How are we going to use AI to drive our top line and our revenue?” Another said, “We have to think about growth and revenue-generating activities—how can AI drive the business?” Mike Hogan, chief information officer at Pennymac, encouraged companies to “be imaginative and think about different ways of doing work.” For those willing to experiment, AI is already delivering value. Mr. Weber suggested differentiating between using AI to exploit and to explore. “Both are important,” he said. “You can exploit AI to automate existing tasks, but it is also becoming very good at exploring new ideas.”

- **Workforce strategies are evolving to meet new needs.** Rather than merely eliminating jobs or job categories wholesale, companies are upskilling current employees or hiring new talent. Ms. Stewart emphasized that *“AI can boost efficiency, but it can’t replace the people who understand how the business truly runs.”* New roles are also emerging, including supervisors of AI agents and data curators. *“We had to put new roles in to make sure we had confidence in what we were building and how it was being rolled out,”* one audit chair said. *“It was not a reduction in force; rather, we brought in new skills and new talent.”* Mr. Schneider emphasized the need for people who can learn quickly and continuously given the unprecedented speed at which AI has been evolving: *“When I recruit, it’s important for me to ensure that the candidate is a continuous learner and inherently curious”* As Mr. Weber put it, *“The machine may not be coming to take your job, but someone who is really good at using AI will.”*
- **Companies are preparing for regulatory shifts.** The regulatory landscape for AI remains fragmented, especially in the US. While the EU AI Act³ appears to be advancing toward implementation, the US continues to rely on existing laws and agency oversight. One member noted that some US-based companies are choosing to align with EU standards for now, anticipating future global harmonization. For example, Ms. Stewart said that Dexcom had launched “Dexcom AI University” to upskill the workforce while also meeting EU training and documentation requirements. Meanwhile, state and local legislatures in the US are advancing their own AI rules. The revocation of Executive Order 14110 (Safe, Secure, and Trustworthy Development and Use of Artificial Intelligence)⁴ in January marked a significant change in federal direction, and the White House’s February request for input on a new “AI Action Plan”⁵ may signal the early stages of a more coordinated national strategy. As one audit chair noted, with so many moving parts, *“the best way to be ready may just be to act as if the regulation is already here.”*

Oversight responsibilities are shifting as governance policies evolve

Companies are experimenting with different AI oversight models and developing policies

that enable responsible use of AI without holding back innovation. Across Tapestry sessions, participants discussed how AI is reshaping expectations for audit committees and prompting shifts in board structure, skills, and governance:

- AI requires active and informed human oversight.** Members said that while AI can support decision-making, it is not a substitute for human judgment. *“I use it as CliffsNotes,”* one audit chair said. *“It just directionally tells me where I need to go.”* Another cautioned, *“You shouldn’t trust AI yet because it can get things wrong.”* Each discussion included an emphasis on the importance of keeping a human in the loop. Mr. Hogan underscored this point: *“The human is the thing that’s still protecting us from letting AI give wrong answers; it’s still incumbent on the user to look the results over.”* Ms. Nottebohm reinforced this concept by adding, *“You still need an experienced person looking at and checking the outputs.”* But not just any human will do. Effective oversight requires a degree of technological literacy. As one member noted, *“We want directors to stay in learning mode.”* To bridge the technology gap, some boards are incorporating technical expertise in their governance structure. *“One of my boards put in place an IT committee chaired by somebody who knows a lot about IT,”* one member said. *“From a governance perspective, it has been tremendous; it has improved the board’s ability to grapple with those issues.”* Having the right expertise in the right role is of paramount importance.
- It’s important to start with clear policies, even if they’re not perfect.** Members agreed that strong policy is essential for responsible AI use, but perfection shouldn’t delay progress. One member cautioned against over-engineering: *“There are so many risks that it’s easy to get stuck trying to create the perfect solution. But it’s better to put a few basics in place, get everyone started, and make sure they understand what they’re doing. The key is to have a clear, sensible policy—and recognize that it will need to evolve over time.”* Mr. Jayaram reinforced the importance of clarity and consistency: *“Policy is critical. We state our AI policy for every single meeting, whether it be internal or with a supplier.”*
- Oversight can extend beyond the audit committee.** Mr. Jayaram emphasized that there’s no one-size-fits-all approach to oversight: *“Each company will have different processes, but establishing the body of governance and deciding how it will report back is important. It needs to be top down to be successful.”* One member emphasized the need to experiment and stay flexible: *“We are experimenting on*

Does your board have the right expertise?

As technology becomes more embedded in the business, boards are reevaluating whether they have the right mix of skills. Some are forming tech committees or bringing in external advisers; others are investing in targeted director education. *“You don’t need to be an engineer,”* one chair said, *“but you do need to be able to ask the right questions.”*

where we put enterprise risk management. We are moving it into the governance committee; the audit committee will keep certain risks while others will be shifted.” As AI becomes increasingly embedded, audit committees are reconsidering oversight because of skills gaps and overloaded audit committee agendas. “If you think about all the other responsibilities that audit committees have, when we are dealing with issues of this complexity that are potentially existential, it strikes me that the audit committee is totally inadequate,” one member said. Some companies have shifted AI oversight to committees with relevant expertise. “I realized I was not qualified to judge AI—and neither was anyone else on our audit committee,” one audit chair admitted. “So we moved oversight into our tech committee, which includes two CIOs. We made that decision because we felt like we needed to have people with experience.”

- **Boards add value by asking the right questions.** Meaningful, ongoing dialogue between directors and technology leaders is critical. Mr. Weber encouraged directors to be proactive in these conversations: “Ask your leadership, ‘Are we going fast enough? What are the risks?’” He also encouraged audit chairs to stay informed about what the company is doing: “They should tell you what they’re doing on the automation side versus the innovation side; you can ask to see a demo.” Boards should keep pushing for clarity on where the company is gaining efficiencies and where AI might unlock new opportunities.

AI and external audit

Audit firms, including EY, have been integrating AI tools into audits. These include code readers, disclosure checklists, policy search tools, and risk benchmarking systems. Firms are increasingly leveraging internal models to analyze client data for anomalies, accelerate testing, and identify targeted risks.

Audit-related AI tools are trained exclusively on internal data and operate within controlled environments. EY noted that it uses internal systems and a prompt-management tool to safeguard how staff interacts with models and queries.

Audit committees can engage with their auditors about AI by asking these questions:

- How is AI used in our audit?
- What productivity or quality gains are expected, and how are they measured?
- How is our company data being protected?
- How does AI change the way risks are identified or addressed in the audit?

Audit committees are encouraging curiosity and exploring how to support innovation

AI may seem novel now, but as Mr. Hogan told members, it will soon become *“ubiquitous, a tool for everyone to use.”* That makes this a critical moment for companies not only to establish governance structures and choose tools wisely but also to build capacities to test and learn responsibly.

Guests discussed the future of AI and shared key insights on how companies can stay ahead of the curve:

- **Create space for experimentation.**

Guardrails are essential, but too many can hinder progress. *“You put controls in, but in some industries, it just stifles opportunity,”* one member said. Companies should foster safe environments where employees can explore AI’s potential. Ms. Stewart noted that her company encourages staff to propose use cases in ideation sessions: *“At this stage, we’re focused on evaluating the appropriateness and potential impact of the ideas—the use case matters, and so do the technical details—we’re just prioritizing value and relevance first.”* Mr. Hogan echoed the idea, adding that projects are also assessed based on whether they are revenue-producing. Although experimentation carries risk, it remains essential to growth. Boards should ensure management strikes the right balance with safety nets, such as updated crisis-response plans and open lines of ongoing communication.

- **Think about new roles.** Mr. Weber encouraged members to consider new structures for managing AI-related risk, especially emerging, less-defined risks that fall outside traditional oversight. *“An individual focused on emerging risks that sits in an office separate from the chief risk officer, with their own budget and freedom to experiment, may be useful.”* According to this model, the individual should be able to distill complex risks into plain language and communicate clearly with management on what matters and why. If a permanent role isn’t feasible, companies should experiment with provisional structures to begin closing this gap.

- **Start now.** Whatever companies decide to do, they should start working on it now. *“It’s really important to figure this stuff out now that it’s early days and it’s simple,”* one member noted. Mr. Weber observed that as the gap between technological

What’s next: robotics and humanoids

AI continues to make inroads into the physical world through robotics and embodied systems. Kevin Lynch, professor of mechanical engineering and director of the Center for Robotics and Biosystems at Northwestern University, told members that touch and movement will drive the next leap in machine learning: *“Dexterity is intelligence. Twenty years ago, drones were a lab experiment; in 10 years, dexterous robots may be a business tool anyone can deploy.”* He added that humanoid robots are attracting serious levels of investment as they combine language models with sensory input and physical dexterity.

potential and actual business adoption expands, customer expectations will also shift. *“Companies need to assess what their risk tolerance to close that gap is; it will become a key source of who rises and who stagnates.”* He warned that companies that lag in technology must act quickly to narrow the gap. Mr. Hogan echoed that sentiment: *“You must use these tools; otherwise, you are putting the company at a disadvantage.”*

Reflection questions for audit committees

- ? How does your company currently use AI? Which business functions are implementing AI tools? Which use cases have delivered the most value so far?
- ? Who is responsible for AI oversight in your company? What about at the board level? What role does the audit committee play in overseeing AI?
- ? What steps is your company taking to ensure data quality, privacy, and governance as AI adoption grows? Are internal data-governance programs in place? How is unstructured data being addressed?
- ? How are audit committee agendas evolving with AI? Is AI a standing topic?
- ? How are your board and committees staying informed about AI developments? What steps are being taken to build AI fluency at the board level (e.g., training, advisory support)?
- ? How are your external auditors using AI in their work? What new AI-related tools are they introducing, and how is your company managing the associated data risks?
- ? How is your company preparing for the evolving regulatory landscape around AI?
- ? What are the biggest risks your company sees with AI adoption, and how are they being mitigated? Where do they sit in the broader risk framework?
- ? What oversight mechanisms exist for reviewing and approving AI use cases? Is there a formal governance body or review process for new AI applications?
- ? How is your board thinking about emerging AI-related roles and talent needs?
- ? Is your company creating space for safe experimentation with AI? How are you balancing innovation with control?

About this document

The Audit Committee Networks are a group of audit committee chairs drawn from leading North American companies committed to improving the performance of audit committees and enhancing trust in financial markets. The network is organized and led by Tapestry Networks with the support of EY as part of its continuing commitment to board effectiveness and good governance.

ViewPoints is produced by Tapestry Networks to stimulate timely, substantive board discussions about the choices confronting audit committee members, management, and their advisers as they endeavor to fulfill their respective responsibilities to the investing public. The ultimate value of *ViewPoints* lies in its power to help all constituencies develop their own informed points of view on these important issues. Those who receive *ViewPoints* are encouraged to share it with others in their own networks. The more board members, members of management, and advisers who become systematically engaged in this dialogue, the more value will be created for all.

The perspectives presented in this document are the sole responsibility of Tapestry Networks and do not necessarily reflect the views of network members or participants, their affiliated organizations, or EY. Please consult your counselors for specific advice. EY refers to the global organization and may refer to one or more of the member firms of Ernst & Young Global Limited, each of which is a separate legal entity. Ernst & Young Global Limited, a UK company limited by guarantee, does not provide services to clients. Tapestry Networks and EY are independently owned and controlled organizations. This material is prepared and copyrighted by Tapestry Networks with all rights reserved. It may be reproduced and redistributed, but only in its entirety, including all copyright and trademark legends. Tapestry Networks and the associated logos are trademarks of Tapestry Networks, Inc., and EY and the associated logos are trademarks of EYGM Ltd.

Appendix 1: Participants

Southeast Audit Committee Network—March 11, 2025

The following members participated in all or part of the meeting:

Art Beattie, PPL Corporation
John Black, Entergy
Theo Bunting, Nisource
Denise Dickins, Watsco
Ward Dickson, Avery Dennison
Glenn Eisenberg, Solventum
Juan Figuereo, Deckers Outdoor and Western Alliance Bancorp
Tom Hough, Equifax
Joe Householder, Advanced Micro Devices
Janet Kennedy, Canadian Pacific Kansas City
Karole Lloyd, Aflac and Churchill Downs
Rich Macchia, Corpay
Maureen Morrison, Asbury Automotive Group and ePlus
Maria Pinelli, International Game Technology
Mimi Thigpen, Globe Life
Carol Yancey, BlueLinx Holdings
Bryan Yokley, Rayonier Advanced Materials

EY was represented by the following:

Kevin Bower, US-Central Region Audit Leader
Cigdem Oktem, Americas Center for Board Matters
Dave Sewell, US-Central Assurance Managing Partner, Ernst & Young LLP

Tapestry Networks was represented by the following:

Kate Cady, Project and Event Manager Team Leader
Ginevra Rollo, Associate
Todd Schwartz, Executive Director
Jason Watkins, Managing Director

West Audit Committee Network-South—March 26, 2025

The following members participated in all or part of the meeting:

Traci Dolan, Steel Dynamics
Mark Foletta, Dexcom and Enanta Pharmaceuticals
Leslie Heisz, Edwards Lifesciences
Ginnie Henkels, LCI Industries

Leon Janks, PriceSmart
Pat Kinsella, Pennymac Financial
Diana Laing, Host Hotels & Resorts
Tim Leyden, Itron
Jeanne McGovern, Huntsman
Kristy Pipes, AECOM and Public Storage
Steve Pizula, Monster Beverage
Dick Poladian, Occidental Petroleum
Les Sussman, East West Bancorp

EY was represented by the following:

Brian Gauer, Partner
Jennifer Lee, Managing Director, Americas Center for Board Matters

Tapestry Networks was represented by the following:

Beverley Bahlmann, Executive Director
Kate Cady, Project and Event Manager Team Leader
Ginevra Rollo, Associate
Jason Watkins, Managing Director

East Audit Committee Network—April 1, 2025

The following members participated in all or part of the meeting:

Bert Alfonso, Eastman Chemical Company
C. E. Andrews, Marriott Vacations Worldwide
Mary Ann Cloyd, Fresh Del Monte Produce
Marie Gallagher, Smithfield Foods
Art Garcia, American Electric Power Company
Diane Nordin, Principal Financial Group
Debra Perry, Korn Ferry
Sandra Rowland, Amentum
Judy Schmeling, Constellation Brands
Helen Shan, EPAM Systems
Sandra Wijnberg, ADP and Cognizant
Gina Wilson, Charles River Laboratories

EY was represented by the following:

Alysia Steinmann, Metro New York Office Managing Partner

Tapestry Networks was represented by the following:

Beverley Bahlmann, Executive Director
Ginevra Rollo, Associate

Ashley Vannoy, Project and Event Manager
Jason Watkins, Managing Director

Southwest Audit Committee Network—May 20, 2025

The following members participated in all or part of the meeting:

Lee Canaan, EQT
Vanessa Chang, Transocean
Donna Epps, Texas Pacific Land Corporation and Texas Roadhouse
Teri Fontenot, AMN Healthcare Services
Sue Gove, RealTruck
Lou Grabowsky, Griffon Corp
Don Kendall, Talos Energy
Debbie Kissire, Celanese
Cathy Lego, Guidewire Software
Don Robillard, Cheniere and Helmerich & Payne
Laura Wright, TE Connectivity and Spirit AeroSystems Holdings

EY was represented by the following:

Jennifer Lee, Managing Director, Americas Center for Board Matters
Pat Niemann, Partner and Co-Leader, Americas Center for Board Matters

Tapestry Networks was represented by the following:

Beverley Bahlmann, Executive Director
Kate Cady, Project and Event Manager Team Leader
Ginevra Rollo, Associate
Jason Watkins, Managing Director

West Audit Committee Network-North—May 28, 2025

The following members participated in all or part of the meeting:

Raman Chitkara, SiTime
Ken Goldman, GoPro
Laurie Hodrick, Roku
Bala Iyer, Power Integrations
Becky Jacoby, S&P Global
Jack Lazar, GlobalFoundries and Resideo Technologies
Michael Montelongo, Conduent
Karen Rogge, GigCapital7
Janice Sears, Sonder Holdings
Nina Tran, American Asset Trust and CoreCivic

EY was represented by the following:

Chris Anger, US-West Assurance Managing Partner

Josh Mock, Partner

Mark Secker, Partner

Tapestry Networks was represented by the following:

Kate Cady, Project and Event Manager Team Leader

Ginevra Rollo, Associate

Todd Schwartz, Executive Director

Jason Watkins, Managing Director

Central Audit Committee Network—June 11, 2025

The following members participated in all or part of the meeting:

Kapila Anand, Elanco Animal Health

Marla Gottschalk, Reynolds Consumer Products and US Foods

Anders Gustafsson, International Paper

Mike Hanley, BorgWarner

Sandy Helton, Optinose

Frank Jaehnert, Nordson

Ginger Jones, Nordson and Tronox Holdings

Blythe McGarvie, Sonoco

Niharika Ramdev, Silgan Holdings

Derrick Roman, CommScope and WEX

EY was represented by the following:

Jennifer Lee, Managing Director, Americas Center for Board Matters

Kevin Brower, US-Central Region Audit Leader

Tapestry Networks was represented by the following:

Joel Ang, Senior Associate

Beverley Bahlmann, Executive Director

Kate Cady, Project and Event Manager Team Leader

Ginevra Rollo, Associate

Jason Watkins, Managing Director

Appendix 2: Guest biographies

Mike Hogan is senior managing director and chief information officer of Pennymac Financial Services, Inc., responsible for the overall vision and leadership of technology initiatives across the enterprise. Mr. Hogan joined Pennymac in 2020 and has served on the company's management team since then, previously as managing director of capital markets and technology. Previously, he was the company's managing director of capital markets technology.

Prior to joining the company, he led technology teams at Bank of America and Countrywide Financial in secondary marketing, data management, corporate accounting, and mortgage servicing. He also spent time as a senior consultant for Microsoft, helping clients develop and implement custom-built software solutions.

Mr. Hogan earned a Bachelor of Science in electrical engineering from Rice University.

Chris Hoofnagle is professor of law in residence at UC Berkeley, where he teaches torts, cybersecurity, consumer protection, and python programming. In addition, Mr. Hoofnagle is of counsel at Gunderson Dettmer and an elected member of the American Law Institute.

In Spring 2024, he served as visiting senior research fellow in the department of war studies at King's College London and visiting researcher at Palantir Technologies.

Mr. Hoofnagle earned his Juris Doctor from the University of Georgia School of Law. He holds a Bachelor of Arts, cum laude, from the University of Georgia.

Hari Jayaram is corporate vice president and chief information officer for Applied Materials, Inc. He drives technical change and delivers the company's digital roadmap while ensuring a safe, scalable, and resilient IT landscape.

With over 30 years in the IT industry, Mr. Jayaram has led transformations in global logistics and high-tech manufacturing and overseen major programs to modernize infrastructure, enhance collaboration, and drive engineering efficiency. Before joining Applied in 2006, he led global infrastructure architecture for DHL Worldwide, delivering strategic programs reaching more than \$250 million.

He was named one of Computerworld's Premier 100 IT leaders in 2015. Mr. Jayaram serves on the board of the Central Texas Food Bank and holds a bachelor's degree in computer science from Bangalore University.

Dominic Keller is vice president of information technology for Transocean, where he is responsible for the strategic direction, development, and implementation of IT initiatives across the company. Over his 22-year tenure at Transocean, Mr. Keller has been instrumental in driving technological innovation and modernizing the company's global IT infrastructure.

He has successfully led transformative projects, including the adoption of cloud computing solutions, the implementation of robust cybersecurity measures, and the development of the company's comprehensive cybersecurity program.

Mr. Keller holds a Bachelor of Science in management information systems from Louisiana State University. He serves as vice chair of the cybersecurity committee for the International Association of

Drilling Contractors and as a member of the InfraGard Maritime Cyber Security Alliance.

Kevin Lynch is professor of mechanical engineering and director of the Center for Robotics and Biosystems at Northwestern University. He also serves as research director of the US National Science Foundation Human Augmentation via Dexterity (HAND) Engineering Research Center.

Dr. Lynch's research focuses on robotic manipulation, locomotion, human-robot systems, and robot swarms. He is editor in chief emeritus of the IEEE Transactions on Robotics, coauthor of three robotics textbooks, and instructor of the Modern Robotics Coursera specialization.

Dr. Lynch earned his BSE in electrical engineering from Princeton University and his PhD in robotics from Carnegie Mellon University.

Olivia Nottebohm is chief operating officer at Box, where she oversees the global go-to-market organization, including marketing, sales, customer success, and GTM partnerships.

Ms. Nottebohm previously held leadership roles at Google, where she led sales and product operations & strategy for the Americas Ads business. She then served as vice president of the SMB business as well as GTM operations for Google Cloud. Most recently, Ms. Nottebohm was Chief Revenue Officer of Notion and she previously served as the COO of Dropbox. Earlier in her career, she was a partner at McKinsey & Company focused on the tech industry.

Ms. Nottebohm is a member of the board of directors of AppFolio (APPF) and Lightmatter. She received a BA in economics from Harvard University and an MBA from Stanford Graduate School of Business.

Andy Quick is vice president and chief AI officer at Entergy, where he leads the company's AI strategy and the development of AI solutions to address major business challenges. He has held leadership roles including vice president of business data & insights and led teams in robotic process automation, business transformation, enterprise architecture, and IT operations.

Prior to Entergy, Mr. Quick was an IT consultant with Andersen Consulting (Accenture). He has also served as an adjunct instructor at Tulane University and the University of New Orleans.

Mr. Quick holds a BS in computer science from Louisiana State University, an MBA from Tulane University, and is a certified Automation Anywhere RPA trainer.

Harald Schneider is chief data and analytics officer at Equifax, where he is responsible for global data innovation, analytics capabilities, and the Equifax Cloud™ data fabric to drive new products and growth.

Mr. Schneider joined Equifax from Visa, where he served as global head of data products. He previously built and launched Tandem Bank in the UK, serving as chief commercial officer and chief analytics officer. Earlier in his career, he held leadership positions at Capital One, Citigroup, and Pardus Capital Management.

Mr. Schneider holds a master's degree in finance from J.W. Goethe-Universität in Frankfurt and an MBA from the University of Iowa Tippie College of Business.

Stacey Stewart is senior vice president and chief information officer for Dexcom, where she leads global information technology strategy and operations. Ms. Stewart brings 30 years of strategic and operational experience across IT management, data engineering, AI, digital, ecommerce, and supply chain.

Prior to Dexcom, she served as senior vice president and CIO at Bausch + Lomb and held roles at Johnson & Johnson, Bristol Myers Squibb, American Standard, and Price Waterhouse Coopers.

She is also a volunteer for Breakthrough T1D. Ms. Stewart holds a bachelor's degree in economics and management information systems from the University of Delaware.

Steve Weber is a partner at Breakwater Strategy, where he brings expertise in strategy, scenario planning, and decision making for organizations navigating complex challenges at the intersection of economics, technology, politics, and regulation. Alongside his advisory work, Dr. Weber has had a thirty-year academic career at the University of California, Berkeley, where he holds joint appointments in the School of Information and the Department of Political Science.

Earlier in his career, he was a senior advisor at Global Business Network and The Monitor Group, helping clients address transitions in information technology, finance, healthcare, and other sectors transformed by digital innovation. Dr. Weber served as director of the Institute of International Studies at UC Berkeley, and in 2015 he founded the Center for Long Term Cybersecurity. His books include *The Success of Open Source* and *Bloc by Bloc: How to Organize a Global Enterprise*.

Dr. Weber earned his PhD in political science from Stanford University.

Endnotes

¹ *ViewPoints* reflects the network's use of a modified version of the Chatham House Rule whereby names of members and their company affiliations are a matter of public record, but comments are not attributed to individuals or corporations. Italicized quotations reflect comments made in connection with the meeting by network members and other meeting participants.

² EY, [*AI Survey Shows Investment Boosts ROI, but Leaders Continue To See Risks*](#) (New York, Ernst & Young, LLP: December 16, 2024).

³ European Union, [*EU Artificial Intelligence Act*](#), July 12, 2024.

⁴ ["Removing Barriers to American Leadership in Artificial Intelligence,"](#) The White House, January 23, 2025.

⁵ ["Public Comment Invited on Artificial Intelligence Action Plan,"](#) The White House, February 25, 2025.