The Business Codes of the Fortune Global 200

What the largest companies in the world say and do
Table of contents

Foreword 4

Key figures 6

1. Definition 8

2. Prevalence 9

3. Drivers 10

4. Content 12

5. Two types of code 18

6. Differences in content and type of code between geographic regions and business sectors 20
   6.1 Differences between regions 20
   6.2 Differences in content between business sectors 21

7. Embedding 22
   1. Communication and training 22
   2. HR policy 23
   3. Other policy measures 25
   4. Monitoring, auditing and reporting 27

8. Four phases of implementation 28

9. Conclusions 30

10. Recommendations 32

Methodology 34

Acknowledgements 34

About KPMG 35

About Rotterdam School of Management, Erasmus University 35

© 2014 KPMG Advisory N.V.
Foreword

Over the last 20 years, KPMG has supported many companies in the development, implementation and monitoring of their business codes (hereafter ‘codes’) and their broader ethics and compliance programmes. This whitepaper illustrates the most important results emerging from a recent study that KPMG conducted in conjunction with RSM Erasmus University into the prevalence, content and embedding of codes among the Fortune Global 200 companies.

In 2008, we conducted a similar desk-research and survey among the Fortune Global 200 companies. This whitepaper illustrates differences in the content of codes compared to 2008, touches upon differences between regions and industries with regard to the content and prevalence of codes, and highlights the progress that has been made since 2008 with respect to the measures that companies take to embed their codes internally.

A properly implemented code is an increasingly important instrument for today’s companies. A code contributes to a company’s strategic positioning, identity and reputation, culture and work climate, and to its financial performance. The need for a code which is fully embedded internally is also driven by (new) laws and regulations which require companies to implement adequate measures to foster a desired culture and to prevent misconduct.

One of the major outcomes of our survey is that, today, the main reasons for adopting and implementing a code are more intrinsically driven than we found in 2008. At that time, the main driver was to comply with laws and regulations. Nowadays a code is seen far more as an important instrument for creating a shared company culture and steering and improving the behaviour of employees rather than a necessity to reassure regulatory bodies. Companies are increasingly seeking a code that is comprehensive and not only focused on what employees can and cannot do. These days, codes are commonly used to serve many more purposes, such as defining the company’s long-term goals, stating the company’s vision on successful business, defining social responsibilities and addressing dilemmas and encouraging a culture in which people speak up. The content of a code should reflect the (desired) culture of a company and is most effective when it is customised to the specific risks, dilemmas, and ambitions of the company.
This shift in the goals of a code is also visible in the core values that are included in codes. These are now focused more on the company culture (e.g. honesty and responsibility), while in 2008 they were mainly focused on the company’s brand (e.g. innovation and client focus).

Compared to 2008, the current codes are more often a combination of principle- and rule-based. On the one hand, companies rely on the sound judgment of their employees and empower them to take the right decision with the code as a guide while, on the other hand, companies include more detailed rules in the code governing certain topics in order to comply with laws and regulations.

Our desk-research shows differences in the content of codes between regions. Asian and US companies more frequently use a rule-based code, while companies that are originally European more often choose a principle-based code. Asian companies often do not include their responsibilities to employees and other stakeholders, while European companies also pay significant attention to the responsibilities that the company has to its employees. Companies originating from the US are more likely to mention politics or the government as a party that must be taken into account while doing business. Such statements have not been found in codes from European or Asian companies.

Surprisingly we did not find substantial differences in the content of the codes between different industries. Small differences were visible, such as more focus on customers in client-orientated businesses, but the content of the codes seems primarily to relate to the region of origin and not the sector.

Over the last six years, companies have been taking more measures to embed their codes into everyday business, such as formal inclusion of the code in decision-making procedures and the establishment of an ethics committee to provide answers to dilemmas. However, the majority of companies have only implemented measures which are tightly connected to the code (training and whistleblower mechanisms), while the frontrunners include the code and accompanying values in many more business processes.

Considering the critical importance of codes and compliance programmes in today’s business environment, we hope that this whitepaper provides a clear understanding of the trends in code development, implementation, and monitoring, as well as differences between business sectors and regions. We also hope that it inspires ideas for embedding your code into your organisation.

**Muel Kaptein**
Partner at KPMG and professor at RSM Erasmus University

**Friso Bons**
Manager at KPMG

© 2014 KPMG Advisory N.V.
Key figures

Code prevalence

- The vast majority of Fortune Global 200 companies have a code: currently 76%.

- When this is compared to our 2008 study, the figure has dropped. This is mainly due to the larger number of Asian companies in the Fortune Global 200 list: only 42% of Asian companies in the Fortune Global 200 have a code.

- Older codes are being updated: 64% of the companies that have had a code for more than three years have updated their codes during the last three years.

Content and drivers

- The three most common drivers of code adoption are:
  1. To create a shared company culture;
  2. To improve staff behaviour;
  3. To protect/improve the corporate reputation.

- These drivers differ from the 2008 study. At that time, the most important driver was to comply with legal requirements.

- The most commonly cited core values are:
  1. Integrity (50%);
  2. Respect (36%);
  3. Honesty (34%);
  4. Responsibility (27%);
  5. Trust (26%).

- Changes in this respect have taken place in comparison to the 2008 survey. At that time, teamwork, innovation and client focus were in the top five, whereas honesty, responsibility and trust were not. The other two values in the top five remained the same.

- Codes are most often directed at employees. Corporate responsibilities to shareholders are discussed in less than one third of the codes.

- More than 75% of the codes discuss the responsibilities of employees regarding confidential information, accuracy of reporting (fraud), protection of corporate property, and dealing with gifts and entertainment. This percentage is rising: in 2008, 70% addressed these issues.
• Most codes contain a combination of principles and rules: 5% of the codes are entirely principle-based, 22% entirely rule-based.

• These findings show a significant contrast with the findings in 2008. At that time, 13% were principle-based, 35% rule-based.

Embedding codes

• On average, US companies have taken more measures to implement their codes than European and Asian companies.

• More than 80% of the companies use e-learning modules to implement their code.

• More than 80% of the companies have an ethics hotline/whistleblower mechanisms.

• More than 80% of the companies have policies to enforce their codes and to investigate violations.

• Less than half of the companies monitor compliance with the code in their business units or have external reporting on compliance.
1. Definition

Academics and practitioners alike use a variety of names for a code

These include the following:

- Business code;
- Business principles;
- Behavioural standards;
- Code of conduct;
- Code of ethics;
- Code of integrity;
- Code of practice;
- Credo;
- Declaration;
- Deontological code;
- Philosophy;
- Policy principles;
- Standards;
- Values statement.

A code can be defined as follows:

A code is a document developed by and for a company as a guideline for the current and future behaviour of its managers and employees.¹

2. Prevalence

Our research into the Fortune Global 200 companies shows that, at present, 76% have their own code. In 2008, 86% of the Fortune Global 200 companies had a code. This decrease can be explained by the relative increase of Asian companies included in the Fortune Global 200 list. Asian companies are less likely to have a code, and the increasing number of Asian companies in the Fortune Global 200 reduces the total percentage. From 2001 to 2014, there has been significant change in the geographical distribution of the companies in the Global 500 rankings, from which the Global 200 is derived. The number of US-based companies reduced from 215 in 2001 to 144 in 2011, whereas the contribution of Asian-based companies increased significantly, from 116 in 2001 to 188 in 2011. The share of European-based companies increased marginally, from 158 in 2001 to 160 in 2011.

However, when comparing the presence of codes per region, we can see an overall increase among US and European companies and a slight decrease among Asian companies. In 2008, all US firms in the Fortune Global 200 had a code, while this applied to only 52% of the Asian companies and 80% of the European companies. In 2014, all US firms still have a code, while the percentage for European companies has increased to 88%, compared to 42% for Asian companies. This indicates that, although the overall percentage declined, the general use of codes in the US and Europe has increased.

Figure 1: The prevalence of codes by region
3. Drivers

The Fortune Global 200 companies give a wide range of reasons for developing a code. Figure 2 highlights the most common of these. The data revealed that each company with a code identified at least five ‘important’ to ‘very important’ reasons for establishing its code, suggesting the flexibility and broad utility of codes by organisations.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason for having a code</th>
<th>Not important</th>
<th>Somewhat important</th>
<th>Important</th>
<th>Very important</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. To create a shared company culture</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>96%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. To protect/improve company reputation</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>82%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. To improve staff behaviour</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>82%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. To comply with legal requirements</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>78%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. To meet stakeholder expectations</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>74%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. To be a socially responsible company</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>59%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. To improve the company’s competitive position</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. To decrease liability in case of misconduct</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. To prevent additional external regulation</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 2: Reasons for having a code

Creating a shared company culture is regarded as the most important reason for implementing a code. 96% of the respondents classified this as a very important reason for having a code, compared to 81% in 2008. This indicates a change in perception in comparison to 2008, when compliance with legal obligations was considered the most important reason (85% in 2008 compared to 78% in 2014). This reflects the increased focus of companies on defining desirable and undesirable behaviour and establishing a working climate that they believe will lead to the best results.
Other highly important drivers are to protect/improve the company reputation and to improve staff behaviour. Lesser reasons for developing a code are to prevent additional external regulation, to decrease liability in the event of misconduct, and to improve the company’s competitive position.

The aforementioned drivers for developing and implementing a code are far more intrinsically driven than they were in 2008. A shift from a regulatory-driven motivation toward a motivation driven more by the company values and behaviour is clearly visible. This is also in line with the increased attention of regulators on a company’s culture. Whereas the focus has long been on complying with rules and regulations, the focus is now more on how companies have been implementing their codes and how they are improving the company culture. Having a code is seen as a simple necessity and it is now recognised that it is the implementation of this code that can truly make a difference.

**Figure 3: Reasons for having a code 2008-2014**
4. Content

A code can consist of various layers of information. The structure of these layers can be depicted as a code pyramid consisting of four layers. The lower the layer, the more extensive, detailed and technical the information in the codes usually is. At the top is (1) the mission and vision of the organisation with, directly underneath, (2) the organisation’s core values, followed by (3) its responsibilities to the stakeholders. The lowest layer comprises (4) the standards and rules for managers and employees. These code elements are often integrated, together forming the company’s ethical backbone. The different layers do not necessarily have to be integrated in one document. Companies sometimes choose to elaborate on one or more layers in separate documents.

Figure 4: Layers of a code

1. Mission and vision

The mission comprises a powerful formulation of the company’s strategic objectives and states what the organisation stands for. It is oriented around the question of the organisation’s ‘raison d’être’, ‘purpose’ and ‘Leitmotiv’. A vision sets forth how the company views itself, its stakeholders, the internal and external factors affecting its development, and the applicable assumptions.
One fifth of the codes of the Fortune Global 200 companies describe the organisation’s mission and/or vision. For example, AXA defines its mission as follows: “The AXA Group’s ambition is to become a global leader in its core business, financial protection.” Freddie Mac expresses its mission as: “to provide liquidity, stability, and affordability to the US housing market.”

What is striking is that the more detailed the code, the less frequently it contains a mission statement.

2. Core values

Core values (sometimes also called corporate values) are often derived from the company mission. Core values focus on the intentions of managers and employees. They do not, however, give any concrete indications for behaviour. For example, General Motors identifies integrity, teamwork, and innovation as its core values. Verizon opts for the core values of integrity, respect, performance excellence, and accountability.

43% of the codes of Fortune Global 200 companies describe their core values in their code. A quarter of these companies formulate five or more core values. The most cited values are shown in figure 5.

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Integrity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Respect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Honesty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Responsibility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Trust</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Customer oriented</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Performance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Open communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>Teamwork/cooperation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>Innovation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 5:** The core values most frequently cited in codes
The Business Codes of the Fortune Global 200

Integrity is again the most cited core value. The only core value new in the top ten compared to 2008 is performance, with professionalism no longer in the list. However, the ranking of the most common core values has changed slightly. Ethical values (i.e. integrity, respect, honesty and responsibility) rank slightly higher than they did in 2008. Values which are more business driven (i.e. customer oriented, performance, innovation) rank lower than in 2008.

3. Responsibilities to stakeholders

A company’s mission and values can be translated into responsibilities which the company believes it has toward its stakeholders. Some codes describe the responsibilities to stakeholders in a single sentence. For example, Philips says that it “wishes to be a responsible partner in society, acting with integrity toward its shareholders, customers, employees, suppliers and business partners, competitors, governments and their agencies, and others who can be affected by its activities.”
However, responsibilities are often described uniquely for different stakeholders:

- Toward customers: For example, Cardinal Health describes its responsibilities toward its customers as: “Our interactions with customers should focus on developing mutually beneficial business relationships so our customers can focus on their patients”;

- Toward shareholders: For example, Shell defines its responsibilities toward its shareholders as: “To protect shareholders’ investment, and provide a long-term return competitive with those of other leading companies in the industry”;

- Toward competitors: For example, Daimler defines its responsibilities toward its competitors as: “Competition motivates and inspires excellence. Our goal is to do the best business with the best products in a decent manner. Accordingly, we treat our competitors fairly and cooperate with our business partners and customers respectfully and in a spirit of trust. These common principles form the basis for these relationships and are meant to guide our business transactions”;

- Toward the environment: For example, Total describes its responsibilities regarding the environment as: “Total is actively involved in environmental stewardship as part of its clear-cut commitment to sustainable development”;

- Toward employees: Volkswagen expresses its responsibility for its employees explicitly: “We create an environment which provides personal and professional prospects for our employees, in which exceptional performance and results can be achieved and which promotes employability of our employees. We invest in the skills and competence of our employees”;

- Toward society: Samsung states in its code: “We sincerely execute our basic responsibilities as a corporate citizen. Employees are encouraged to endeavour to build trust within the local community by fulfilling their duties and responsibilities”.

Figure 7 depicts the orientation of codes toward various stakeholders. In almost all codes, the descriptions of the company’s responsibilities toward its employees exceed one paragraph. This may be explained by the fact that employees are also the main addressees and representatives of the codes and are seen as the company’s main asset. Figure 8 depicts the specific responsibilities companies cite as having to their employees. Compared to 2008, the responsibilities toward society increased in importance from position 6 (61%) to position 2. This can partly be explained by the credit and financial crisis, after which companies were blamed for neglecting their responsibilities to society at large. Many companies have taken this into account and have described their responsibilities toward society more prominently and in more depth in their (updated) codes.
Figure 7: Responsibilities toward stakeholders

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stakeholder</th>
<th>Brief (1 sentence)</th>
<th>Average (1 paragraph)</th>
<th>Elaborate (more than 1 paragraph)</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Employees</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>95%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Society</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>79%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Natural environment</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Competitors</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Customers/consumer</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Government</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Business partners</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Shareholders</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 8: Specific responsibilities toward employees

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responsibility</th>
<th>Brief (1 sentence)</th>
<th>Average (1 paragraph)</th>
<th>Elaborate (more than 1 paragraph)</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Equality</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>85%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safe working conditions</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dignity/respect</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal development of employees</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Involving employees in decision-making</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good compensation</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Privacy of employees</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stable and secure job opportunities</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4. Standards and rules

The fourth layer of company codes consists of the standards and rules for employees and is therefore frequently the most extensive and elaborate section. Standards provide guidelines to managers and staff on how they should act in situations where clear-cut rules are impossible or undesirable. Often, standards are presented in codes as rules. Rules indicate more or less exactly what is and is not possible and acceptable. Rules of thumb are where standards and rules meet.

The most common issues that standards and rules apply to are summarised in figure 9. The most frequently addressed issue in this respect is confidential or secret information (93%). In general the most common issues do not differ significantly from 2008.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Brief (1 sentence)</th>
<th>Average (1 paragraph)</th>
<th>Elaborate (more than 1 paragraph)</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Dealing with confidential or secret information</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Corruption and bribery</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Accuracy of reporting (fraud)</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Protecting the organisation’s assets</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Accepting gifts</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Side-line activities (conflict of interest)</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Offering gifts</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Contacts with the media</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Use of company time</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 9: Staff responsibilities
Two approaches can be identified regarding whether or not to include concrete standards and rules in codes. 22% of the companies responding to our survey believe that a good code minimally contains standards and rules. However, 44% completely disagreed. Another 24% were neutral. The opinions also greatly differed regarding the extent to which a code should give employees the freedom to follow their own ethical judgment: 33% agreed and 46% disagreed.

These views appear to impact the content of codes. 5% of the codes we studied were entirely principle-based: they set out abstract expectations such as the mission, values and/or responsibilities toward stakeholders. 22% of the codes were wholly rule-based. These codes mainly contain detailed standards and rules. Almost three-quarters of the codes (73%) were a mix of general principles and detailed standards and rules. When compared to the results we found in 2008, this number has changed drastically. Six years ago, 13% of all codes were principle-based, 35% were rule-based and 52% a mix. This shows a tendency toward a more mixed version of codes.

This can be explained by two contrasting developments. Firstly, over the last few years, there has been a significant increase in legislation and enforcement which requires companies to set stringent rules regarding certain legislative areas such as export controls, bribery and sanctions. Legal requirements do not allow for much freedom of interpretation. As a consequence, for example, codes often include monetary thresholds for accepting gifts and exact rules on exporting goods to sanctioned countries. Secondly, however, employees seem to be being seen more as autonomous professionals who are able to make their own decisions within the given guidelines, with companies relying more on the sound judgment of their employees and empowering them to make the right decision.

Rule-based codes are almost always significantly more detailed than principle-based ones and, on average, are four times as lengthy. They are usually written in the second or third person singular (“you should, he/she is to”), are more commanding, predominantly prescriptive, and more legalistic. They are primarily for internal use. More US companies have such codes than companies based in other continents, which reflects the legal orientation that still drives the development of many US codes.
Principle-based codes are more generalised and abstract. They usually consist of a couple of pages at most. They are often written in the first person plural, are more positively formulated, prescriptive as well as descriptive (“the way we do things”), and are more intrinsically driven. They are not only for internal use but also to be distributed to external stakeholders. Comparatively, more European companies have such codes than US-based and Asian-based companies. The effectiveness of either type of code depends on many factors. A rule-based code creates clarity and uniformity, while a principle-based one is more accessible and flexible. As presented above, a growing number of companies use both types. Rule-based codes increasingly include the corporate mission, values, and responsibilities to stakeholders, so that staff can better understand what the norms and rules are based on. Principle-based codes are increasingly being extended to include standards and rules to make them more concrete.
6. Differences in content and type of code between geographic regions and business sectors

6.1 Differences between regions

Based on our research into the content of company codes, there is evidence of differences between companies from different regions, as follows:

• **The preference for a specific style of code seems to relate to the region of origin of the company**
  Our research shows differences in type of code based on origin of the company. Asian and US companies which tend to use a rule-based code, while companies that are originally European more frequently adopt a principle-based code. This suggests a difference in attitude: European codes often offer employees more space for their own interpretation and assessment of rules and standards, while Asian and US codes are more rigid.

• **Chinese companies mention stakeholders to a much lesser degree**
  Companies originating from China tend to formulate their codes solely in terms of the rules that employees must adhere to. This means that, in these codes, stakeholders such as society, the natural environment and shareholders are given very limited attention or no attention at all.

• **European companies tend to describe more the responsibilities of the company toward employees**
  Where US and Asian companies primarily focus on the responsibilities of employees toward their company, European companies also pay a lot of attention to the responsibilities that the company has toward its employees, such as guaranteeing a balance between work and private life, involving them in decision-making etc.

• **Although not all companies detail the company’s responsibilities to its employees, equality and discrimination are almost always mentioned**
  Where European companies tend to describe more the responsibilities of the company toward their employees, US and Asian companies attach to a certain extent also some value to the right of equality and non-discrimination. This is without a doubt true for US and European
companies but less so for Asian companies, which is mainly due to the focus of Asian codes on the rules that employees must adhere to rather than having a broader view.

- **US companies often mention politics or the government as stakeholders, whereas European and Asian companies do not**
  Companies originating from the US are more likely to mention politics or the government as a party that must be taken into account while doing business. Such statements have to a much lesser degree been found in codes from European or Asian companies.

### 6.2 Differences in content between business sectors

- **There are no significant differences regarding the mention of society and the natural environment between the various business sectors**
  Although it seemed likely that certain business sectors would pay more attention to society (such as the healthcare industry) because of their highly social profile, or to the natural environment (such as vehicles & transport and the oil, gas & energy industry) because of the high impact of their business activities on the environment, we found no significant differences. Whether or not these topics are mentioned in fact primarily relates to region of origin and not the sector.

- **Customers are more often mentioned by certain business sectors**
  The household items & groceries, healthcare and electronics sectors focus more on their responsibilities toward customers than the other business sectors distinguished in this research. This can be explained by the relatively close contact that companies in these sectors have with their clients, compared to sectors such as energy or technical services.

- **Responsibilities toward suppliers are more often mentioned by certain business sectors**
  The close relationships between companies in the household items & groceries, healthcare and electronics sectors and their customers also seems to influence their relationships with suppliers. Companies in these sectors describe their responsibilities toward suppliers more extensively than companies from other sectors.

- **Politics is mentioned significantly more by companies from the healthcare sector**
  Companies in the healthcare sector pay significantly more attention to politics in their codes than companies from other sectors. This might be due to the extensive rules and regulations this sector has to deal with.

- **There are no differences between sectors with regard to human rights**
  Before conducting our research, we believed it would be logical to find differences in the frequency that human rights are mentioned in company codes between sectors. For example, companies in the oil, gas & energy sector perform a lot of their activities in less-developed countries where human rights are not always respected. It seemed likely that they would put more emphasis on their role in protecting human rights. No such differences were identified however.
7. Embedding

Having a code is only the beginning. A code can be an extremely effective tool to achieve numerous business goals, thus once a code is adopted, it makes sense to put it to use. Additionally, many leading companies seek to have a ‘living’ document that guides the behaviour of their managers and staff. To achieve these benefits, it is important for the code to be effectively embedded throughout the organisation. The means of implementation can be divided into four clusters:

1. Communication and training;
2. HR policy;
3. Other policy measures;
4. Monitoring, auditing, and reporting.

1. Communication and training

85% of the companies we surveyed have issued their code to more than 95% of their personnel. Some of the ways in which codes are brought to people’s attention are:

- By including the code in letters or e-mails;
- By setting up a separate intranet site;
- By including a section on the code in the in-house magazine;
- By making copies of the code available at busy locations in the organisation (such as the reception, waiting rooms, and meeting rooms);
- By organising special information evenings and site visits;
- By printing different passages from the code on meeting agendas and minutes or on payslips, or by including them as banners on the website;

---

**Figure 11:** Some communication and training instruments offered by KPMG (illustrations 1 and 2)
• By referring to the code in speeches (such as at the New Year reception, the company broadcast, or at anniversaries) as well as at meetings and in other consultation gatherings;
• By developing interactive instruments such as digital/online games and dilemma applications for smart phones.

Training courses on the code are a much-used resource. At 90% of the companies, at least three-quarters of the managers had attended a classroom training session during the past three years. At 63% of the companies, more than three-quarters of the employees had undergone face-to-face or e-learning training during the past three years. Compared to 2008, these numbers have increased significantly: at that time, 74% and 56% respectively had undergone the aforementioned training.

Some of the purposes of such training programmes are:
• To strengthen the moral compass;
• To provide insight into the importance of the code;
• To incorporate the code into people’s personal behaviour;
• To establish model behaviour;
• To identify and deal with dilemmas;
• To provide instruments and teach staff to use them in order to implement the code more effectively.

2. HR policy

The code is also frequently assigned a prominent place in a company’s HR policy, taking on a range of forms.

Applicants

The company can inform new employees about the code in a variety of ways. Only at 4% of the companies surveyed was the code referred to during job interviews but, at 8% of the companies, the code was referred to in job advertisements. Background checks of future managers and employees are carried out by 56% and 44% of the companies respectively. None of the companies surveyed includes the code in applicants’ information packages but, at 60% of the companies, the code is part of the employment contract and as such part of the information package new hires receive. At 29% of the companies, the code is referred to during the induction programme for new employees.

Compared to 2008, these numbers have not changed significantly. What is striking is that only 29% of the companies refer to the code during their induction programmes, while these programmes are the ideal forum for familiarising new employees with the code.
Sign-off

Managers are required to acknowledge their receipt of the code at 56% of the companies, while employees must acknowledge this in one-third of the cases. These numbers have diminished since 2008. In 2008, 65% of the companies had their managers acknowledge receipt of the code and in half of the cases employees had to acknowledge receipt of the code. While in some jurisdictions there are legal reasons for ‘signing-off’, there are also many companies (mainly European) which are of the opinion that signing-off does not add any value to the implementation of the code and even stimulates a ‘tick the box’ mentality.

Sign-off takes place in various ways. The differences have to do with:

- Timing: personnel may acknowledge receipt of the code upon joining the company, once only (when first received) or periodically (as a rule annually) or as an integrated part of their employment contract;
- Role: all staff or only managers (of a certain level) and/or employees in positions where they may be more exposed to irregularities;
- Purpose: for receipt, as read, as approved, for retrospective compliance, or for prospective compliance;
- Scope: only relating to the individual or also to the persons managed.

Performance and assessment criteria

A code provides criteria for the assessment of managers and employees. At 44% of the companies, the code is a feature of the performance interview. At 30%, the remuneration and promotion criteria are directly related to compliance with the code. Since codes often include abstract criteria for desired behaviour it is necessary to translate these into concrete competencies. For example, companies that have included teamwork as a value in their code can develop key performance indicators that measure the teamwork showed by the employee. To steer and improve staff behaviour, the key performance indicators and (leadership) competencies should be aligned with the code and core values.

Sanctions/disciplinary policy

There are obligations attached to the code. 40% of our respondents believe that a sound indicator of the effectiveness of a code is whether people who violate it are dismissed. However, 21% totally disagreed with this view. In any event, it is important that the organisation has an effective and fair sanctions policy which describes the steps leading to a sanction being imposed and the penalty per type of violation. Three-quarters of the companies (76%) have a sanctions policy, which is a significant increase on 2008 (55%). Transparency regarding the possible sanctions and enforcing the code subsequently are important measures for steering the behaviour of employees. If employees have the feeling
(either perceived or based on facts) that their code is not (effectively) enforced, they will be less willing to adhere to the code than they would be if the code was visibly enforced effectively. There is an increase in companies which (externally) report on the number of violations of their code, such as in their annual report and/or sustainability report. Companies also internally communicate (anonymously) on these violations and the disciplinary measure that was enforced.

3. Other policy measures

Besides the communication and personnel policy, measures and activities can also be implemented in numerous other areas in order to anchor the code effectively in the organisation. The following are five such measures.

Risk analysis

Many firms are encouraged by law to take a risk-centred approach to their compliance and ethics programmes and to take adequate measures, including code development, to mitigate risks. This entails applying strategic risk analysis to generate insights into the organisation’s most significant risks, and shaping the code and compliance and ethics programmes around those risks. After all, different risks apply to a company in the construction industry than to a pharmaceutical company. The code should address the topics that cover the prioritised risks. Strategic risk analysis can also be used to assess, on a periodic basis, whether the code is still focused on the firm’s most important risks. Two-thirds of the companies (68%) carry out such an analysis on a periodic basis. This number was 56% in 2008. Companies which have had their code in place for several years can use the results of risk analysis to verify whether the code still reflects the risks that the company is currently facing. The same applies to the dilemmas that are documented during dilemma workshops. The topics around the dilemmas that are raised most frequently should probably be addressed in the code.

Decisions checklist

Decisions checklists are a useful way to include the code in companies’ everyday business decisions. Half of the companies (49%) use a checklist in their operations. These checklists can be used to incorporate the code by adding a question to the checklist as to whether the proposed decision complies with the code. These kinds of checklist are also used in boardrooms to verify whether a board decision is in line with the code.
Screening of business partners

Similar to the process for members of staff, external stakeholders can also be screened by reference to the code. More and more companies are seeking to push their codes out to their agents and suppliers, to find out, for example, whether supply chains involve any child labour or corruption. Companies are seeking business partners that observe the same ethical standards as they apply. The code can be a useful tool in this respect because it can establish clear standards of behaviour. Moreover, including a code in contracts with external business partners allows for screening regarding compliance with the code as a part of the contract provisions and also allows for termination of the contract in case of violation of the code. Many companies include a termination clause in contracts addressing breaches of the code. At 40% of the companies surveyed, stakeholders are screened against the code.

Whistleblower mechanisms and protections

Questions relating to difficult situations and signals relating to violations of the code should, first and foremost, be dealt with by direct line managers. However, this is not always enough. Employees can face barriers when it comes to raising certain issues, particularly if these are of a structural nature or if their manager is part of the problem. Particularly in the case of larger companies, the establishment of a safety net is important in this respect, often legally desirable and perhaps even obligatory (e.g. required under SOX legislation and several corporate governance codes). 89% of the companies with a code have, as a last resort, a confidential and/or anonymous hotline or ethics channel that employees can use to report misconduct or seek advice. These channels for raising concerns can either be provided by an external hotline provider or internally via, for example, the compliance office. Often a whistleblower and/or complaints procedure is desirable in order to set out the rules relating to the reporting and processing of alleged violations. The channel available for raising concerns is often mentioned in the company’s code. An investigation protocol, which is also in place in 90% of the companies, describes who carries out which investigation and when, and which procedures are to be complied with. The number of companies which do have a channel for raising concerns has increased in the past six years due to legal requirements but also due to the fact that companies want to have insights into all (imminent) breaches and want to avoid their employees having to report infringements externally.

Ethics committee, office and officers

Slightly more than one-third of the Fortune Global 200 companies surveyed have an ethics committee which meets regularly to discuss current issues and any queries that may have arisen. Employees can, for example, submit ethical questions, dilemmas, and suggestions to this committee of internal and/or external experts. Since more and more
companies are introducing (partly) principle-based codes, more guidance on dilemmas (conflicting values) might be required.

An ethics office is often an internal body that carries out a wide range of activities designed to stimulate compliance with the code and monitor compliance with the code. The committee often consists of various representatives (heads) of departments within the organization (e.g. HR, Internal Audit, Compliance and Legal) ranging from 5 to 13 people. Many companies also have one or more compliance or ethics officers (sometimes called ombudspersons), who can be approached to address dilemmas and questions regarding the code.

4. Monitoring, auditing and reporting

To ensure that specific attention is paid to raising the level of compliance with the code, it is advisable to include the code in the regular planning and control cycle. This is partly because supervisory bodies are paying more and more attention to the degree to which codes are being implemented, and partly because it makes sense from a business perspective in order to reap the full benefit of adopting a code. The code can serve as a basis for internal accountability (from employees to managers, from managers to the executive directors, and from the executive directors to the supervisory board) and for external accountability (to shareholders, other stakeholders and society in general). The frequency of such reporting can range from monthly to once every two or three years and can be by business unit or the company as a whole. The results can be checked by the company’s own auditors and/or a third party.

At 85% of the companies, compliance with the code is reported on periodically. In 44% of cases, monitoring and reporting is even arranged for each business unit. The board of directors is informed of violations of the code on a monthly basis at 7% of the companies, 44% are informed each quarter, and 25% only annually. Reporting can range from the number and nature of measures taken to implement the code to reporting on the number of violations of the code and subsequent disciplinary measures taken.

The effectiveness of the code can also be monitored in many different forms. Questions regarding familiarity with the code can be included in employee engagement surveys which makes it possible to monitor the awareness among employees. Other examples of monitoring the effectiveness of the code are performing root cause analysis of significant incidents and losses in order to identify whether the code was breached and monitoring the attendance at training sessions regarding the code.²

² See the book: Muel Kaptein, The Living Code, Embedding Ethics into the Corporate DNA, Sheffield: Greenleaf 2008, for more suggestions on how to monitor the effectiveness of codes.
8. Four phases of implementation

Complete overview

Figure 13 shows an overview of the measures the Fortune Global 200 companies have taken to implement their code. Codes are implemented in various ways. While most companies nowadays have hotlines and whistleblower procedures (the circle furthest to the left), background investigations on prospective employees and the formal inclusion of the code in decision-making procedures are common practice in less than half of the companies (the circle farthest to the right).
On average, US companies have taken more measures to implement their codes compared to their European counterparts, while Asian companies have taken the fewest measures.

Based on the data received, four phases can be distinguished in the way businesses approach code implementation. These range from the instruments in:

- **Phase 1**, the basic programme, applied by more than 80% of the companies;
- **Phase 2**, the basic + programme, applied by 60% to 80% of the companies;
- **Phase 3**, the advanced programme, applied by 50% to 60% of the companies;
- **Phase 4**, the front-runners programme, applied by 40% to 50% of the companies.

A pattern can be discerned in code and implementation programme development. Phase 1 contains the instruments that are mostly associated with the implementation of a code: having a confidential and anonymous hotline and whistleblowing procedures, using an incident reporting system, providing employees with e-learning programmes, and having clear policies to investigate and take corrective action in case of misconduct. When these results are compared to those of 2008, there are no major differences. This indicates that these measures really are the most basic ones that companies implement.

Fewer firms engage in all of the practices described in phase 4: these firms tend be the front-runners. Front-runners have integrated their codes into the strategic decision-making process and not only prospective managers but every prospective employee is screened (and recruited) against the code. In addition, there is an ethics committee that provides answers to dilemmas regarding the content of the code.

With respect to these front-runners, we found different results from those in 2008. In 2008, only 40%-50% of all companies used the code in major decision-making procedures, had their internal audit departments reporting on compliance per business unit and used performance evaluation criteria. These measures have now been adopted by a higher percentage of companies. This means there is evidence that companies are taking more measures to implement their codes.
9. Conclusions

Based on our research into the prevalence, content, and embedding of codes among Fortune Global 200 companies, we can draw the following eight conclusions:

- **The presence of codes per region is increasing: the focus now is on effective implementation**
  Although the overall number has decreased, adoption by US, European and Asian companies increased when these three categories are looked at individually. This means that the lower percentage of companies with a code among the Fortune Global 200 companies is due to the fact that more Asian companies are now in this list, as fewer Asian companies have a code than US and European companies. Companies that have a code increasingly also have to demonstrate that they are complying with it. Merely having a code is starting to be less meaningful. The growing emphasis from regulators is on effective implementation.

- **The content of codes differs more and more: the search is now for authentic codes**
  The size and content of codes differ greatly and the trend is for companies to develop a code that is tailored to their own situation, linking it to the organisation’s strategy, identity, and dilemmas. Particularly those companies that, in recent years, developed a code too rapidly are expected to focus more on what should make their code unique when updating it.

- **There is a shift from external to more intrinsic motivations for having a code: the main aim now is to create a shared company culture**
  Comparing the results from 2008 to the results in 2014, we can see that the reasons that companies give for having a code have changed. Where earlier these reasons were more directed at complying with rules and regulations and the reputation of the company, today it seems that intrinsic values play a larger role. In 2014, the most important reason for having a code is to establish and foster the right company culture.

- **Most codes are a combination of rule and principle-based: companies want the best of both worlds**
  The most common structure of a code is that first the company mission and corresponding values are explained, after which these are translated into more specific rules and guidelines. This makes the codes a mix between principles and rules. A trend is visible of companies combining a principle-based code with a more rule-based part regarding specific topics. This might be due to increasing legal requirements that require
stricter rules for certain areas, coupled with a tendency to provide more freedom to employees to make their own decisions. The more principle-based codes are especially found among European companies while US and Asian companies tend to have more rule-based codes.

- **A multitude of measures for implementing the code is visible: keeping the code alive is more than just drafting a code**
  The research shows that codes are being implemented in various ways. Code training by means of classroom meetings and web-based modules are common in many companies. More companies are taking structural measures to stimulate compliance with the code. A lot of companies have implemented ethics hotlines and channels for raising concerns, with accompanying response procedures. It is still not common that stakeholders are screened against the code or that the code is included in the new employee selection process, assessment criteria, and important investment decisions. The key is to prevent the code from gradually fading into the background. Companies with a ‘living’ code are better able to anchor it in the hearts and minds of their personnel.

- **There is increasing activity in the assessment of the code’s effectiveness: internal monitoring per aspect and complete external reporting**
  Most companies monitor, to a certain degree, compliance with the code. At the same time, this monitoring varies greatly. Periodic monitoring of each aspect is performed by fewer than half of the companies. Many companies still struggle with the question of how to measure the effectiveness of the code and how it can be included in the regular planning and control cycle. The involvement of internal audit departments in the monitoring of code implementation and compliance is growing. Third parties such as regulators and shareholders will increasingly demand that organisations demonstrate that their code is a living document.

- **There are large differences in the topics covered by the code stemming from companies’ origin: the origin of an company effects the content and type of the code**
  There are clear differences in the inclusion of certain topics and the addressing of responsibilities to stakeholders by companies from various countries. It also turns out that the different regions have different preferences for the style of their codes. Asian and US companies often choose a rule-based code while European and companies combine a rule-based approach with a more principle-based foundation.

- **There are only a few differences in topics covered by the code stemming from companies’ business sectors: the type of business does not play an important role in the content of the code**
  There are only a few differences between the codes of companies from the various business sectors. It is not only the country of origin but also, to a lesser extent, the type of business that influences the content of a company’s code. However, the origin is far more important that the specific sector the company is operating in.
Below are our recommendations on how the issues described in chapter 7 of this whitepaper (‘Embedding’) can be handled.

**Creating an authentic code**

To create an authentic code, companies should consider the following:

- Take the company’s mission and ambitions as a starting point and derive the content of the code from them;
- Collect input from employees and internal and external stakeholders to identify the desired culture which should be reflected in the code;
- Assess the current risks and challenges that management and employees are facing in the business process. Dilemmas form the building blocks of a good code. Analyse those dilemmas in terms of the conflicts they cause and determine what the code should include to resolve these dilemmas;
- Pay attention to issues that are specific to the business sector that the company is involved in;
- Be aware of cultural bias in the code, stemming from the national culture;
- Try to include issues for which there is no clear cut answer yet;
- Ask stakeholders what they expect from the company in terms of mission, responsibilities, values, norms, and rules;
- Ask internally and externally what makes or ought to make the company unique and how it can distinguish itself from other companies in the sector;
- Circulate new drafts of the code and ask people inside and outside the company to come up with suggestions for improvement;
- Select one or more issues for which the company can present innovative viewpoints;
- Determine relevant social trends and developments and reflect their impact in the code;
- Identify future legislation, challenges and issues that can be included in the current code;
- Discuss with senior management to what extent the code describes the company that they want it to be.
Keeping the code alive

To keep their codes alive, companies should:

- Pay periodical attention to the code in meetings, speeches, training etc.;
- Assess at least once every three years whether the code still reflects the current situation and issues, or whether the code should be updated;
- Create a corporate culture in which ethical dilemmas around the content of the code can be raised without fear of repercussions and discussed productively;
- Be aware of the cultural differences between various branches of the company and address them in the code;
- Make the code part of the competencies of managers as well as of their coaching, development, and review process;
- Search for creative, original, and unexpected means of communicating the code, for example by using applications on smartphones and the use of serious gaming. Infuse people with pride, energy and awareness to fully commit themselves to the code;
- Include the code in performance appraisal reviews. Ask staff about their experience with the code and evaluate them on compliance with it;
- Include the code in strategic dialogues with stakeholders. Discuss the code and ask them to give their perceptions and suggestions on how its practical application can be improved.

Monitoring the effectiveness of the code

To monitor the effectiveness of their codes, companies should:

- Assess the corporate ethical climate or culture periodically (for example, using a tailored code survey among staff);
- Monitor not only on compliance with the code per unit, but also include it in the business planning cycle. Set targets on what to improve;
- Assess the effectiveness of supporting measures and instruments (e.g. awareness around the whistleblower channel and transparency of enforcement actions);
- Ask staff about their experience with the code and the room they see for improvement;
- Determine what follow-up activities have been undertaken after implementation of the code;
- Analyse the reports of violations of the code for recurring problems and opportunities for improvement;
- Request the ethical office to report on its activities and experience;
- Perform code-based risk assessments on a periodic basis;
- Include the code in root cause analysis of incidents;
- Develop a dashboard with relevant key performance indicators on the effectiveness of the code.
Methodology

This study covered the 2013 Fortune Global 200 companies. Firstly, each company’s website was checked in the summer of 2014 to ascertain whether the company had a code. A code was regarded as constituting all documents covered by the definition included in this whitepaper. If no code was referred to on the website, the company was telephoned (usually the ethics office, corporate communication and/or human resources), and discussions were held with as many different people and departments as was needed to establish whether the company had a code or not. A final decision as to whether a company had a code was taken after we had examined a copy of any relevant documentation. We received definitive answers from almost all companies by 1 May 2014.

The codes were analysed using the model developed and described in the article ‘Business codes of multinational firms’ (M. Kaptein, Journal of Business Ethics, 2004).

All companies that have a code were sent a questionnaire, with full anonymity being guaranteed. They were then telephoned and/or emailed to request their participation. In total, 17% of the companies returned a completed questionnaire.
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