

2016



EUROPEAN
**Business
Ethics**
FORUM
R E P O R T

27– 29 January

Crowne Plaza
Palace Hotel
Brussels

Sharing Ideas & Successful Practices



Meet your **forum hosts**



Cercle d'Éthique des Affaires (CEA)

Cercle d'Éthique des Affaires (CEA)

Tel: +33 (1) 40 25 47 23

Fax: +33 (1) 40 25 03 88

cea@cercle-ethique.net

www.cercle-ethique.net



European Business Ethics Network (EBEN)

Tel: +30 210 6886292

Fax: +30 210 8983157

secretariat@eben-net.org

www.eben-net.org



Ethics & Compliance Initiative (ECI)

Tel: +1-703-647-2185 (Va.); +1-781-647-9333 (Mass.)

Fax: +1-703-647-2180 (Va.); +1-781-647-9399 (Mass.)

ethics@ethics.org

www.ethics.org



Institute of Business Ethics (IBE)

Tel: +44 (0) 20 7798 6040

Fax: +44 (0) 20 7798 6044

info@ibe.org.uk

www.ibe.org.uk



27– 29 January 2016

Crowne Plaza Palace Hotel

Brussels

Summary Report

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

Thursday 28th January

Forum Welcome	5
Plenary Session : Ethics & Sustainability	5
Concurrent Facilitated Discussions	7
Business and Human Rights: concrete implementation of the Guiding Principles	7
Friends, Romans, Countrymen Lend Me Your Ears	7
Conducting an E&C Risk Assessment in your Organisation	7
Navigating Internal Investigations that Cross Borders	7
Ethics & Compliance: why are the two better than one?	7
Cultural Differences between Asia, Americas, EU and Middle East: the effect on ethical and compliance standards	7
Exploring the Business Case for Business Ethics	7
Making the Difficult Choice, to do or not to do the deal	8
How to Handle Unethical Managers who are Delivering High Performance	8
Compliance as a Cultural Managerial Discipline	8
Speed Sharing	8

Contents *continued*

Friday 29th January

Plenary Session : Big Data, Larger Ethical Responsibilities – board assurance for preserving brand, revenue and reputation	9
Concurrent Facilitated Discussions	11
Rebuilding Trust Once It's Been Lost	11
Supply Chain Audit for Ethical Standards	11
Building and Improving Credibility of the E&C Professional	11
Innovation in Communication and Training	11
How Does Your Programme Develop Tomorrow's Leaders?	11
Plenary Session : Identifying Best Practice in Speak-Up Arrangements	12
Looking Ahead: recent lessons and new challenges	14
Forum Dinner	14
Speaker Profiles	15
Forum Hosts	16

We would like to thank and acknowledge the support of our 2016 EBEF sponsor Syngenta



Thursday

28 January

Forum Welcome

Tobias Goessling, Board Member, European Business Ethics Network

The 2016 forum was opened by Tobias who briefly welcomed participants to Brussels, explaining that the time together over the next two days was an opportunity to hear about and discuss some of the most pressing issues for ethics and compliance practitioners.

He wished everyone an enjoyable time together.

Plenary Session

Ethics & Sustainability

Thomas Leysen, Chairman, Umicore, Corelio & KBC

Mr. Leysen shared his experiences of his roles as CEO, and now Chairman, of Umicore. He spoke of joining an organisation with a discordant culture, and how he established it as a company committed to sustainability and ethics. He spoke of three instances which incurred significant costs to the business, but were followed as they were the right thing to do. Mr. Leysen also shared his more recent experience of attempting to achieve a similar story in the Financial Services sector with KBC Group.

In the late 1990s, a significant takeover had resulted in a culture at Umicore where the engineering culture of one firm, and entrepreneurial culture of the other, clashed. Mr. Leysen's speech focused on his efforts since taking over as CEO in the wake of this, and how a variety of challenges had also presented opportunities for Umicore to define itself as an ethical leader.

When Mr. Leysen took the reins at Umicore in 2000 a major restructuring, which had helped the company regain much of its solidarity (following "civil war" in the senior management ranks), was almost complete. However, there was still conflict in the identity of the organisation. This presented the senior management with an opportunity to define a new vision, strategy and identity for the company. One key pillar which they chose to focus on was sustainability and being a responsible business.

Once the vision and strategy had been established, the Executive Team also decided that they needed a way to articulate the desired culture of the organisation. To this end, they created *The Umicore Way*, a short (10 page) document, which defined the important beliefs they wanted to adhere to as the organisation. It also defined the culture, values, mission and corporate philosophy of Umicore, and was personally endorsed by Mr. Leysen as CEO. It was also supplemented with a 'more traditional' Code of Conduct.

Mr. Leysen then went on to explain a number of ways in which the document was brought to life throughout the company, telling the story of how, when it was launched, he took personal responsibility for it, taking it on a 'roadshow' where he explained its importance and application in series of face-to-face meetings with over 700 managers.

He also gave a number of examples of situations in which its principles were applied in ethical 'grey areas' which also served to reinforce its importance to the company:

1. Addressing claims of historic pollution

One of the consequences of the company's long history (with roots which can be traced back over 200 years) was that standards of what are considered to be acceptable in terms of pollution and emissions have changed. Prior to Mr. Leysen's involvement, Umicore had always defended their previous actions in a legalistic way, insisting that they had complied with the required standards of the day. However, this was considered to be inconsistent with the new strategic focus on sustainability. Therefore, the decision was made to change the approach and engage with regulators on this issue, accepting to take the costs of remediation of historic pollution charges. They made a public announcement, that it was "*an expensive day, but a happy day*", which proved to be a watershed moment at the company. Mr. Leysen explained that it released pride in the company and created credibility, when previously the allegations had been a weight around the company's neck. It also "liberated" the employees, who had previously been trained to give the 'right', legal answer, which they never felt completely comfortable with.

This decision cost the company about €200 million, but it demonstrated that they really do mean what they say in the Umicore Way.

2. Self-reporting EHS non-compliance to the regulator

Mr. Leysen explained how an internal audit had discovered a longstanding issue whereby one department had been falsifying one of their key EHS metrics for a number of years. After some deliberation, senior management took the difficult decision to self-refer the issue to the authorities. Umicore had to invest almost €4 million to solve the issue, and the contracts of a number of individuals were terminated, but they were able to find an acceptable solution in the given timeframe. As a result of the proactive approach taken by the company, the regulator acted favourably.

Mr. Leysen also explained how they had made a case study of this event, and told the story at the next senior management meeting to illustrate what the Umicore Way actually meant in practice.

3. Engaging with cobalt miners in the Congo

Following the breakdown of formal, industrial cobalt mining in the country, only a small number of artisan miners were left for Umicore to be able to do business with. However, these often didn't meet their required standards. Consequently, Umicore developed a 'rule book' for suppliers, which explained what were the acceptable standards for supplying to them. They also set up a stringent audit system to ensure compliance with the rule book, and to provide assurances that no child labour was being used and that minimum safety standards were being adhered to. Eventually, they decided to withdraw from most of the mines, because the others only paid lip service to the Umicore guidelines.

This again had a business cost, as there were other operators who didn't require such rigorous standards to be observed, and were happy to continue using the mines which didn't meet Umicore's standards.

Before closing the session, Mr. Leysen also briefly shared his experience as Chairman of KBC. He explained how the company found a €7 billion accounting hole which almost brought the company down. The recovery required KBC to take state aid, which, over seven years, cost the company close to €3 billion in repayments. The group was able to find the funds to effect full repayment through strict discipline and refocusing. Mr. Leysen explained that now the challenge for the management and the board is to keep the regained solidarity, ensure that the lessons are learnt and fully regain societal trust.

Concurrent Facilitated Discussions (1)

Business and Human Rights: concrete implementation of the Guiding Principles

Facilitator: Philip Jordan | Chairman of the Ethics Committee | Total SA

Moderator: Marie Agnes Vieitez | CEA

Rapporteur: Theresa Hinz | Atos

Friends, Romans, Countrymen Lend Me Your Ears

Facilitator: Barney Rosenberg | Vice President, Ethics and Business Conduct | Meggitt PLC

Moderator: Simon Webley | IBE

Rapporteur: Joyce Jones | BAE Systems

Conducting an E&C Risk Assessment in your Organisation

Facilitator: Steve Pegg | Senior Ethics Officer, EMEA | Lockheed Martin International

Moderator: Philippa Foster Back CBE | IBE

Rapporteur: Clare Norriss | BP

Navigating Internal Investigations that Cross Borders

Facilitator: Katie Rowen | Senior Director, Ethics and Business Conduct Office of the General Counsel

Global Headquarters | Raytheon Company

Moderator: Moira McGinty Klos | ECI

Rapporteur: Dan Johnson | IBE

Ethics & Compliance: why are the two better than one?

Facilitator: Magali Herbaut | VP Ethics & Policies | Schneider Electric

Moderator: Cedric Dubar | Group Ethics & Compliance Officer | Dassault Systèmes

Rapporteur: Judith Houston | LEGO

Concurrent Facilitated Discussions (2)

Cultural Differences between Asia, Americas, EU and Middle East: the effect on ethical and compliance standards

Facilitator: Marie-Agnes Vieitez | Head of Ethics & Compliance Programme, Corporate E&C Officer | Airbus Group

Moderator: Cedric Dubar | Group Ethics & Compliance Officer | Dassault Systèmes

Rapporteur: Steve Pegg | Lockheed Martin International

Exploring the Business Case for Business Ethics

Facilitator: Tobais Goessling & Geert Demuijnck | Board Members | EBEN

Moderator: Tobais Goessling & Geert Demuijnck | EBEN

Rapporteur: Dan Johnson | IBE

Making the Difficult Choice: to do or not to do the deal

Facilitator: Sandra Middel | Regional Compliance Officer, EAME | Syngenta

Moderator: Philippa Foster Back CBE | IBE

Rapporteur: Alex Fell | GlaxoSmithKline GSK

How to Handle Unethical Managers who are Delivering High Performance

Facilitator: Annette Johnson | Director Global Business Ethics & Integrity | Prudential

Moderator: Ronnie Kann | ECI

Rapporteur: Ronnie Kann | ECI

Compliance as a Cultural Managerial Discipline

Facilitator: Dr. Eberhard Schnebel | Group Risk Management | Commerzbank

Moderator: Simon Webley | IBE

Rapporteur: Jo Anne Hennigan | Michelin North America, Inc.

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:

- How does your organization measure program effectiveness? Do you use particular metrics?
- In your professional development, what has been the training or educational experience that most impacted your success in the ethics and compliance function?
- What types of training does your organization offer to employees? C-Suite? The Board of Directors? How do you keep your training programs innovative and engaging?

Friday

29 January

Plenary Session

Big Data, Larger Ethical Responsibilities – board assurance for preserving brand, revenue and reputation

Dr Claudia Natanson, Founder, Security Practitioners Ltd

In this session Dr Claudia Natanson shared her experiences of Information Security, helping participants better understand the current security landscape. She also offered a number of challenges which companies need to address to ensure that they are “*breach ready*”.

Claudia began the session by offering a definition of Big Data, which consisted of the four ‘V’s’ of Big Data:

1. **Volume** – in Big Data, organisations are dealing in terabytes and petabytes of information. By way of an illustration, 1 terabyte of data is the equivalent of 2,000 hours of high quality audio.
2. **Variety** – information from all parts of the business, and from a variety of sources (text, email, video, audio, etc.) can now be pulled together and analysed to make strategic decisions.
3. **Velocity** – the speed at which the data is both collected, and used.
4. **Veracity** – the integrity of the data. Organisations need to trust that the data they have is correct, and that they can make decisions with confidence, so that it has value (which could be considered by some to be a fifth ‘V’).

The observation was also made that due to the scale and the speed of technological change, trying to address security concerns is like trying to catch a moving target.

The remainder of the session was spent discussing the way in which this “*tidal wave*” of technology is transforming 21st century organisations, and how the business world is unprepared for its impact, through three overarching questions:

1. Can the traditional way boards manage ethics be effective in a transformed organisation which is now totally information centric and risk based?
2. How are the ethical challenges presented by new regulations and updated standards being adequately reviewed and addressed? How are decisions being pushed down through the organisation?
3. How are organisations re-organising to harness the power of Big Data and new ways of working, while remaining true to their ethical responsibilities?

Specific examples of business factors impacted by this were also given:

- Business and strategic planning is being impacted by the insights which can now be achieved from Big Data.
- Organisational cultures are changing, and the prominence of BYOD (Bring Your Own Device), where employees are matching pleasure and work on one device, is increasing.
- Legal boundaries, regulations and global standards are shifting, and a recent ISO standard now puts personal accountability on directors for information security.

The specific ethical dilemma faced by many organisations of balancing the improved customer experience which can be achieved from data analytics, with the responsibility of protecting the customer/consumer/client, was also addressed. On this, Claudia challenged participants to consider “*how much data is too much?*”, questioning, at what stage should an organisation stop collecting data on its customers? She also emphasised another question which should be addressed: “*who decides?*”

Claudia then moved on to give further insight into the current security landscape by sharing a series of worrying statistics and observations:

- In 2015, Hacktivists were responsible for 58% of data theft, primarily in the form of “*denial of service*” attacks, where they are bringing down systems to deny an online service provided by the organisation.
- Hackers were also identified as being very smart. They will often find a weakness in the system, take as much data as they can, and then exit the system, fixing the weakness for you and covering their tracks.
- Only 19% of organisations have the capabilities to detect whether they have had an intrusion.
- On average it takes 170-180 days to detect the breach.
 - However, if the breach is committed by someone internal, then the average rises to 259 days.
- 59% of breaches are committed by insiders.
 - Of these, 84% were from people with ‘normal’ levels of access to the network.

Information about the impact of a data breach was also shared with participants. From Claudia’s experience, the average cost of a security breach was said to be €62 per document. She also spoke of the reputational damage which could be incurred, which is not something that you can put a value figure on.

Claudia concluded the session by giving some tips for mitigating the risks of a security breach. First, organisations need to proactively set their risk appetite. This needs to be spoken about, and a framework needs to be put in place that everyone can utilise. However, you need to be careful when putting in controls as ‘shadow IT’, where employees find ways around controls which they consider to be overly restrictive, is rapidly growing.

Second, in-sourcing and outsourcing are specific risk areas which need to be considered, especially in relation to risks which appear in the data supply chain. This requires Information Security and Cyber resilience planning.

Third, there are a number of new requirements on boards which they need to specifically address. Recent regulations have made both the CFO and the CEO legally responsible for data security in an organisation (specifically those companies listed on the NASDAQ), with potential punishments including jail sentences.

Finally, participants were given a number of questions which their CEO should be able to address following a data breach, as it’s not a case of if you’re going to have a breach, it’s a case of when. This is because there is no such thing as 100% security assurance. There is, however, 100% effort and that does go a long way.

These questions are:

- What data was taken?
- What system did it come from?
- How did it happen?
- Who did this? Was it an insider or an outsider? What was the motivation?

- Is the attack actually finished?
- Can it happen again?

A company will be pressured at time to be able to answer these questions in less than 72 hours of detecting a breach in order to retain trust, which is crucial to successfully navigating a data breach.

Concurrent Facilitated Discussions (3)

Rebuilding Trust Once It's Been Lost

Facilitator: Hans van Lent | Deputy Business Unit Compliance Officer | Siemens Belgium

Moderator: Geert Demuijnck | EBEN

Rapporteur: Dan Johnson | IBE

Supply Chain Audit for Ethical Standards

Facilitator: Magda Carrasco | Sustainable Procurement Director | L'ORÉAL

Moderator: Cedric Dubar | Group Ethics & Compliance Officer | Dassault Systèmes

Rapporteur: Magali Herbaut | Schneider Electric

Building and Improving Credibility of the E&C Professional

Facilitator: Ronnie Kann | ECI

Moderator: Ronnie Kann | ECI

Rapporteur: Ronnie Kann | ECI

Innovation in Communication and Training

Facilitator: Peter Holmes | Ethics Partner & Anita Aul | Director | Deloitte LLP

Moderator: Simon Webley | IBE

Rapporteur: Judith Houston | LEGO

How Does Your Programme Develop Tomorrow's Leaders?

Facilitator: Alex Fell | Head GEC Strategy, Operations and Planning | GlaxoSmithKline GSK

Moderator: Philippa Foster Back CBE | IBE

Rapporteur: Madeleine Duverne | UNICEF

Plenary Session

Identifying Best Practice in Speak-Up Arrangements

Dr Wim Vandekerckhove, Principal Lecturer in Organisational Behaviour, University of Greenwich

In this session, participants were presented with the preliminary findings from Wim's current research (funded by ACCA Global and ESRC UK) into how organisations can implement effective speak up (whistleblowing) arrangements. He shared insights regarding the impact of key variables, including time, organisational support, responsiveness and independence, on the effectiveness on such arrangements. He also spoke about methods of measuring effectiveness, before offering a practical application of the research.

The research was focused on four different organisations: a UK healthcare firm, a multi-national engineering firm, a multi-national banking firm and a Southeast Asian government agency. The [final report](#) has now been published.

Wim began by explaining how speaking up (whistleblowing) forms a key means of addressing dangerous wrongdoing and dysfunctional behaviour in organisations. He also made it clear that blowing the whistle should be a process of both raising concerns, and also responding to the issues which have been raised.

The impact of four variables on the effectiveness of arrangements were explained. These variables were:

- Time
- Organisational support
- Responsiveness, and
- Independence.

First, time was revealed to be an important variable in the perceived effectiveness of the arrangements, as the prominence with which each of the channels offered is used varies over time. It was observed that at the beginning of the process the question channel, or ethics advice line, was the most frequently used. However, after a while, and as the trust in this mechanism grew, the use of the 'external' hotline increased. After another while, the level of usage of this channel also decreased, and the local ethics and compliance officers became the most used source. However, this process was certainly not always a straight line.

The second variable considered was the level of organisational support offered. Trust is required where there is an uncertainty, and this is true for both sides involved with speak up arrangements. Those raising their concerns will be uncertain about how their concern will be received or dealt with. However, those operating the arrangements may also be faced with a number of uncertainties, so they also need to have trust in the arrangements. Therefore, the effectiveness of the arrangements was considered to be positively related to the level of organisational support offered.

Third, the company's perceived responsiveness to issues raised affects employee confidence in the arrangements. Barriers to employee confidence in the arrangements observed in the research included:

- how anonymous reports were handled
- vague communication of outcomes (even where there were legal limitations about what could be said)
- invisibility of corrective actions taken, and
- retaliation against the whistleblower.

Another barrier to the effectiveness of arrangements was found amongst middle management. The research found that in some instances, even where the tone from the top is good, companies struggle to act on concerns which had been raised until the CEO became involved. In these situations, it was observed that once the concern landed in the right place, it was dealt with effectively. However, it was often difficult to get it there.

Conversely, good responsiveness was observed to have a positive impact on employee confidence in the arrangements. Examples of good practice observed during the research included:

- good communication of policies, including the message that responding is part of a manager's task
- prescribed rules for referring concerns to appropriate persons within the organisation
- word of mouth sharing of positive experiences, and
- intranet visibility of concerns and action orientated responses.

Fourthly, the perceived independence of those operating the system is important in building credibility. Having an independent function overseeing the arrangements allows specialisation, which in turn allows a process based response to concerns which have been raised (as opposed to a more arbitrary response). In the long run, this also permits pattern recognition, so that you're able to make connections between events which may have originally seemed unrelated.

Wim also shared his observations of the challenges of measuring the effectiveness of speak up arrangements. The first challenge which they needed to overcome was measuring the trust in the arrangements. This is because trust is commonly talked about as a static variable – you measure it at certain points in time and there is either more or less of it. Instead, trust should be considered as dynamic. The approach that was taken in the research was a process view of trust – where it is not a question of how much trust, but how each of the different “*trusting practices*” enables speaking up.

The second challenge observed was related to the common reliance on the number of contacts as a measure of effectiveness. Organisations want to know the numbers, but they commonly don't know the benchmark against which they wish to compare themselves. Wim also raised a point of caution to organisations which are over-dependent on the number of contacts received, by posing the question: do you really want more concerns reported? This is because the organisation's ability to respond to the concerns adequately is of utmost importance in trying to build trust in the arrangements and the processes. If you are unable to deal with the current number of concerns raised in a satisfactory way, then you should not wish for more. To add to this confusion, it was remarked that the research companies also spent a large amount of time wondering about what constituted a speak up connection – if and when to consider contacts from each channel, including those raised in person. The findings did, however, reveal that the company which captured all concerns, including those raised locally, were the most confident about their arrangements.

Lastly, Wim shared one of the conclusions from the research, which suggests that whilst organisational agency (the extent to which the organisation is in control of the trusting practices) is limited, the control that companies do have is crucial in building the effectiveness of the speak up arrangements. This means that organisations should offer many different channels of interaction, and observe which ones are used most frequently (and how this changes over time) – they should attempt to read their speak up culture, as opposed to writing it. They should also respond, and be seen to be responding, to what is raised, even if it is not what was hoped for.

Looking Ahead: recent lessons and new challenges

To wrap up this year's forum, three senior conference participants were invited to share their highlights of the two days in Brussels, as well as the challenges they are expecting to face in 2016.

Mic Yaxley, Ethics and Compliance Director, CH2M Hill

Mic's highlights of the forum included the assurances provided by others of a number of issues, including:

- the insight that having a strong ethical culture reduces the need for the compliance activities
- the impact of having the right tone at the top
- the importance of operational experience, and the value that it adds to the ethics and compliance role.

Mic also outlined the challenges he currently faces in CH2M Hill as:

- engaging all staff across the organisation which encompasses three generations
- continuing to win the hearts and minds of staff, when 50% of employees have been with the company less than 5 years.

Finally, he also outlined his priorities for 2016:

- refocusing attention on the company's ethics ambassadors, re-launching the network and making sure that they are properly equipped
- ensuring the robustness of supplier due diligence
- continuing to seek an answer to the question, "how do we know we are as ethical as we think we are?"
- implementing IBE's SayNoToolkit App.

Sandra Middel, Regional Compliance Officer EAME, Syngenta

Sandra also picked up on a number of similar themes as her highlights of the forum:

- reinforcing the need importance of ethical leadership
- ensuring that the leadership of the organisation is well informed about the activities of the E&C function
- the importance of asking probing questions, such as "*is what we are doing ethical?*", "*is our programme the right one?*", because common sense can lead you in the wrong direction.

Sandra returned to big data and technology as her main challenge going forward, questioning how prepared the ethics function was to meet these challenges.

Barney Rosenberg, Vice President, Ethics & Business Conduct, Meggitt PLC

Finally, Barney shared his observations as an EBEF 'veteran', with 2016 being his 10th consecutive EBEF. He reflected on changing emotions over this time saying that 10 years ago EBEF was considered to be the greatest gift for a new ethics manager. Five years ago the sentiment had changed to "not EBEF again". However, he paid testament to the forum saying that he was still there, and the forum was now as valuable as ever, highlighting the support network provided as its unparalleled strength.

He concluded by remarking that the prospects for the future of business is terrifying, but ethics and compliance can bring a sense of control and calm to the organisation.

Forum Dinner

Dinner on Thursday evening was held at the Théâtre du Vaudeville.

Speakers



Thomas Leysen

Chairman

Umicore, Corelio and KBC

Thomas Leysen (born 1960) is a Belgian businessman. He obtained a law degree at the Katholieke Universiteit Leuven. Thomas Leysen became Chairman of Umicore in November 2008 after having served as Chief Executive Officer of Umicore since 2000. He is also the chairman of Corelio, the largest media group in the low countries and since 2011 of KBC, a mid-size banking and insurance group. He was president of the Belgian Federation of Enterprises in Belgium and holds board functions in several cultural and philanthropic organisations in Belgium and abroad.



Dr Claudia Natanson

FBCS CITP, CISSP

Founder

Security Practitioners Ltd

An Information and Cyber Security Leader with over 15 year's global experience in implementing security for large global IT transformation programmes. Working at board level across diverse sector FTSE 100, Fortune 500 companies as well as government she helps organisations embed security into the cultural fabric of their organisations as well as understand what is needed to secure and maintain brand, revenue and reputation. The founder of Security Practitioners, she has served on the Board of the world Forum of Incident Response and Security Teams (FIRST) and also held the post of Programme Chair and Steering Committee member. Currently the Chair of the Corporate Executive Programme (CEP) which brings together senior and C- level leaders for whom risk, security, privacy are priority items on their agendas, she is active across Europe in the area of networks, security and policy and a regular speaker and journal contributor in the security industry. She continues to be involved in global projects and US Federal Security initiatives.

Dr Natanson holds a B.Sc. in Nuclear Chemistry, MSc. in Computer Science and a Ph.D. in Computers and Education. She is a CISSP, a Chartered IT Professional, Certified ISO27001 Lead Auditor and a Fellow of the British Computing Society.



Dr Wim Vandekerckhove

Principal Lecturer in Organisational Behaviour

University of Greenwich

Dr Wim Vandekerckhove holds a Phd in Applied Ethics from Ghent University. He is now Principal Lecturer in Organisational Behaviour at the University of Greenwich, where he teaches Business Ethics.

He has been researching whistleblowing for more than 10 years. His work has been published in various academic journals, reports (Whistleblowing - The Inside Story, UK Public Attitudes to Whistleblowing, Freedom to Speak Up), and books including Whistleblowing and Organisational Social Responsibility (Ashgate), Ethics in an Era of Globalisation (Ashgate), Questioning Cosmopolitanism (Springer), Labor and Global Justice (Routledge), Whistleblowing and Democratic Values (IWRN), and International Research Handbook on Whistleblowing (Edward Elgar).

He has provided expertise for various organisations, including Transparency International, Public Concern at Work, the Whistleblower Advice Centre in the Netherlands, and the Council of Europe. He was recently commissioned by the UK Department of Health to do qualitative research on the implementation of speak up arrangements in the NHS. He is currently undertaking case study research financed by ACCA Global and ESRC into internal and external speak up arrangements in various industries.

More about your **EBEF** hosts

Cercle d'Éthique des Affaires (CEA) of France

The Cercle d'Éthique des Affaires was founded in 1993 and is the longest serving Ethics and Compliance Association in France. In 2011, its Articles of Association were amended to keep abreast with the evolution of the profession with the goal to become a leading think tank where researchers and practitioners freely exchange on Ethics and Compliance.



The CEA is first and foremost a trusted place where Ethics and Compliance professionals i.e. officers in corporations and organisations come to meet their peers, discuss, benchmark, learn, share, etc. on a confidential basis, in a format especially designed for them –the “Club des Professionnels de l'Éthique” (Ethics and Compliance Professionals Club).

The CEA offers various activities to help strengthen its members' professional practice from “reflecting” on prospective topics, to “learning” about a new law, and “doing” practical case studies in small working groups or conducting specific benchmark and surveys. For example, in 2015 it conducted a European survey on Whistleblowing.

The CEA also organizes book reviews with writers in the “Librairie de l'Éthique” (Ethics Book Club) and “Focus Groups” where a specific Ethics and Compliance topic is “studied” by practitioners with the help of an outside expert.

European Business Ethics Network (EBEN)

The European Business Ethics Network (EBEN) is a membership driven organisation concerned with promoting business ethics education and training as well as improving practices throughout Europe. It was established in 1987 in Brussels and is the only European network focused exclusively on business ethics and business ethics education. EBEN has over 1,100 members representing 40 countries.



EBEN National Networks exist in Germany, Spain, the UK, the Netherlands, Poland, Belgium, France, Turkey, Austria, Greece, Cyprus, Finland, Italy, Israel, Switzerland, Ireland, Ukraine & Scandinavia.

In a dynamic social and political environment, EBEN supports business persons by offering an international network of academically informed competencies in the field of business ethics and related fields such as corporate social responsibility, accountability, and corporate citizenship. It offers an unparalleled arena for exchanging information on business initiatives and best practices.

EBEN's diversity of membership means there are always many varied views within the group about business ethics. EBEN is an inclusive network and accepts plurality of perspectives.

Ethics & Compliance Initiative (ECI) of the United States

The Ethics & Compliance Initiative (ECI) empowers its members across the globe to operate their businesses at the highest levels of integrity through research and best practices, networking and certification opportunities. Through its membership, ECI represents more than 450 entities across nearly every industry, each dedicated to promoting integrity in organisations worldwide. ECI's more than 1,400 members are located in 37 countries on six continents around the globe.



ECI's signature study, the National Business Ethics Survey® (NBES), which is expanding globally, is the most rigorous study of American perceptions of ethics in the workplace. The study has been conducted nine times since its inception in 1994. ECI also offers the most comprehensive survey methods and benchmarks available, enabling organizations to measure their program impact against other organizations and national averages.

ECI's membership community connects global practitioners, thought-leaders, academicians and partners by providing in-person and online events, webcasts, best practice groups, presentations and networking opportunities to foster the advancement of the E&C industry.

ECI's certification program (Leading Professional in Ethics & Compliance [LPEC]) is the primary professional E&C designation. LPEC covers all facets of E&C theory and practice, and individuals that pass the LPEC exam and achieve the LPEC designation have proven that they have the skills needed to create and manage an effective E&C program.

ECI is comprised of the Ethics Research Center (ERC), the Ethics & Compliance Association (ECA) and the Ethics & Compliance Certification Institute (ECCI). ECI is based in Arlington, Virginia and Waltham, Massachusetts.

Institute of Business Ethics (IBE)

The Institute of Business Ethics was established in 1986 by businesses to encourage high standards of business behaviour based on ethical values. It is a UK registered charity (No. 1084014).

The IBE raises public awareness of the importance of doing business ethically and collaborates with other UK and international organisations with interests and expertise in business ethics.

It helps organisations strengthen their ethical culture and encourage high standards of business behaviour based on ethical values. The IBE helps organisations across the globe provide guidance to their staffs and build relationships of trust with their principal stakeholders through its advice, publications, events, training and education activities.

To fulfil the institute's vision and mission, its team members help organisations by applying their practical business experience to the difficult ethical issues that companies face. The IBE is based in London and is supported by corporate and individual subscribers.





London

2017

1-3 February

Sharing Ideas & Successful Practices



EUROPEAN
**Business
Ethics**
FORUM

**Please join us
for the 2017 EBEF!**

Park Plaza
Victoria
London

More information to come on the EBEF website: www.ebef.eu