



Succession planning

'Failure to address the topic of succession planning with clarity may lead to a weakened trust in the board's quality and ability to select the right leadership to generate shareholder value while addressing the concerns of other stakeholders.'

Luca Giacalone

What does a 21st Century Board look like?

'If things go on as they are, we shall see an increasingly bureaucratic, over regulated nightmare blocking the future development of not just the UK's FTSE 300 organisations but also family companies, entrepreneurs, state-owned enterprises, NHS boards, civic organisations and charities.'

Professor Bob Garratt

Content

- | | |
|----------------------|---|
| News | 3 New guidance about shareholder meetings
The Chartered Governance Institute in the UK has published guidance about shareholder meetings in light of the current pandemic |
| International | 4 Sustainability reporting expectations during Covid-19
The pandemic has highlighted the importance of managing material social risks and opportunities among key stakeholder groups, such as employees, customers, suppliers and the community |
| Global News | 5 Companies urged to disclose ethnicity of directors
Final Rules on proxy advisors approved
Sustainability reporting in China
Corporate governance and fraud prevention |
| Features | 7 Agile boards
Helena Wayth argues that the Covid-19 crisis has highlighted the fact that agile boards can help build greater resilience |
| | 8 Succession planning
Luca Giacalone looks at what is probably the most important board decision – who should lead the organisation? |
| | 10 What does a 21st Century Board look like?
At a recent All Party Parliamentary Corporate Governance Group meeting, on this topic Professor Bob Garratt was one of the panellists. This is a transcript of his remarks which has been updated to incorporate his answers to questions during the discussion |

Feature

.....

What does a 21st Century Board look like?

At a recent All Party Parliamentary Corporate Governance Group (APPCGG) meeting, on this topic **Professor Bob Garratt** was one of the panellists. This is a transcript of his remarks which has been updated to incorporate his answers to questions during the discussion.

I am delighted to be able to address this joint meeting of MPs and Peers. My argument is in two phases. First, that UK legislators are faced with a paradox regarding their current approach to UK corporate governance. They created this dilemma themselves in 1890 and yet seem loathe to resolve it. So they have let it fester for 130 years. Without such a resolution a post-Brexit UK will become an also-ran in global competitiveness.

One horn of this dilemma is that internationally the UK is seen to have made so many advances in the field of corporate governance practice and regulation that it is much admired, with many countries trying to emulate it.

Yet the other horn shows in plain sight this unresolved rot at the centre of UK businesses law. I am talking of the interlinked board issues of defining 'the controlling mind' and 'unlimited liability'. This is why the UK public detest you for failing to legislate effectively to protect their interests, especially since 2008.

The issue was urgent enough in Gladstone's time that he called an enquiry – the Salomon Judgement of 1890 – which was meant to resolve this. It did not and has left a running sore ever since.

This very week (12.03.20) the *Financial Times* raised the issue again following the acquittal, to public disquiet, of the final Barclays Bank defendants on fraud charges. Mr Justice Jay did no-one any favours by leaving a judgment where 'the Bank could not be held accountable for the actions of its chief executive, but neither could the chief executive be accountable for the actions of Barclays'. This may be the current law but no rational member of the public could understand or agree with it and the Serious Fraud Office is left wondering if in such cases boards of directors and Chief Executives are above the law?

Legislators need first to resolve this position and then ensure that sufficient legal precedent is created for the guidance of board members' future behaviours and values, allowing clarity in the public's mind and so restoring public trust.

Few civil cases have ever been before the courts and almost no criminal cases with exception of the Ernest Saunders' case. Little has been tested in the High Court let alone the Supreme Court. There seems no political will to do so.

To ensure effective UK businesses we need to resolve this to achieve our post-Brexit ambitions. Hopefully this new parliament and government will take up the challenge.

What would the 21st Century Board look like if extrapolated from the present non-system of UK corporate governance?

If things go on as they are, we shall see an increasingly bureaucratic, over regulated nightmare blocking the future development of not just the UK's FTSE 300 organisations but also family companies, entrepreneurs, state-owned enterprises, NHS boards, civic organisations and charities. Public trust in all their directors and senior managers will continue to decline. Corporate governance will continue to focus wrongly only on directors, without designing a national system that specifies both the rights, but also the duties, of owners, regulators and legislators. And all must then be under formal public scrutiny.

We need to reframe the meaning, behaviours and context of UK corporate governance. The UK will lose its global lead in the field. It is already beginning to be overtaken in practice by other parts of the world, especially those with whom we shall need to trade more effectively in the future.

It is tragic that UK politicians in both houses passed a world class Companies Act in 2006 that was never effectively implemented. But which of the current MPs and Peers know, or care? I have asked many politicians to list for me at least three of the seven duties of a director in the 2006 Act? Or what the purpose of a board is in relation to its company? None have ever been able to give me a satisfactory reply.

Most say that they were not around in 2006 and have no idea what was passed or why. But as we now have a new cohort of MPs and Peers it is time for them to be informed by such groups as the APPCGG to go back to the basics and learn both what was enacted and why it has failed to be implemented effectively.

What if we took a different approach and behaved as if the UK's 2006 Act was real? The UK's Corporate Governance Code can be reduced to just two A4 pages.

I argue that we should now drop the existing Corporate Governance Codes and the wildly over-complex one for financial services. We should revert to what our legislators meant in 2006. We should live by the values and behaviours of sections 171 and 172 of the Companies Act.

The Cadbury Code was published in 1992 to great acclaim but was side-tracked into becoming a cottage industry creating more and more clauses and subsets. I argue that we are now

Feature

mature enough to drop the over-elaboration and redundancy of our Corporate Governance Codes. We should focus on ensuring the future health of the company, not on increasing compliance. Government legislated for this but then dropped the ball.

‘I argue that we are now mature enough to drop the over-elaboration and redundancy of our Corporate Governance Codes.’

The globally admired patron saint of corporate governance is Sir Adrian Cadbury. I am proud to have worked with him long before 1992 and the invention of the fashionable ‘corporate governance’ phrase. In those days we called it ‘reviewing board effectiveness’, a much better descriptor. But I was always critical of the Cadbury Codes in having a restrictive vision of corporate governance as being essentially financial and concerning listed companies. These are less than 5% of the organisations that bond our national society. Neither could they, or the Financial Reporting Council, debar directors. Sir Adrian was sympathetic and wrote to me in his beautiful longhand just before his death commenting on a draft of my forthcoming book *Stop The Rot: Reframing Governance for Directors and Politicians* saying: ‘good luck ... and do ensure that you focus on the entrepreneurial, risk taking aspects of good governance, and not the Codes and compliance aspects that are now starting to cripple it.’

What do sections 172 and 171 say?

I was going to say here ‘let me remind you of the two key sections on which were meant to develop effective UK corporate governance’. However, I have been so alarmed at how few legislators, and company directors, now know even the basics of these key two sections that I have chosen to list them briefly here.

Section 172 reflects on the purpose of a board of directors: it is the duty, responsibility and accountability of a board to promote the long-term success of the company. It never mentions the supremacy of the shareholders.

Remember that since January 2019 it is mandatory in the UK for companies to provide an annual report outlining the consequences of their board decisions on:

- The likely consequences of any decision in the long-term;
- The interests of the company’s employees;
- The need to foster the company’s business relationships with suppliers, customers and others;

- The impact of the company’s operations on the community and the environment;
- The desirability of the company maintaining a reputation for high standards of business conduct;
- The need to act fairly as between members of the company.

Because of legislator ignorance we have the paradoxical position of many current legislators clamouring publicly for the very things on which they already passed legislation in 2006. At that time we even invented the currently fashionable concepts of ‘ESG’, sustainability and integrated reporting. But 14 years on we have done little about their implementation.

The board values and consequent behaviours of section 172 are Accountability, Probity and Transparency to the stakeholders. Which board assesses these on a rigorous basis?

Section 171 reflects on The Seven Duties of a Director:

- To act within the board’s constitution;
- To promote the success of the company;
- To exercise independent judgement;
- To exercise reasonable care skill and diligence;
- To avoid conflicts of interest;
- Not to accept benefits from third parties;
- To declare interests in proposed transactions.

The personal values and consequent behaviours of a board member under section 171 are Independence of Thought, Care, Skill and Diligence. Again, how many boards assess these rigorously?

So my challenge to you today is how are legislators going to rebuild and live by sections 171 and 172? You do not need new legislation. But you do need commitment and energy to create the legal precedents to make your legislation work.

You will know that you have succeeded when the public are openly asking informed questions on limited liability, the controlling mind, the purpose of a board, and the delivery of the seven duties of a director. The public must hold boards to account, not regulators.

Professor Bob Garratt works with his wife Sally reviewing and developing boards of directors on five of the six continents. He is a practitioner and researcher whose book ‘The Fish Rots From The Head: Developing Effective Directors’ became a best seller internationally. He is a Visiting Honorary Professor at Cass Business School, London; and Professor Extraordinaire at the Business School of Stellenbosch University, South Africa. He has just been appointed as External Examiner of the Gulf Co-operation Council’s Board Development Institute for their new Director Development accredited awards.

He is currently researching informally with colleagues David Jackson and Guy Jubb the development of the ideas behind this paper.

Subscription form

Please complete this form and send by mail to:

Subscriptions Department Governance
Publishing and Information Services Ltd
The Old Stables, Market Street,
Highbridge, Somerset, TA9 3BP, UK

Tel: +44 (0) 1278 793300
Email: info@governance.co.uk
Website: www.governance.co.uk

(Please tick one)

- Yes! I would like to subscribe to Governance for one year
- Or save with a 2 year subscription

Governance international subscription costs:

	£UK	Euro	US\$
1Yr	325	450	490
2Yr	585	790	855

Governance can accept cheques in other currencies but an administration fee of £15 will be charged.

<input type="checkbox"/> I enclose a cheque/bankers draft for	
Currency	Value
<input type="checkbox"/> Please invoice me	
Specify currency:	
Order reference:	
Title:	
First name:	
Surname:	
Position:	
Company/Organisation:	
Address:	
Postcode:	
Email:	
Tel:	
Fax:	

What our subscribers say

'Governance is a great publication that I look forward to reading.'

'I have found Governance to be a good resource for identifying and elaborating on emerging corporate governance trends.'

'Governance provides a very useful summary of key issues.'

'I enjoy Governance very much. The comprehensive range of topics covered keeps me up to date on corporate governance matters.'

'Governance is a useful means of keeping up to date on developments in a field which is assuming greater importance by the day.'

'Governance is the leading monthly publication covering major corporate governance issues. A most valuable source of information for investors, financial advisors, corporate board members and executives.'

Index

Organisations		Companies	
The Chartered Governance Institute	3	A Bird's Eye View	7
SEC	5	Bennett & Philp	5
		Glass Lewis	5
People		Institutional Shareholder Services	5
Larry Fink	7	SquareWell Partners	8
Professor Bob Garratt	10		
Luca Giacalone	8		
Helena Wayth	7		

Designed and printed by WithPrint
Riverside Studio, Gills Lane, Rooksbridge, Somerset, BS26 2TY
www.with-print.co.uk

ISSN 1358-5142

© Governance Publishing 2020. All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise, without written permission of the copyright holder.

Governance Publishing and Information Services Ltd
The Old Stables, Market Street, Highbridge, Somerset TA9 3BP, UK
Tel: +44 (0) 1278 793300
Email: info@governance.co.uk Website: www.governance.co.uk