EUROPEAN Business Ethics FORUM

Paris Marriott Opera Ambassador Hotel, February 2015

The conference was held under the Chatham House Rule which means that participants may use and repeat what was said but they may not attribute anything by name or company. For this reason, the full report is available only to participants.

This summary report outlines the plenary sessions and the topics discussed in the breakout sessions.

Contents

Thanks are due to this year's generous sponsors:
Supreme Group, DCNS, Thales and Le Group La Poste:

SUPREME   LE GROUPE LA POSTE

THALES DCNS

Thursday 5th February

1. Welcome and Introductions

The conference was opened by introductions from the four organising groups**.** Cercle d'Éthique des Affaires (CEA) was the hosting partner this year.

Speaking in French, as 2015 is the francophone year, Yves Medina, President, CEA, emphasised two main points. First, he spoke of the increasing concern of a number of big companies of potentially excessive regulation in a world where some countries do not permit fair competition. Second, the necessity to define a realistic and operational Business Ethics strategy was highlighted, pointing to the "*Manifesto for a Business Ethics Vision*" which the CEA established and adopted at the beginning of the present year. Yves also thanked the organising committee for putting together what was the largest EBEF conference ever, as well as the sponsors for this year's event. A word of condolence was offered in memory of Christophe de Margerie and Professor Graham Dietz, both of whom were due to speak at the conference but unfortunately passed away last October and December respectively.

Rebecca Rehm, Director, Member Services and Certification, Ethics & Compliance Officer Association (ECOA), gave a short report on the ECOA's strategic alliance with the ERC which was announced in October 2014. They feel this alliance creates a unique position in the US market.

Tobias Goessling, European Business Ethics Network (EBEN), gave an overview of EBEN, explaining that they focus on making communication possible between academics and practitioners in business ethics by highlighting the three conferences EBEN is involved with each year.

Philippa Foster Back CBE, Director, Institute of Business Ethics (IBE), added her words of welcome, reminding those in attendance that the conference aims to create an environment in which candid peer-to-peer sharing and networking are possible. Philippa gave her view on the previous year in business ethics from the UK, suggesting that companies are still under the microscope increasing the pressures on ethics practitioners. However, she felt that this was also accompanied with more resources than previously and greater buy-in from boards and senior management.

2. Plenary 1: Business Ethics - The Total Vision

Speaker: Patrick Pouyanné, Chief Executive Officer, TOTAL

Mr Pouyanné began his speech by honouring the late Mr de Margerie who was deeply committed to ethical matters and believed that you couldn't have a sustainable business without a strong commitment to business ethics. This was a commitment Patrick Pouyanné insists on continuing.

He spoke openly and honestly about the challenges faced on a practical level. He explained how Total was much more than an integrated oil company, being also an integrated gas company and the number two worldwide in solar energy. Total operates in 130 countries through many partnerships and joint ventures in which they take a variety of different roles. Issues such as human rights, corruption, complex supply chains and different cultural contexts mean that Total is under the spotlight of various stakeholders who are not just interested in what they achieve, but also how they achieve it.

The importance of the code of conduct and having clear policies in achieving this aim were explained. The first edition of the Code was launched in 2000 and since then it has been through a number of revisions, the most recent in 2014 when the commitments to international human rights standards were enhanced and commitments and expectations concerning stakeholders were clarified.

The code is based on Total's shared values of respect, responsibility and exemplary business conduct, all of which are outlined by the CEO in setting the tone from the top. It has three priority business principles: Health, Safety, Security and Environment; prevention of fraud, corruption and anti-competitive practices; and respect for internationally recognised human rights standards. The code is distributed widely to all employees and external stakeholders.

In addition to the tone from the top and the priority business principles the code commits to following a number of international principles especially in the area of human rights; insists on mutual respect for the code in stakeholder relationships; and explains how people can speak up on issues pertaining to the code.

Mr Pouyanné also explained the structure the organisation has in place to deal with ethics and the code of conduct. This includes a committee of the main board and a group ethics committee which is consulted around 100 times a year on a wide range of topics. Through a network of compliance and ethics officers throughout the group around 600 alleged breaches of the code of conduct are investigated each year.

Another important element is the monitoring of the code and related policies. Total seeks external assessment of its performance in relation to business ethics with reports from GoodCorporation, the Danish Institute of Human Rights and CDA Collaborative Learning Projects each year.

Mr Pouyanné also gave three examples of experiences in the company:
1) Total's commitment to the highest level of safety standards based upon these values. Even though the overall number of accidents was seen to be decreasing, just one fatality is considered one too many.
2) The presence of a US DOJ monitor in the Total offices since 2013 has meant that employees really understand the importance of a zero tolerance approach to bribery and corruption.
3) Total's history of business operations in Myanmar where they faced real questions of whether business could be conducted in line with the principles of the code. The easy response would have been to pull out of the country as it would not have involved a big cost to the company. However, they decided to stay because even though they could not have an impact on everything that was happening in the country, they did have control over their own operations, and could insist upon higher standards of business conduct. This is seen as having contributed to sustainable development and other positive evolutions in the country itself, including Myanmar joining the Extractives Industry Transparency Initiative (EITI) in 2014.

Finally, Mr Pouyanné referred to the agreement recently signed with IndustrAll Global Union representing a major step in the company's commitment as a responsible employer in areas of labour relations, environmental stewardship and community engagement.

In his closing remarks, Mr Pouyanné observed that whilst Total has made a lot of progress, there are still areas where they need to improve specifically in the areas of supply chains and Joint Ventures.

Questions and Comments

Q: What role does private business have in promoting well-being?

A: Business has a significant role in promoting well-being, as it is more than just a wealth producer. Through the consistent application of standards a company of the size of Total has a wider impact than just on those it employs. For example, in Europe, standards with regards to human rights may be fairly consistent, but this is not the case around the world.

Total can't just conduct its business in line with the laws of the countries in which it operates. A company the size of Total cannot adopt a minimalist approach as, in an inter-connected world with different standards of what is acceptable, stakeholders will not be satisfied. Reference was made to the Myanmar example above.

Q: How are you encouraging your employees to live up to your values and your expectations?

A: Total has just launched a new campaign: "*committed to better energy*". This was not just designed as a communication campaign. It was a result of intense dialogue amongst the top team about what they want the company to do, and how they want it to do it. They are trying to achieve this through four/five key behaviours, and by aligning strategy with these. They found that the words were good, but the behaviours were not a reality. They have therefore started training and evaluating performance based on these behaviours.

Q: When considering the supply chain, how far down do you look/ how far down is the code disseminated?

A: Not deep enough! Mr Pouyanné has asked management to work on the risks of human rights issues in the supply chain, for example child labour, in the same way as they work on issues such as CO_2 emissions. This may bring up some uncomfortable issues, but they have to deal with them, otherwise stories can immediately arise on Twitter or in the news.

Q: What have the consequences been of the settlement with the DOJ and the Ethics Monitor?

A: It obliged Total to get policies formalised on paper and implemented. The work had to be done that much quicker. They needed a clear involvement of senior management; there was an audit programme – which created an obligation to really face the issue. The monitor was a professional person; he really tried to understand the business. His presence made things real. He offered practical suggestions that were not too difficult to implement. Total now has a network of nearly 400 compliance officers and the implementation is going well.

Q: What is Total doing do make sure that internal and external clients are not becoming disinterested in ethics in the current climate where oil prices are low and money may be tight?

A: Safety and ethics are not areas where we have to save costs; it's a question of properly allocating employee time and resources, and continuing to build the right culture. There is a need to continue to do this level by level, and ensure that as problems are addressed they are not merely being pushed down the supply chain.

3. Breakout Sessions 1

Three sessions of five simultaneous breakout discussions followed over the course of the forum. The goal of these sessions is for participants to share highs, lows, and lessons learnt, rather than to give a platform to "experts". The rapporteur's notes for each breakout discussion follow.

1.1 Creating Advocates in Middle Management

Introduced by: Magali Herbaut, Ethics & Policies Vice-President, Schneider Electric
Moderated by: Cédric Dubar (CEA)
Rapporteur: David Morris, Boeing

1.2 Conducting Effective Investigations

Introduced by: Micky Khurana, Global Compliance & Ethics Breach Manager, Diageo
Moderated by: Simon Webley (IBE)
Rapporteur: Laure Moscardo, DCNS

1.3 Measuring Programme Effectiveness

Introduced by: Gareth Tipton, Group Director Ethics & Compliance and COO, BT
Moderated by: Philippa Foster Back (IBE)
Rapporteur: Mark Farrow, Network Rail

1.4 Working with Other Functions in Your Organisation

Introduced by: Courtney Wallize, Corporate Director, Ethics & Business Conduct, Northrop Grumman Corporation
Moderated by: Moira McGinty Klos (ECOA)
Rapporteur: Moira McGinty Klos, ECOA

1.5 Big Issues around Big Data

Introduced by: Annette Johnson, Director, Global Business Ethics & Integrity, Prudential Financial, Inc.
Moderated by: Rebecca Rehm (ECOA)
Rapporteur: Stefan Louwers, Rabobank

4. Breakout Sessions 2

2.1 Incorporating Behavioural Ethics into Your Programme

Introduced by: Andrew Cave, Head of Group Sustainability & Lisa Stewart, Sustainability Manager, Royal Bank of Scotland
Moderated by: Philippa Foster Back (IBE)
Rapporteur: Harriet Kemp, Serco

2.2 Auditing Your Ethics Programme

Introduced by: Emma Sharma, Chief Ethics & Compliance Officer, Supreme Group
Moderated by: Rebecca Rehm (ECOA)
Rapporteur: Rebecca Rehm, ECOA

2.3 Third-Party Due Diligence: Identifying and Rating Ethical Risks

Introduced by: Corinne Lagache, SVP Chief Compliance Officer, Safran
Moderated by: Cédric Dubar (CEA)
Rapporteur: Laure Moscardo, DCNS

2.4 Customising E-Training for Your Audience

Introduced by: Natacha Le Sellier, Ethics Programme Manager, L'Oreal
Moderated by: Marie Agnes Vieitez (CEA)
Rapporteur: Roz Bliss, Northrop Grumman Corporation

2.5 Tackling Challenges around Creating a Speak Up Culture
Introduced by: Alexander Sulaimani, Director, Compliance & Ethics, Euroclear
Moderated by: Tobias Goesseling (EBEN)
Rapporteur: Micky Kharuna, Diageo

5. Speed Sharing

The aim of this session was to allow participants to share while getting to meet new colleagues in a small and fun setting.

Three questions were posed to participants sitting in groups of 8-10:
- What were your biggest achievements in 2014?
- What are your main challenges for 2015?
- How do you measure the success of your programme?

6. Plenary 2: After the Storm: How to Rebuild Trust

Speaker: Professor Rosalind Searle, Coventry University

Professor Searle shared her insights from the findings of a number of academic studies surrounding levels of trust amongst employees. The findings were the results of hands-on research within a variety of organisations which showed three main conclusions:

1) You can sustain and even build trust amongst staff when you are downsizing;
2) It's not what you do, but how you do it – this helps to create a 'trust bank';
3) Distrust is different to low trust. Once you have moved to distrust, you are in a whole different 'country'.

The research started from Professor Searle's personal experience working with one organisation where she experienced a 'sense of grief' as trust was breached for experienced staff it had employed, but who were now retained on consultancy contracts. She observed how many different organisations and institutions, in which trust had been taken for granted, were now being questioned regarding their integrity, resulting in new low levels of trust.

Trust was defined as "*a willingness to be vulnerable to the actions of another party based on the positive expectations that the other will act beneficially, or at least not inflict harm, irrespective of any monitoring or control mechanism*".

The benefits of operating in a high trust context were contrasted with the struggles of operating in a low trust context. In a high trust context, research revealed that there was a greater sense of job satisfaction, staff were more likely to recommend the company to those they came in contact with, they were happier and worked harder, there was greater knowledge transfer and there was quicker error detection as employees were more willing to speak up. Conversely, in a low trust organisation, more PR was required, there was an increased need for regulation and compliance and the required levels of assurance were likely to be more stringent. The workplace culture was often poor which in turn meant that the workplace was also likely to be more unhealthy with lower attendance levels and higher levels of stress amongst employees, as well as higher staff turnover.

Professor Searle also identified a number of different types of trust, and explored how to build trust in relation to each of these areas. In general, it was observed that trust is a two-way thing, as trusting others is dependent on feeling trusted. This is especially important in the context of knowledge sharing.

At the *interpersonal level*, trust is built by gauging trustworthiness based on ability, benevolence, integrity and predictability. From a *cognitive standpoint*, building trust is about having confidence in an individual or organisation which leads to certainty. However, *affect-based trust* is different as it is based on a sense of being cared for. Commonly, this latter dimension can be important in distrust situations, producing less rational and more emotional responses based on wariness about the other party's exchange reciprocation.

She outlined brand new research which revealed three distinct types of '*trust storm*'. These can occur individually or potentially together in a sequence of events which lead to a '*trust tsunami*'. She argued how important it was that organisations are better able to identify the type of trust storm they find themselves in, in order to more effectively repair the damaged trust.

Historically, trust has always been considered on a scale of trust to distrust. However, Professor Searle's new studies reveal that trust and distrust are different, and once an organisation has crossed into distrust, far tougher questions arise as the rose-tinted glasses

are taken off. She argued how distrust may not necessarily be repaired.. She showed a new analysis that her team have developed which lets organisations identify the levels and types of trust fragmentation that are present and can be pivotal in the more effective identification, targeting and development of repair tactics. She showed that how perceptions of being treated with care and respect were often critical to trust breach situations.

As a result, organisations need to manage these storms and identify how to bridge over, or come out of, '*valley of low trust*'. In order to manage this, she showed a four-strand approach to the better management of trust and its repair. She showed the connectivity of these distinct pieces.

Groups of employees have differing levels of trust in other groups of employees. The research found that usually, co-workers are most trusted, whereas levels of trust decrease on the way up to top management. Another interesting finding revealed that, regardless of the level of management, benevolence matters to employees, especially in establishing trust. She outlined research on what mattered most at the top.

Professor Searle finished with a Dutch proverb: "Trust *arrives on foot but leaves on horseback*". She warned of the dangers of taking trust for granted and not seeing it as a precious competitive advantage. Trust matters!

Questions and Comments
Q: Can you explain more about the differences between managers and employees in terms of the levels of trust observed?
A: Top management often have the bigger picture whereas employees are often concerned by 'small things' such as rumours or inconsistent messages. This can create a sense of a divide, or a feeling of 'them and us'.

Q: Can you explain the link between levels of trust and the health of the organisation?
A: 'Healthy' companies are commonly more benevolent, and consequently have greater trust banks and are therefore more resilient.

Q: Is internal trust necessary for external trust?
A: Yes, my research focused on employees as the lynchpin. Their sense of fairness is intuitive, and critical. They are collecting evidence and how trusted employees feel will be reflected externally.

7. Breakout Sessions 3

3.1 Engaging Senior Leadership
Introduced by: Robert Smith, Group Ethics Officer, Serco
Moderated by: Simon Webley (IBE)
Rapporteur: Simon Webley, IBE

3.2 Incentivising Behaviour: For Better and For Worse
Introduced by: Maryann Clifford, Group Ethics & Compliance Officer, BP International
Moderated by: Philippa Foster Back (IBE)
Rapporteur: Judith Houston, Lego

3.3 Implementing the Protect, Respect, Remedy Framework
Introduced by: Francoise Guichard, SVP for Ethics and Compliance
Moderated by: Marie Agnes (CEA)
Rapporteur: Lisa Stewart, RBS

3.4 The Role of Ethics Ambassadors and Other Local Programme Advocates

Introduced by: Graham Luck, Ethics Officer, Lockheed Martin UK
Moderated by: Rebecca Rehm (ECOA)
Rapporteur: Rebecca Rehm, ECOA

3.5 Joint Ventures, Mergers and Acquisitions: A New Paradigm for Your Programme

Introduced by: Corinne Suné, Head of International Compliance Programme, Airbus Group
Moderated by: Cédric Dubar (CEA)
Rapporteur: Roz Bliss, Northrop Grumman Corporation

8. Plenary 3: Under the Microscope: Lessons Learned from a Corporate Monitorship

Speakers: 1. Mark Serfozo, Director of Risk, Rolls-Royce plc
2. Stevan Verkin, Vice President Group Compliance, Technip

Mark Serfozo, Rolls-Royce

Mark spoke of his personal experience with two monitors during his time with BAE Systems as well as the current quasi-monitor at Rolls-Royce, about how to engage the monitor in order to make the most of the experience.

In the case of BAE the monitor was installed as part of a deferred prosecution agreement (DPA) with the Department of Justice (DOJ) in the US. The company was asked to nominate a list of potential monitors and they had a number of specific requirements about who would be appropriate due to the nature of the business. They provided a shortlist of candidates to the DOJ and were able to agree on one individual with excellent credentials, supported by internal resources, rather than a US law firm assisted by the big four accountants.

The monitor was appointed to find out what the company thought about ethics, and what they were doing about it. The content of the agreement was set out explicitly at the beginning, and the monitor was to give an objective opinion on the state of compliance at the end of the agreed term. This would be used to make the judgement as to whether the monitor would need to extend his stay. Consequently, what developed was a tripartite dialogue.

Mark explained how his experiences with the monitors varied between being collaborative, directive and team working. He likened the experience to having many bosses: your usual line manager, the monitor, the CEO, and the Board, all of whom were right, all the time. As the ethics practitioner you need to see the bigger picture and be able to share the appropriate knowledge to manage these relationships.

Monitorships can be costly, inconvenient, deflating, time-consuming and embarrassing, but they can also be positive, acting as a catalyst for culture change and exposure. The observation was made that monitors want all your attention all the time. They need full access to everything, not just the compliance team, as they need to understand the business. They are also very keen on voluntary disclosures, and do not respond well to surprises, they need to feel respected. However, they are well intentioned and are looking for long-term, lasting change.

Practically, it is important to get to know the monitor on a personal basis, as then you are able to develop the relationship based on trust, making it more effective. It is also important

that you only deal in facts, being very open on both the positive and the negative side – they are going to find out anyway! Another tension which requires balancing is that of when to introduce the monitor to the CEO and top team. They need to know something about the business before they can join the top level conversations, but it must not be left too long. To help achieve this, Mark recommended creating a briefing pack of all the relevant information.

Finally, Mark outlined some of the lessons learnt from these monitorships. First, the importance of internal communication was highlighted, as having a monitor is all consuming. As the ethics practitioner, you need to ensure that everyone is kept on board, throughout the entire process. Second, there needs to be a focus on the legacy and long-term benefits of the monitorship. There is a real need to develop the monitoring and assurance systems so that everything continues to happen once the monitor has gone. Third, attempt to keep the monitor focused on ethics and behaviours as getting the 'ethics' right leads a long way on the journey to compliance. Fourth, get a project manager on board to make the experience as efficient as possible. Fifth, do not forget HR. They can feel isolated, especially when there are suggested changes to behaviours, training and communications, areas which have traditionally been "*HR's turf*". Getting Comms, HR and the Ethics team working together will increase harmony during the monitorship as well as subsequently. Sixth, there will be some areas in which you need to hold your ground, but pick your battles. Lastly, make it a positive experience; it will dominate your life if it happens to you.

Stevan Verkin, Technip

Stevan then outlined his experience of monitorship with Technip. In 2010, Technip also reached a DPA with the DOJ for allegedly paying up to $180m in bribes to the Nigerian Government. The settlement of the DPA included a $338 million fine and a monitor for the period of 2 years. Similar to BAE, Technip had a number of specific requirements for the monitor and were able to negotiate a French national as their monitor, supported by a major US firm and a local French firm.

For Stevan, there were a number of important take-aways from the experience, the most important of which was the value of proper preparation. This allowed the monitorship to go smoothly and in line with initial timeframes. Stevan's recommendation was that as soon as you get an idea what the monitor wants to do, start doing it, because the monitor can rely on actions already being taken by the company.

Once in to the monitorship, the first thing to do was to educate the monitor about the business. The monitor had a financial compliance mindset, and was not fully up to speed on the nature of the business, especially in relation to subcontracting. This was achieved by setting up meetings with all functions and departments across the organisation. Technip had 30-60 days to formulate the work plan for the year to provide focus on what was outlined in the DPA.

Again the importance of keeping the monitor focused was highlighted. Monitors are encouraged to dig deep, but they do have a specific remit. They are not investigating previous conduct, or indeed what is actually in the DPA. Their mission is to see what is there at the moment, and what needs to be done, make recommendations, and enforce tone at the top.

The presence and purpose of the monitor also needed a lot of explaining internally, as it can start with the feeling that there is a spy walking around. Initially, people were afraid that they were being personally investigated by the DOJ and that they could go to prison, which is not the case. The monitor is not there to investigate individuals, but to review organisational systems and processes.

Stevan highlighted that co-operation is critical to successful monitorship, suggesting that Technip took the 'team' approach. The goal of the monitorship is to add value to the

company in terms of enhancing the Ethics & Compliance function as well as meeting the aims of the DPA and getting the top team on board. This is also one of the aims of the Ethics and Compliance Function.

Reports made by the monitor include recommendations. Some people feel these are being imposed, more as requirements than recommendations, but the company does have the opportunity to comment on the recommendations before the final report is written. These recommendations are binding, but if the relationship is good it is already likely to be a recommendation that you have agreed to. In Stevan's experience, these recommendations were very positive and included introducing more tailored approaches and making policies more understandable for the average employee. This, however, does require open ears on both sides.

Finally, Stevan outlined some of the pros and cons of monitorship. On the positive side: a monitor can give a lot of leverage to a Compliance officer; when you are through the monitorship you will have robust processes in place; consequently, it can lead to a best in class compliance programme as the monitor does not just look at paper policies, but also at how they are embedded; this can also lead to an innovative compliance programme. Conversely, on the negative side: the time requirements are incredible; it can take the focus of the 'business guys' away from the business, which may have consequences; keeping momentum after the monitor leaves can be difficult, the challenge is engraining the right mindset in the management, as there can be a temptation to celebrate or breathe a sigh of relief once the monitorship is complete. Trying to regain lost momentum is much more difficult.

Questions and Comments

Q: Is this limited to Bribery and Corruption or is this wider?
A: The start point is bribery and corruption, but the compliance programme is much wider, therefore so is the monitor's remit. The focus needs to be on ethics, you don't get any points for compliance, you have to do it.

Q: How much interaction did the monitor request with the board and top team?
A: Most interaction was with senior management rather than at the board, but they do attend certain relevant meetings.

Q: How do you select a monitor?
A: You need to find someone who is respected and capable, they can be provided with the support they need. The balance is in finding someone who knows the legal side as well as the business side. You definitely need somebody with some sort of compliance background, so that the monitor is someone that the DOJ would trust. It is possible to use a head hunter for this purpose.

Q: How did you fit in the interactions with the monitor in with the job?
A: At Technip, the compliance role was created as part of the monitorship, so it was built in from the beginning. At BAE there was a small compliance team, but they recognised the need to establish a larger team. Mark was brought in from M&A then went exclusively in to the operation of the monitorship. However, the challenge was trying to make ethics part of the everyday business of the company, rather than something specific.

9. Plenary 4: Challenges On The Horizon: Looking Ahead To 2016

Three participants were asked to provide their views on what they had learnt and what challenges lay ahead.

1. Dominic Hall, Head of Ethical Business Conduct, BAE Systems

Dominic praised the format of the conference and commended the honesty of those present as people really looking to share and addressing where they have challenges. Dominic's reflections focused on two areas which had been addressed over the course of the conference which were especially pertinent in his role at BAE Systems. The first was the integration of the ethics function with other departments. He observed that Ethics and Compliance practitioners are well rounded professionals, but they could do more to establish strong relationships with other departments based on trust. The second area Dominic highlighted were the challenges surrounding engagement with middle management. An emphasis was placed on leader-led training which addressed the '*WIIFM*' (what's in it for me?) question amongst this demographic of employee. Addressing this will help to make business life better as issues, both big and small, can be addressed at the team level.

2. Joan Elise Dubinsky, Director Of Ethics, United Nations

Joan asked "*What does it mean to be truly independent in our roles as ethics and compliance leaders?*" In order to be successful, several aspects of independence will need to be mastered. Six key parameters were suggested:

1) Access – do we have full and complete access to critical information and key people?
2) Reporting structure – are we and our offices positioned for success within our organisations' structures and hierarchies?
3) Influence – are we able to assert influence both formally and informally? With and without authority?
4) Voice – are we engaged in the conversations we need to have? Just as importantly, are we speaking a language and using words that others will understand?
5) Visibility – are efforts and results visible both internally and externally?
6) Independence of thought – are we respected for the independence and creativity of our thinking and contributions?

As a second point, Joan highlighted the need to keep ethics front and centre when talking about business ethics. There are multiple challenges both nationally and internationally, as well as global meta-issues which were not discussed at the conference. If some of these major ethical issues, like public health crises, terrorism, human rights, refugees and human trafficking, can be tackled within our own conversations, we are on the way to considering these same issues within our industry sectors. It is tough to talk about the big questions, but, as Joan concluded, "*who else but we can start these conversations?*"

3. Emmanuel Lulin, SVP & Chief Ethics Officer, L'Oreal

Emmanuel observed that there still needs to be an '*awakening on ethics*' in many countries and that in organisations, staff and management sometimes appear to only be able to take in ethics in '*bite-size portions*'.

One thing that is required to help achieve more rapid change is more academic work on the business case for business ethics. Often this job can be compared to an act of faith due to the difficulty in proving the business case.

In addition, there are a number of big issues are coming up fast. Issues surrounding big data and advances in technology mean that our world, and therefore business, will be fundamentally different in 15-20 years time. These subjects cannot be addressed by

compliance only. Ethics practitioners need to be one of the persons in organisations who help management think about these issues.

Emmanuel also noted the reticence of Ethics practitioners to talk about issues closer to home, such as corruption in France or international corporate spying, which need to be addressed by the ethics community to ensure that Ethics practitioners remain credible in the future.

Finally, Emmanuel also observed that there is a need to prepare the new generation of Ethics practitioners. He has found that the next generation of ethics and compliance officers are already there, asking good questions and understanding the challenges they face. There is a chance to pass on the torch of ethics to the next generation who are very capable.

Forum Dinner

Dinner on Thursday evening was held at the Cercle de l'Union Interalliée.

The 2016 conference will be held in Brussels, 27th – 29th January. Registration with an "early bird discount" will open soon. Please check the EBEF website for details: www.ebef.eu.