Board Leadership Centre

On the 2025 Board Agenda

KPMG.com/au/blc

Boards can expect their oversight and corporate governance processes to be put to the test in 2025 as companies face unprecedented disruption and uncertainty – ongoing and intensifying wars in Ukraine, the Middle East and Sudan, elevated trade and geopolitical tensions, economic uncertainty, high interest rates, recession risks, technology and business model disruption, elevated cyber security risk, climate risk, domestic polarisation, continuing political gridlock in the US, and more. Advances in artificial intelligence (AI) and heightened regulation globally will continue to add to the challenge.

In this volatile operating environment, demands from investors, regulators, employees, and other stakeholders for greater disclosure and transparency – particularly around the oversight and management of risks to the company's operations and strategy – will continue to intensify. The pressure on management, boards and governance will be significant.

Drawing on insights from our global board leadership centre network, we highlight eight issues to keep in mind as boards consider and carry out their 2025 agendas.

©2025 KPMG, an Australian partnership and a member firm of the KPMG global organisation of independent member firms affiliated with KPMG International Limited, a private English company limited by guarantee. All rights reserved. The KPMG name and logo are trademarks used under license by the independent member firms of the KPMG global organisation.

Liability limited by a scheme approved under Professional Standards Legislation.

01

Maintain focus on how management is addressing the risks and opportunities related to geopolitical and economic shifts and global disruption

The wars in Ukraine, the Middle East and Sudan, continuing US–China and US–Russia tensions, the potential for political and social disruption posed by disinformation and cyberattacks, and elevated geopolitical and trade tensions globally – combined with economic risks including interest rates, market volatility, and the risk of a global slowdown – will continue to drive volatility and uncertainty.

At the same time, the continuing pullback on supply chains is an indicator of a broader pendulum swing that's reshaping the full-throttle globalisation of recent decades. Shifting from the 'cheaper-faster' strategies enabled by highly complex, decentralised supply chains to greater or even hyper-localisation and control of a company's networks (suppliers, services, data/information) is clearly about resilience of the company.

But concerns about the resilience of national economies, and of the global business arena at large, are also driving the momentum toward more centralised and local supply chains.

National industrial and security policies and 'country-first' models are taking centre stage, and de-risking and friendshoring, particularly in strategic sectors like chip technology and critical minerals, are hedges against geopolitical shocks and exposure to arbitrary local rules. As this globalisation reset unfolds, companies will face pressing questions. Is the company prepared to operate in a higher-cost (of capital, green tech/energy, labour) environment? What is the right balance between operating efficiently, maximising growth, and ensuring resilience?

Help management reassess the company's processes for identifying the risks and opportunities posed by this global disruption – and the impact on the company's long-term strategy and related capital allocation decisions. Does management have an effective process to monitor changes in the external environment and provide early warning that adjustments to strategy might be necessary? That includes risk management as well as crisis readiness and business continuity and resilience.

It calls for frequent updating of the company's risk profile and more scenario planning, stress testing strategic assumptions, analysing downside scenarios, considering the interrelationship of risks, and obtaining independent third-party perspectives.

Companies need to think about risk events and how they will impact the company's operations, business model and strategy; however, it is also critical to understand the underlying structural shifts taking place (geopolitical, demographic, technological, economic, climate, global energy transition, societal, etc.) and the longer-term implications.

What is the right balance between operating efficiently, maximising growth, and ensuring resilience?

©2025 KPMG, an Australian partnership and a member firm of the KPMG global organisation of independent member firms affiliated with KPMG International Limited, a private English company limited by guarantee. All rights reserved. The KPMG name and logo are trademarks used under license by the independent member firms of the KPMG global organisation.

Liability limited by a scheme approved under Professional Standards Legislation.

02 Understand the company's gen AI strategy and related risks, and closely monitor the governance structure around the company's deployment and use of the technology

As gen AI moves from market buzz toward business value and large scale rollout, it is critical that boards understand the opportunities and risks posed by the technology, including how gen AI is being used by the company, how it is generating business value, and how the company is managing and mitigating its risks.

The companies that will excel in using gen AI technology at scale understand that it's also a leadership journey. Fundamentally changing what people do every day and how they work will require leadership, as well as skills and know-how to assess the company's processes and workflows and to decide where to deploy gen AI to improve productivity. Successful adoption will also require the refinement of risk management frameworks to mitigate critical risks related to inaccurate data and results, bias and hallucinations, intellectual property, reputation, talent, and compliance with emerging AI legislation and regulation globally.

Given the strategic importance of the technology, gen AI will be a critical priority for boards in 2025. We offer the following suggestions to help boards focus and structure their oversight efforts.

Understand the strategy to develop business value with gen AI and monitor the trajectory of deployment

Boards are seeking to understand what this technology means for the company – including its operations, products and services, business model, and strategy. The board should be satisfied that the C-suite can articulate the primary impact they expect gen AI to have on the company, e.g. new business models, new product or revenue streams, and/or increased operating efficiency. The board should also probe management about the expected impact on the company's revenue and cost over the next one, three, and five years as its customers, competitors, and suppliers roll out gen AI. What revenue is at risk? What new revenue can be generated? What costs will be reduced? What price pressure or opportunity does the company see?

Monitor management's governance structure for the deployment and use of gen AI, including the management and mitigation of gen AI risks

Given the strategic importance of gen AI and the complexities and risks associated with the technology, it is critical that the board focus on management's policies for the development of a governance structure and processes for the deployment and use of gen AI. Key issues/topics to be addressed in management's governance structure include:

- How and when a gen AI system or model (including a third-party model) is to be developed and deployed, and who makes that decision.
- How the company's peers are using the technology.
- How management is mitigating the risks posed by gen AI and ensuring that the use of AI is aligned with the company's values. What AI risk management framework is used, and what is the company's policy on employee use of gen AI?
- How management is monitoring evolving AI legislation in Australia and globally – including Voluntary AI Safety Standards and proposed mandatory guardrails for AI in high-risk settings – and ensuring compliance.
- Whether the organisation has the necessary AI-related talent and resources, including in finance and internal audit.

©2025 KPMG, an Australian partnership and a member firm of the KPMG global organisation of independent member firms affiliated with KPMG International Limited, a private English company limited by guarantee. All rights reserved. The KPMG name and logo are trademarks used under license by the independent member firms of the KPMG global organisation.

Liability limited by a scheme approved under Professional Standards Legislation.

How the company is ensuring the quality and accuracy of gen AI output

Achieving the hoped-for productivity and efficiency improvements with gen AI will depend on the quality of the company's data and how it is processed and stored. Boards need to have insight into how management is ensuring the quality and accuracy of gen AI output and whether the company is making the right investments in IT infrastructure to help ensure data quality.

Assessing board oversight

Many boards are still considering how best to oversee gen AI. For most companies, oversight is largely still at the full board level, where major strategic and/or transformational issues typically should be addressed. However, some board committees, such as the audit committee or a technology or risk committee, may already be involved in overseeing specific gen AI issues.

Oversight structures will likely evolve as gen AI programs evolve. Ultimately, oversight of gen AI, like oversight of sustainability, may touch all or most board committees. Another important question for boards is whether they have the knowledge, access to experts, and ongoing education to effectively oversee the company's use of gen AI.

Boards need to have insight into how management is ensuring the quality and accuracy of gen AI output.

©2025 KPMG, an Australian partnership and a member firm of the KPMG global organisation of independent member firms affiliated with KPMG International Limited, a private English company limited by guarantee. All rights reserved. The KPMG name and logo are trademarks used under license by the independent member firms of the KPMG global organisation.

Liability limited by a scheme approved under Professional Standards Legislation.

Probe whether the company's data governance and cyber security governance frameworks and processes are keeping pace with the growth and sophistication of data-related risks

The explosive growth in the use of gen AI is also prompting more rigorous assessments of data governance frameworks and processes more generally, as well as the steps being taken to help ensure that management's cyber security risk management practices are keeping pace with increasingly sophisticated cyber threats enabled by gen AI. This is a significant undertaking requiring board attention. Three key areas of board focus are:

1. The adequacy of the company's data governance framework and processes

While companies typically develop their data governance framework based on their industry and company-specific facts and circumstances, there are a number of data governance frameworks that they might consider.

The frameworks vary in many respects, but generally focus on data quality, data privacy and security, data stewardship, and data management.

Data governance includes compliance with industry-specific privacy laws and regulations, as well as privacy laws and regulations that govern how personal data – from customers, employees, or vendors– is processed, stored, collected, and used.

Data governance also includes policies and protocols regarding data ethics – in particular, managing the tension between how the company may use customer data in a legally permissible way and customer expectations as to how their data will be used. Managing this tension poses significant reputation and trust risks for companies and represents a critical challenge for leadership. In its oversight of data governance, the board should insist on a robust data governance framework that:

- makes clear what data is being collected; how it is stored, managed, and used; and who makes decisions regarding these issues
- identifies which business leaders are responsible for data governance across the enterprise, including the roles of the chief information officer, chief information security officer, and chief compliance officer.

2. How management is enhancing cyber security risk management processes to address AI risks

Many companies and their boards have devoted substantial time and resources to understanding cyber security risk, and making sure the company has the right governance, technology, and leadership in place to manage and mitigate cyber security risk. However, with gen AI developments, the risk of data breaches and malware attacks continues to mount, with gen AI enabling cybercriminals to scale their attacks in terms of speed, volume, variety, and sophistication. Boards should be sharpening their focus on the company's cyber security posture, including:

- periodically reviewing management's cyber security risk assessment
- taking a hard look at supply chain and third-party risks
- insisting on a cyber security scorecard (e.g. volume, nature, and materiality of attacks)
- understanding and periodically reassessing the company's cyber incident response plan.

3. Structuring board oversight of cyber security and data governance

For many companies, much of the board's oversight responsibility for cyber security and data governance has resided with the audit committee. Many audit committees also have significant oversight responsibilities for legal/ regulatory compliance, which includes compliance with evolving data privacy and AI-specific laws and regulations globally.

Given the audit committee's heavy agenda, it may be helpful to have another board committee monitor and do the heavy lifting related to cyber security and data governance.

©2025 KPMG, an Australian partnership and a member firm of the KPMG global organisation of independent member firms affiliated with KPMG International Limited, a private English company limited by guarantee. All rights reserved. The KPMG name and logo are trademarks used under license by the independent member firms of the KPMG global organisation.

Liability limited by a scheme approved under Professional Standards Legislation.

04 Keep environmental and social issues embedded in risk and strategy discussions, and monitor preparations for new reporting requirements

How companies address climate change, human capital management (HCM), diversity, and other ESG issues continues to be viewed by many investors, research and ratings firms, activists, employees, customers and regulators, as fundamental to the business and critical to long-term value creation. However, the pushback against ESG – including the backlash against green policies and climate disclosures in the US, Europe and Australia – as well as energy industry concerns about the costs associated with a rapid shift from oil and gas to renewable energy, has caused many companies to reassess their ESG initiatives.

In this environment, several fundamental questions should be front and centre in boardroom conversations about climate and ESG:

- Which ESG issues are material or of strategic significance to the company? The ESG issues of importance will vary by company and industry. For some, it skews toward environmental, climate change, and emission of greenhouse gases (GHG); others may emphasise diversity and social issues.
- How is the company addressing ESG issues strategically and embedding them into core business activities (strategy, operations, risk management, incentives, and corporate culture) to drive long-term performance? Is there a clear commitment with strong leadership from the top, and enterprise-wide buy-in?
- In internal and external communications, does the company explain why ESG issues are materially or strategically important? If the company is no longer using the term 'ESG', does the terminology used (e.g. 'sustainability') clearly convey the company's priorities in this area?

In the case of diversity initiatives, many companies are taking steps to minimise legal risk while also maintaining their commitment to workforce diversity. Companies should anticipate that claims of 'reverse discrimination' may be alleged, with plaintiffs arguing that the diversity initiatives are biased and unfair. Legal counsel should review the company's diversity initiatives, including related plans, processes, and communications, to ensure that the initiatives are consistent with all legal requirements and promote opportunity for all.

Management's efforts to prepare for new reporting and assurance initiatives that will dramatically increase climate and sustainability disclosure requirements for companies in the coming years will be an important area of board focus and oversight. We have seen many companies restate some of their ESG metrics and anticipate some modified assurance opinions in the first round of CSRD reporting due to a lack of available evidence to support the disclosures. This may impact the way investors vote at the AGM, so boards should be prepared to articulate their position and manage the risk of any votes against the reappointment of directors.

©2025 KPMG, an Australian partnership and a member firm of the KPMG global organisation of independent member firms affiliated with KPMG International Limited, a private English company limited by guarantee. All rights reserved. The KPMG name and logo are trademarks used under license by the independent member firms of the KPMG global organisation.

Liability limited by a scheme approved under Professional Standards Legislation.

CEO succession and talent development

Few board responsibilities are more important than hiring and replacing the CEO – a reality that continues to generate media attention, particularly if the board is caught flat-footed. A key question for the board is whether its CEO succession planning process is keeping pace and evolving to identify the CEO skills, traits, characteristics, and experiences necessary to drive the development and execution of the company's long-term strategy and position the company for the future.

In our recent conversations with directors, they have emphasised the importance of devoting significant time and attention to identifying 'what' the company needs in a future CEO before addressing the 'who'. The board should develop a list of the top six or eight (but probably no more than ten) skills, traits, characteristics and experience needed in a new CEO.

Identifying the 'what' is a complex and time-consuming process. What will be the impact of new technologies, such as gen AI, on the business and strategy? Will navigating geopolitical turbulence and ESG become more important to the business? What skills, experience, and traits will be required of the future CEO and how might they differ from those of the current CEO? What will be non-negotiable? With clarity on the 'what', the board should identify potential internal and external candidates.

Clearly linked to the importance of having the right CEO is having the talent required – from the top of the organisation down through the ranks – to execute the company's strategy and keep it on track. As companies gear up to deploy gen AI at scale, there will be increased demand for technology professionals with AI-related skills such as model development, algorithmic development, and ensuring data quality. At the same time, companies may need ESG, climate, and sustainability expertise to manage those risks and opportunities; and to gather, organise, calculate, assure, and report the necessary ESG, climate, sustainability and GHG emissions data; and to develop the necessary internal controls.

Institutional investors have been vocal about the importance of human capital and talent development programs and their link to strategy. We expect companies will face an increasingly difficult challenge in finding, developing, and retaining the talent required at all levels of the organisation. Does management's talent plan align with its strategy and forecast needs for the short and long term? Which talent categories are in short supply and how will the company successfully compete for this talent? More broadly, as Millennials and younger employees join the workforce in large numbers and talent pools become globally diverse, is the company positioned to attract, develop, and retain top talent at all levels?

©2025 KPMG, an Australian partnership and a member firm of the KPMG global organisation of independent member firms affiliated with KPMG International Limited, a private English company limited by guarantee. All rights reserved. The KPMG name and logo are trademarks used under license by the independent member firms of the KPMG global organisation.

Liability limited by a scheme approved under Professional Standards Legislation.

06

Help set the tone, monitor the culture, and keep abreast of management's efforts to build stakeholder trust

Does the company make it safe for people to do the right thing? Headlines of sexual harassment, price gouging, aggressive sales practices, and other wrongdoing continue to keep corporate culture front and centre for companies, shareholders, regulators, employees, and customers.

Boards themselves are also making headlines – with investors, regulators and others asking, 'Where was the board?' – particularly in cases of self-inflicted corporate crises.

Given the critical role that corporate culture plays in driving performance and reputation, we see boards taking a more proactive approach to understanding, shaping, and assessing corporate culture. Have a laser-like focus on the tone set by senior management and zero tolerance for conduct that is inconsistent with the company's values and ethical standards, including any 'code of silence' around such conduct. Be sensitive to early warning signs and verify that the company has robust whistleblower and other reporting mechanisms in place and that employees are not afraid to use them.

Understand the company's actual culture (the unwritten rules versus those posted on the staffroom wall). Use a variety of tools – surveys, internal audit, hotlines, social media, walking the halls, and visiting facilities – to monitor the culture and see it in action. Recognise that the tone at the top is easier to gauge than the mood in the middle and the buzz at the bottom – a challenge that is further complicated by the prevalence of remote work.

How does the board gain visibility into the middle and bottom levels of the organisation? Make sure that incentive structures align with strategy and encourage the right behaviours, and take a hard look at the board's own culture for signs of groupthink or discussions that lack independence or contrarian voices. Focus not only on results, but the behaviours driving results.

The growing prevalence of mis-, dis-, and malinformation (MDM) should be on the board's radar given the significant reputational risks it poses. Inaccurate information – no matter the type, source, or motive – continues to undermine trust and exacerbate polarisation. Gen AI technology gives the purveyors of MDM the ability to understand what resonates with their target audience and provides the tools to generate content (including deepfake images, narratives, and voices) that is convincing enough to damage corporate reputations.

To get ahead of MDM, a company should understand what disinformation narratives can materially impact the business and who the likely purveyors of MDM might be.

What will cause investors, employees, or customers to lose trust in the company or its products and services? What capabilities and processes does the company have in place (risk management, corporate communications, investor relations, corporate counsel) to prevent or counter disinformation? Having a clear narrative for the marketplace – and building a surplus of trust with customers – are essential.

We see boards taking a more proactive approach to understanding, shaping, and assessing corporate culture.

©2025 KPMG, an Australian partnership and a member firm of the KPMG global organisation of independent member firms affiliated with KPMG International Limited, a private English company limited by guarantee. All rights reserved. The KPMG name and logo are trademarks used under license by the independent member firms of the KPMG global organisation.

Liability limited by a scheme approved under Professional Standards Legislation.

Revisit risk oversight responsibilities and the allocation of issues among committees

Given this challenging risk environment, many boards are delegating risk oversight responsibilities to standing committees for a more intensive review than the full board could undertake. We see boards delegating to various committees the responsibility to support the board's oversight of mission-critical risks, as well as other risk categories such as climate, ESG, HCM, cyber security, data governance, legal and regulatory compliance, supply chains, M&A, and more.

Recognise that risk rarely fits neatly into a single, siloed risk category.

The challenge for boards is to clearly define the risk oversight responsibilities of each standing committee, identify any overlap, and implement a committee structure and governance processes that facilitate information-sharing and coordination among committees. While board committee structure and oversight responsibilities will vary by company and industry, we recommend boards consider the following:

- As the risks that boards oversee grow in volume and complexity, evaluate whether committee scope-creep is a concern and consider whether any oversight responsibilities could/should be transferred or assigned to another or new committee. Does another board committee(s) have the time, composition, and skillset to oversee a particular category of risk? Is there a need for an additional committee, such as a technology, sustainability, or risk committee? Is there a need for new directors with skillsets or experience to help the board oversee specific risks?
- Recognise that risk rarely fits neatly into a single, siloed risk category. While many companies historically managed risk in siloes, that approach is no longer viable and poses its own risks.
- Identify risks for which multiple committees have oversight responsibilities and clearly delineate the responsibilities of each committee. For example, in the oversight of climate and other ESG risks, the sustainability committee, audit committee, remuneration committee, and even nomination committee likely each have some oversight responsibilities. And where cyber security and AI oversight resides in a technology committee (or other committee), the audit committee may also have certain responsibilities. To oversee risk effectively when two or three committees are involved, boards need to think differently about how to coordinate committee activities. For example, some boards have established a new board committee composed of a member of each standing committee to oversee management's preparation of the company's ESG disclosure – including sustainability reports and other ESG publications – for quality and consistency with strategy, as well as consistency across the company's various ESG reports and publications.

Essential to effectively managing a company's risks is maintaining critical alignments – of strategy, goals, risks, internal controls, incentives, and performance metrics. Today's business environment makes the maintenance of these critical alignments particularly challenging. The full board and each standing committee should play a key role in helping to ensure that – from top to bottom – management's strategy, goals, objectives, and incentives are properly aligned, performance is rigorously monitored, and that the culture the company has is the one it desires.

©2025 KPMG, an Australian partnership and a member firm of the KPMG global organisation of independent member firms affiliated with KPMG International Limited, a private English company limited by guarantee. All rights reserved. The KPMG name and logo are trademarks used under license by the independent member firms of the KPMG global organisation.

Liability limited by a scheme approved under Professional Standards Legislation.

08

Think about the company's future needs and whether the board's composition and succession planning is appropriate

Boards, investors, regulators, and other stakeholders are increasingly focused on the alignment of board composition – particularly director expertise and diversity – with the company's strategy.

Indeed, the increased level of investor engagement on this issue points to the central challenge with board composition: having directors with experience in key functional areas critical to the business while also having deep industry experience and an understanding of the company's strategy and the risks to the strategy. It is important to recognise that many boards will not have 'experts' in all the functional areas (such as cyber security, climate, gen AI, ESG, etc.) and may need to engage outside experts.

Developing and maintaining a high-performing board that adds value requires a proactive approach to board building and diversity – of skills, experience, thinking, gender, and race/ethnicity.

While determining the company's current and future needs – the 'what', as discussed previously in CEO succession planning – is the starting point for board composition, a broad range of board composition issues require board focus and leadership, including succession planning for directors as well as board leaders (the lead director and committee chairs), director recruitment, director tenure, diversity, board and individual director evaluations, and removal of underperforming directors. Boards need to 'tell their story' about the composition, skillsets, leadership, and functioning of the board and its committees.



Board composition, diversity, and renewal should remain a key area of board focus in 2025, as a topic for communications with the company's institutional investors and other stakeholders, enhanced disclosure in the company's proxy, and – most fundamentally – positioning the board strategically for the future.

Board composition, diversity, and renewal should remain a key area of board focus in 2025.

©2025 KPMG, an Australian partnership and a member firm of the KPMG global organisation of independent member firms affiliated with KPMG International Limited, a private English company limited by guarantee. All rights reserved. The KPMG name and logo are trademarks used under license by the independent member firms of the KPMG global organisation.

Liability limited by a scheme approved under Professional Standards Legislation.

The KPMG Board Leadership Centre

KPMG's Board Leadership Centre, led by our National Chairman Martin Sheppard, connects you with a dynamic group of board-level peers with access to a wide range of subject matter experts. Here, you can test new ideas, challenge traditional thinking, and stay informed on issues impacting you and the organisations you lead.

Learn more at kpmg.com.au/blc

Contact us

Martin Sheppard
National Chairman
KPMG Australia
E: msheppard1@kpmg.com.au

Caron Sugars
Partner, Governance,
Risk & Compliance and
Board Advisory Services
E: ccobargsugar@kpmg.com.au

The information contained in this document is of a general nature and is not intended to address the objectives, financial situation or needs of any particular individual or entity. It is provided for information purposes only and does not constitute, nor should it be regarded in any manner whatsoever, as advice and is not intended to influence a person in making a decision, including, if applicable, in relation to any financial product or an interest in a financial product. Although we endeavour to provide accurate and timely information, there can be no guarantee that such information is accurate as of the date it is received or that it will continue to be accurate in the future. No one should act on such information without appropriate professional advice after a thorough examination of the particular situation.

To the extent permissible by law, KPMG and its associated entities shall not be liable for any errors, omissions, defects or misrepresentations in the information or for any loss or damage suffered by persons who use or rely on such information (including for reasons of negligence, negligent misstatement or otherwise).

©2025 KPMG, an Australian partnership and a member firm of the KPMG global organisation of independent member firms affiliated with KPMG International Limited, a private English company limited by guarantee. All rights reserved.

The KPMG name and logo are trademarks used under license by the independent member firms of the KPMG global organisation.

Liability limited by a scheme approved under Professional Standards Legislation.

February 2025. 1226481187BLC