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Introduction

A company’s annual report and accounts (ARA) is an important and high-profile channel through which boards can communicate how they are delivering value for stakeholders over time. We know from research and our conversations with investors that ARAs are still highly valued — but ongoing evolution is required.

This is partly to meet the expectations of regulators and other stakeholders in a period of sustained and far-reaching corporate governance reform. In the last two years, the UK’s corporate governance framework has undergone a comprehensive review via a Parliamentary Select Committee inquiry, a Government consultation and a fundamental review of the UK Corporate Governance Code by the Financial Reporting Council (FRC). These have resulted in new secondary legislation requiring larger companies — including private companies — to report, among other things, on their corporate governance arrangements and how their boards have had regard to the likely consequence of any decision in the long term and the interests of stakeholders when making principal decisions; a revised UK Corporate Governance Code (the 2018 Code) for premium listed entities; and other measures, such as the development of governance principles for large private companies.

The new requirements have a significant impact on boards and their committees, who need to demonstrate a clear focus on creating and preserving value over the long term. They need to demonstrate a stronger regard for the interests of all relevant stakeholders in their long-term decision making. Boards need to establish a clear corporate purpose and ensure alignment of this to the company’s strategy, culture and values.

They need to establish clear mechanisms for considering the views of their workforce, and engage with employees to explain how executive remuneration aligns with the wider company pay policy. Careful consideration of board composition is also required, taking account tenure and diversity in its broadest sense to promote robust and independent challenge.

This much we know. But more change is certainly coming, given other regulatory reviews and initiatives still under way that will ultimately reform the wider ecosystem in which companies operate. These include the FRC’s Future of Corporate Reporting Project chaired by Paul Druckman, who shares his ambitions for this initiative on page 6 of this report. Also still progressing are the Brydon review on the future of audit, the Government’s consideration of the Competition and Markets Authority’s review of the audit market, and the Kingman review of the FRC.

All these reviews were instigated in response to the breakdown in society’s trust in business and the ecosystem that supports an active capital market — encompassing management, boards, auditors, investors and regulators. This isn’t a UK-only phenomenon.

Internationally we also see a growing desire for business to do more to restore and build the trust of its stakeholders and wider society. The UK’s corporate reporting framework needs to respond by providing a more complete picture of long-term value creation.

Although the outcomes from all the ongoing reviews are unknown, corporate reporting will remain a vital cog in the wider corporate governance ecosystem. It is one of the key means by which stakeholders hold directors to account. It is also an important influence on the value of an audit: an audit will only have real value if the information in the ARA, on which assurance is provided, is relevant and useful. We need to be clear on what we want directors to report, and where, before focusing on the question of how audit can and should be reformed to provide the highest quality assurance on the information that matters most to stakeholders.

The current reviews and reform initiatives provide a real opportunity for the UK to lead the way in strengthening corporate governance, corporate reporting and the audit ecosystem. The UK’s governance and reporting frameworks already have a strong reputation around the world. The changes companies will make in their 2019 ARAs under the 2018 Code and secondary legislation in the form of the Companies (Miscellaneous Reporting) Regulations 2018 (MRR), both of which are the subject of this report, should push that reputation a notch higher.

We will see the first reporting against these new requirements in earnest in December 2019 ARAs. However, based on this review of FTSE 350 ARAs for 2018/19 — the sixth in the series — it’s encouraging to see that some companies have made a head start in certain areas. Our report identifies some of these early reporting practices and provides our views on what good reporting and corporate governance practice looks like. We also suggest how companies can develop their reporting in preparation for their next year end to realise the aims and ambitions of the recent regulatory changes.
We encourage companies to embrace the spirit of the 2018 Code and secondary legislation and their aspirations for enhanced corporate governance. Failure to do so risks the imposition of further regulation as future governments look for new ways to restore public trust in business and the capital markets. A far better course is to strive now to achieve the highest standards of corporate governance and reporting — using the ARA as the high quality communications channel it can be.

We hope that those involved in preparing their ARAs will find our publication useful in achieving this objective. We also hope it will provide insights for investors whose engagement with directors is vital to rebuilding trust. As shown by EY’s recent research ‘Turning the tide to greater corporate accountability’, which assessed how UK-based asset managers and asset owners are currently reporting on and engaging with their investee companies, environmental, governance and social issues rank as top areas of focus by investors, but there remains room to improve how these (and other focus areas) are reported in investors’ stewardship reporting. Greater transparency — both from investors and their investee companies — enables greater accountability. We therefore encourage investors to make use of the new information reported by companies under the 2018 Code and MRR in their engagement activities, and provide directional feedback to help drive improvements. Over time, better reporting by companies should help investors target and improve their engagement and in turn their stewardship reporting.

In line with previous years, we have strived to keep our publication pragmatic, providing practical insights and guidance not only on disclosure requirements, but also on underlying governance processes. The table on page 5 outlines what to look out for in our report depending on your role.

---

**How our publication can support you in your role**

**Directors**

Learn about your key new responsibilities, including monitoring and assessing culture, engaging with stakeholders and overseeing emerging risks.

Get a sense of how early reporting practice has developed so far. This may help you influence and oversee the approach being developed/proposed at the companies which you serve.

**ARA preparers**

Gain practical insights into the new disclosure requirements including current direction of travel so you won’t be starting from a blank sheet of paper.

Understand what some investors, the Financial Reporting Lab (FRL) and the FRC are most interested in seeing from the new disclosures.

**Investors**

Gain insights into how the new focus areas under the 2018 Code and MRR might influence your stewardship activities and trigger different conversations and engagement with boards.

Peer insights — quotes from investors which indicate what they are hoping the new disclosures will help achieve and how companies should be approaching them, should help you develop your thinking as you plan your engagement with companies and their boards.

---

**What to look out for in our report**

**Directors**

- Overview of findings in each section — should provide you a succinct summary of the early reporting practices we have observed against the 2018 Code and MRR.
- Our two-page ‘acid test’ (page 8-9) — will help you challenge management on the story and narrative that the company’s disclosures convey.
- Hallmarks of leading practice — in each section will help you identify what you may like management to address as they draft the disclosures for the next year end.
- Upcoming reporting developments in Appendix 1 will provide an overview of the developments that management will or are likely to have to prepare for in 2020/21.

**ARA preparers**

- Examples of early adoption.
- Hallmarks of leading practice — should help you develop and progress your disclosures from the early practice we have observed.
- Investor and FRL quotes.
- Our two-page ‘acid test’ (page 8-9) — should help you challenge whether your ARA conveys the key messages cohesively.
- Upcoming reporting developments in Appendix 1 will help you plan ahead and keep a watching brief on impending developments.

**Investors**

- Investor quotes.
- Our summary of new requirements at the beginning of each section which bring together the relevant aspects of the 2018 Code and MRR.

---

1 Turning the tide to greater corporate accountability, New research into investor stewardship reporting and engagement, EY, September 2019.
You are the Chair of the Future of Corporate Reporting Project Advisory Group. What are the project’s aspirations and, from a personal perspective, what do you want this project to deliver?

There are short-term fixes in the corporate reporting landscape that this project aims to bring forward as recommendations for legislative changes next year. However, from a personal perspective I hope to do more than fix the current system: I would like to paint a vision of where reporting is heading. Reporting can influence behaviour and I would like us to illustrate how this fits into the transformation of the capital market. The drivers for change from the 2018 Code and the (to be published) revisions to the UK Stewardship Code require reporting to at least keep pace. These clearly extend what is currently reported by companies and take us forward, but my aspiration is to look even beyond this.

Allied to this, the ARA of the future must be more than a document: it needs to be a connected architecture of communication — we are working on just that.

What is the role of the government, regulators, the audit and accounting profession and investors in driving change in what is reported by companies?

Everyone has a role to drive change in what is reported and there is an appetite for change. From government setting the tone within its industrial strategy; to regulators creating a frame, creating standards (and codes) and providing guidance; the accounting profession providing thought leadership and advising companies; and to investors setting a direction for companies and leading by example.

How can companies better communicate the long-term value they create for stakeholders?

I have been an advocate of value being created by different resources (or stores of value). When I was at the International Integrated Reporting Council, we described the six capitals in order to demonstrate the breadth of thinking away from merely financial capital. Supporting this, the Embankment Project for Inclusive Capitalism (EPIC), which EY pioneered with the Coalition for Inclusive Capitalism and as further discussed on page 7, has really brought to light the need for a broader range of performance indicators to better understand how value — and I mean financial and non-financial value — is created for a range of stakeholders. In time, such work as that of EPIC, the World Benchmarking Alliance and others will help to create some of these broader benchmarks and metrics to compare companies’ performance on value creation. However, in my view, it is not just about long-term value creation — the debate could be rephrased as ‘value creation over time’ i.e., the short, medium and long term. I say this because companies need to generate cashflow and returns now and next month to survive sustainably into the future. They need to have assets now to enable future value creation and need to be clear what aspects of past performance are relevant to value creation in the future.

I think all of this then needs to be communicated cohesively by the board and the ARA is a key channel to do this.

Care needs to be taken when publishing non-financial performance measures, to ensure that they are not seen to be ‘cherry-picked’, and that they are relevant within the context of the strategy and purpose of the business. This was the focus for EPIC, which EY pioneered with the Coalition for Inclusive Capitalism. The project tested EY’s methodology for arriving at the most relevant metrics to measure long-term value creation, and also proposed metrics or narrative disclosures in vital areas such as human capital deployment culture, innovation, consumer trust and health and corporate governance. We continue to test the outcomes from EPIC and hope to work with other like-mind initiatives in the future, to continue this journey.

Hywel Ball, Managing Partner Assurance UK & Ireland and UK Head of Audit

At the end of the first phase in November 2018, a report including an open-source methodology was published. The metrics and the underlying methodology are designed to be flexible enough to allow companies to adapt them to their specific circumstances and long-term value narrative. More information on the project itself, EY’s long-term value framework, and the metrics proposed by participants can be found here: www.inc-cap.com
Acid Test

We have developed an ‘acid test’ as a practical tool for preparers and boards looking to ensure their ARA covers key qualitative aspects of leading practice. These are the key questions we believe a reader should be able to answer having read the narrative report. We update this set of questions in response to new developments and pronouncements.

Throughout this publication we provide further insight to a number of these topic areas.

Purpose, strategy and culture
• What is the company’s purpose?
• Does it explain why the company exists and how it contributes to wider society?
• Does the company’s purpose clearly inform its strategy?
• What is the company’s strategic objectives? Are they clear and measurable?
• What is the company’s competitive advantage and how is it sustained over time?
• Which aspects of the company’s culture are critical to the operation of the business model and/or the delivery of its strategy and how does the board measure and monitor the extent to which the culture is embedded?
• How does the board make decisions regarding how capital is allocated across short and long-term priorities? For example, capital investments, R&D activities, shareholder distributions, tax, pensions, employee reward.

Business model
• How does the company make money?
• What are the company’s key inputs, processes and outputs (for shareholders and stakeholders)?
• How are the company’s key tangible and intangible assets (including its physical assets, IP, people, culture, technology, etc.) engaged in the process of value creation?
• How does the business model help deliver the strategy and how is it different from others in the sector?

Key performance indicators (KPIs)
• What are the key metrics the board uses to measure progress against its strategic objectives? Are these leading indicators which truly measure performance against strategy over the long term rather than just output measures?
• How has the company performed against these metrics over time and how has this influenced the remuneration of key executives?
• Are alternative performance measures (APMs) clearly signposted and reconciled to GAAP measures? Is their use balanced with GAAP measures?

Risk appetite and principal risks
• What levels of risk is the board willing to take in pursuit of its strategy and how is this monitored by the board?
• What are the key risks to the successful delivery of the strategy and operation of the business model and how have these evolved since the last report?
• What are the risks that pose the greatest threat to the viability of the company i.e., solvency and liquidity risks?
• How, specifically, might these risks manifest in the company as opposed to generally in the sector?

Risk management and internal control disclosures:
• How are the principal and emerging risks mitigated and controlled by the company’s systems of internal controls and risk management and how does the board monitor these controls?
• What did the board’s review of the effectiveness of these systems and controls encompass and what were the findings?
• Has the board identified significant failings or weaknesses and is it clear what actions have been or will be taken to address these failings or weaknesses?

Governance
• What did the board and its committees actually do in the year to govern the company – what specific governance issues arose and how were they addressed?
• What, if any, changes were made to governance arrangements during the year and why?
• What areas for improvement were identified from the board and committee evaluations and what progress was made against actions from the previous evaluations?
• How is board and committee composition and succession planning being managed, giving due regard to the evolving strategy of the company, skills, experience, diversity and tenure?
• Are the key stakeholders of the company clearly identified?
• How did the board seek to understand the views of and seek input from both shareholders and stakeholders during the year? Does the board articulate the feedback received from such interactions and any actions taken? How has the board had regard to these groups in their principal decision making?

Viability statement
• Over what timeframe has the board considered the viability of the company and why? How has the period been rationalised especially where the company is making investment decisions over longer periods?
• What process did the board use to assess viability?
• Does the board understand which, if any, severe but plausible risks (or combination of risks) would threaten the viability of the company and has appropriate disclosure been provided?
• What specific scenario and sensitivity testing has been performed on the model(s) supporting the viability statement and what was the outcome of this testing?
• What assurance did the board obtain over relevant elements (e.g., stress testing)?
• What assumptions did the board use in reaching its conclusion?
• What is the board’s view on the wider prospects of the company beyond the period of the viability statement?
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Articulating purpose and culture

Overview of findings

The number of companies disclosing their purpose and values has been increasing in recent years. Most companies also now refer to corporate culture in their ARA. However, the narrative can come across as generic or lacking connectivity with the rest of the report.

When describing their culture, companies use terms such as ‘client-centric’, ‘open’, ‘inclusive’, ‘innovative’ and ‘based on respect’, but do not directly link these characteristics to values or behaviours. The discussion is often split between safety/risk culture and other cultural aspects, suggesting that these are separate from each other, rather than part of a broader organisational culture.

Where ARAs discuss cultural change programmes or the need to embed culture throughout the organisation, only a few explain the divergence between the desired and actual culture. Similarly, few provide meaningful insight into the activities being undertaken to foster the desired behaviours. Disclosure on how culture is measured and monitored is in its infancy, so it is unclear how progress is being assessed by boards.

The challenge companies face in light of the 2018 Code, is to make their disclosure less generic, more meaningful and joined up, and bring out the board’s role in promoting the desired culture across the organisation.

New requirements

2018 Code

- The board should establish the company’s purpose (Principle B) taking into account that a successful company generates value for shareholders and contributes to wider society (Principle A).
- The board should establish the company’s values (Principle B).
- All directors need to promote the desired culture (Principle B).
- The board needs to satisfy itself that culture is aligned to purpose and values (Principle B), as is executive remuneration (Principle P).
- The board should assess and monitor the culture (Provision 2) and where it is not satisfied that policy, practices or behaviour throughout the business are aligned with the company’s purpose, values and strategy, it should ensure that management is taking corrective action.

Hallmarks of leading practice and disclosure

- Disclosure of organisational purpose and values, even though not strictly required under the 2018 Code.
- Translating values into desired behaviours and supplementing with case studies to illustrate how values are lived in practice.
- Where purpose is established for the first time, explaining how the board arrived at it and why it uniquely represents the organisation.
- Clarity on how the desired culture supports the delivery of strategy and operation of the business model, including how culture not only mitigates against risks, but also is an ‘asset’ that drives competitive advantage.
- Giving the discussion of culture a prominent position in the ARA e.g., in the chair’s statement to emphasise commitment from the top.
- Where a company is working towards cultural change, describing the current culture alongside actions being taken to move towards the desired state.
- Clear disclosure of the board’s activities to assess and monitor culture, including how the board considered various sources of information available, such as the feedback from workforce engagement, whistleblowing, culture survey results, metrics and other indicators.
- Disclosure of actions to realign policy, practices or behaviour with the company’s purpose, values and strategy — using an open tone of voice and being honest about mistakes of the past.

Culture is difficult to report on. It is useful to see a combination of narrative, metrics and also some case study examples of culture in action. This helps to show the actual impact of the company’s culture.

Rebecca Vine, Senior Corporate Governance Analyst, Aviva Investors

“...
Making meaningful purpose disclosures

A company’s purpose is not the same as its vision or mission statement. The purpose explains why the company exists and for whom, rather than articulating what the company will look like or where it is heading. When articulating purpose, companies need to reflect that profit is a product of the corporate purpose. It is not the corporate purpose. To make an impact, the articulation of purpose should be concise, memorable and meaningful to both employees and external stakeholders. Expanding on the statement by providing additional detail can also be valuable. Positioning this explanation within the chair’s letter, as done by Lloyds Banking Group plc (Figure 1), gives it prominence, a personal touch and emphasises its importance.

Examples: explaining purpose

Pearson plc, 2018 ARA (page 10)
The CEO’s statement in the accounts of Pearson plc (page 10) effectively moves from the purpose of empowering people to progress in their lives through learning to the three strategic priorities seen as key to achieving the purpose. Case studies and a concise ‘market trends’ summary support and provide justification for the priorities.

Intu plc, 2018 ARA (page 30)
The business model disclosure of Intu plc (page 30) provides a breakdown of the purpose into its two constituents: i) creating compelling, joyful experiences that make customers smile; and ii) helping brands/retailers flourish. It references additional disclosures that describe how the company is delivering on its purpose.

Unilever plc, 2018 ARA (page 7)
Unilever plc refers to its purpose of making sustainable living commonplace throughout its ARA, including at both division and brand level. The narrative is enhanced by consistent links to the Unilever Sustainable Living Plan (page 7), which sets out clear progress against KPIs.

Figure 1. Lloyds Banking Group plc, 2018 ARA (page 2)

Chairman’s statement

Our purpose
At the heart of our success is our continued focus on Helping Britain Prosper. The Group plays a vital role in supporting the prosperity of people, businesses and communities across the UK, and in doing so builds deep, long-term customer relationships. It is also important to the Board that our strategy is fully consistent with our commitments as a responsible business and during the year we have committed to becoming a leader in supporting the UK to transition successfully to a more sustainable low carbon economy. We recognise that the success of the Group is inextricably linked to the health of the UK and in this uncertain economic environment we are working hard to support the whole economy, and to help businesses take advantage of the continuing opportunities we have to build a prosperous future for the nation.

Lord Blackwell Chairman

Purpose within the broader strategic narrative

Purpose should be grounded in the company’s context and provide insight into its key stakeholders. A company’s strategy should outline a plan for achieving its vision, in line with the company’s purpose. It should be translated into strategic objectives that are clear and measurable.

Presenting the flow from purpose to strategic objectives graphically can be visually appealing, but care must be taken to ensure that the graphics retain substance (over form), e.g., that the linkages are sufficiently evident. The graphic in the Inmarsat plc’s ARA (Figure 2) passes this test. Disconnect between the articulation of purpose and strategy can arise, for example when the purpose references broader societal value, but the discussion on strategy focuses solely on shareholder return.

Uncovering the connected world

1. Capture the maximum number of innovative platforms
2. Reputation & brand for new growth
3. Establish our digital platform and business
4. Create a high performance organisation
5. Transform our operating environment
6. Adding the connected world
7. Enabling the connected world

Figure 2. Inmarsat plc, 2018 ARA (page 14)

Values of society are changing; it is possible that a societal purpose will create a positive alpha (valuation uplift).

Andrew Neville, Fund Manager, Allianz
From establishing purpose to reporting on culture – an overview

- The purpose explains why the company exists and for whom; it informs the desired values and identification of key stakeholders.
- The desired values are translated into behaviours, which support the achievement of strategic objectives.
- The behaviours are embedded and promoted throughout the organisation; this includes incorporating measurable culture KPIs in executive remuneration structures.
- Key culture metrics are established, driven by reliable business data. Indicators of the behaviours are tested e.g., using a survey or other measurement mechanisms and monitored in a manner that provides actionable outputs.
- Root cause analysis is conducted when cultural issues are identified. Actions are undertaken to realign the current and desired state.
- The ARA provides a meaningful description of the desired culture, how actual culture was assessed and disclosure of the board’s monitoring activities.

How the desired culture supports delivery of strategy

The 2018 Code requires the alignment of culture with purpose and strategy. Articulating this link is not simple, but a useful approach is to start by translating values into behaviours that contribute to the achievement of strategic objectives. This helps explain how culture is an ‘asset’ that drives competitive advantage.

Meggitt plc (Figure 3) illustrates how values are lived in practice by including a compelling case study, which demonstrates how high-performance culture concepts are applied at one of its sites. Rentokil Initial plc (2018 ARA, page 54) Illustrates value creation by providing examples of ‘culture in action’. The Chairman of Rolls-Royce Holdings plc (2018 ARA, pages 5-8) refers to culture in his letter, with the CEO providing an overview of how cultural change is part of the strategic overhaul.

By ensuring that any risk appetite disclosures are consistent with the description of risk culture, companies can articulate how culture mitigates against risks.

Embedding and promoting the desired culture

Embedding culture must extend beyond mandating code of conduct training. Companies need to undertake a broad range of activities, from ‘tone from the top’ communications and engagement through to recruitment and onboarding. Ways to embed culture must also be considered in operational processes, appraisal and reward structures, compliance and risk management, branding and marketing.

Wood Group (John) plc’s 2018 ARA (Figure 4) provides a discussion of the company's ongoing journey to embed its culture, giving examples of initiatives undertaken to champion desired behaviours. Taylor Wimpey plc’s 2018 ARA (page 111) recognises the importance of its client-centric culture, which it promotes by including a customer service metric as an input into the executive bonus computation.
Measuring and monitoring culture

Monitoring enables boards to identify to what extent actual culture and behaviours differ from desired culture and behaviours, and therefore what corrective actions are required. A board that believes in the importance of culture will already be considering some data points that are proxy indicators of the existing culture. The most accurate and holistic picture can be created by looking at a variety of information sources, including results of specific culture surveys and metrics driven by business data that extend beyond compliance reporting.

3 Our EY paper Governing Culture: practical considerations for the board and its committees includes key questions to stimulate constructive debate and discussion in the area of culture.

Zanele Mtshali, ESG Analyst, MSCI

Although employee engagement can be revealing in terms of the relationship between an organisation and its people, it remains in the final analysis a behavioural data point. Research for EPIC (page 7) established employee turnover data provided a quantum which could be utilised by analysts in their deliberations over future value.

Dr Anthony Hesketh, Associate Professor, Lancaster University

For example, Rentokil Initial plc (Figure 5) combines survey results with metrics. Banks such as Lloyds Banking Group plc and Standard Chartered plc make use of culture dashboards. Although their ARAs do not specify the data points included within these, they do combine the use of surveys and metrics. The Board Reputation Committee of Barclays plc (2018 ARA, page 75) makes clear reference to debating the use of culture dashboards, receiving updates on employee survey results and internal audit activities relating to culture.

Best practice involves using third party data (e.g., Glassdoor or Trustpilot) either directly as a metric or to set benchmarks. The board should also draw on the outcomes of its workforce engagement to enhance its cultural insights.

The results from the board’s activities to monitor culture must translate into corrective actions that can lead to improved results. It is therefore important that the board receives information that is transparent, balanced and sufficiently granular (rather than averaged out) to allow it to identify trends and issues both negative to ensure corrective action is taken, and positive to identify best practices for broader rollout.

We recommend undertaking a root cause analysis to understand the underlying reasons for any issues and trends, and that this analysis be reported to the board with clear plans of action. The board will then need to monitor the progress being made in addressing issues. Given the extent of new requirements introduced by the 2018 Code and evolving practice around culture, our expectation is that management and boards will need time to fully establish and fine-tune their activities in this area.

Figure 5. Rentokil Initial plc, 2018 ARA (page 53)
Culture surveys
There is no substitute for asking a large proportion of employees about the culture they experience. Culture surveys are different to people engagement surveys. If the two are combined, it is essential that culture-specific questions are included. The EPIC (page 7) report provides some pragmatic recommendations on how these could be structured.

Culture metrics
Numerous data points are available to organisations that may provide insight into culture. Boards will need to determine what the most appropriate culture metrics are and whether they are already being accurately tracked. Boards may already be scrutinising some of these metrics for different purposes (e.g., health and safety performance) and applying a culture lens to them may also be appropriate. Some companies consider the level of employee engagement as a culture metric. This approach requires caution, as engagement scores may not be indicative of the alignment of actual behaviours with the desired culture.

Examples: disclosing metrics that can reflect culture
Companies are already disclosing metrics that may be indicators of culture. The links between the metrics and culture are sometimes direct and in other cases implicit.

Taylor Wimpey plc, 2018 ARA (page 24)
Customer satisfaction 8-week score ‘would you recommend’ measured by the National New Homes Survey eight weeks after legal completion

British American Tobacco plc, 2018 ARA (page 26)
Employee turnover rates, with a focus on senior women

Schroders plc, 2018 ARA (page 19)
Retention of key talent

Man Group plc, 2018 ARA (page 34)
Number of internal transfers

BAE Systems plc, 2018 ARA (page 29)
Dismissals for reasons relating to unethical behaviour

Inmarsat plc, 2018 ARA (page 49)
% of workforce reached by the ‘high performance culture programme’

CRH plc, 2018 ARA (page 14)
% of zero-accident locations

We recommend that companies clearly identify what they consider their culture metrics to be and explain why these metrics have been chosen.

Qualitative indicators
Some information may be more qualitative e.g., observations obtained from leaver interviews, the outcomes of workforce engagement, and regular evaluations of how the CEO and other senior executives are modelling desired behaviours and communicating the desired culture to the organisation. Analysing trends over time may provide useful insights into cultural developments.

Reporting on culture
Boards have a real opportunity to showcase how culture contributes to competitive advantage. We encourage using an open tone of voice when reporting on culture. Being honest about mistakes of the past makes the narrative provided by marks and Spencer plc (2019 ARA, pages 15-17) on its journey of cultural change, convincing and credible.

---

4 In 2018 EY undertook a global culture assessment, covering more than 260,000 people.
5 The FRC’s 2018 Guidance on Board Effectiveness provide examples of sources of culture insights.
Overview of findings

There are increased disclosures relating to companies’ consideration of the stakeholder agenda due to the regulatory, societal and political pressure in this area.

We found that most companies explain who their key stakeholders are. However, disclosures need to develop on how the board engaged with these key stakeholders, the issues covered and, most importantly, the impact of engagement (if any) on the board’s discussions and decisions.

New requirements

2018 Code

- Explain how key stakeholder interests and the matters set out in s172 of Companies Act 2006 have been considered in board discussions and decision making (Principle D and Provision 5).
- In respect of workforce engagement, if the board has not chosen one or a combination of the following methods proposed in the 2018 Code i.e., a director appointed from the workforce, a formal workforce advisory panel, and/or a designated non-executive director (NED), it should explain what alternative arrangements are in place and why it considers that they are effective (Provision 5).
- Describe the work of the remuneration committee, including what engagement has taken place with shareholders and the impact this has had on remuneration policy and outcomes; and what engagement has taken place with the workforce to explain how executive remuneration aligns with wider company pay policy (Provision 41).

The 2018 Code overlaps with the requirements introduced by the MRR.

MRR

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Requirement</th>
<th>Scope</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. S172(1) statement</td>
<td>UK incorporated companies already required to produce a strategic report, except for those qualifying as medium-sized within a financial year. The size criteria are that a company meets any two of the large company threshold below: • Turnover £36m or more • Balance sheet £18m or more • 250 employees or more</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Stakeholder interests</td>
<td>Any two of the large company threshold below: • Turnover £36m or more • Balance sheet £18m or more • 250 employees or more</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Employee engagement</td>
<td>Any 250 UK employees or more, 6 although the term is not defined in the 2018 Code, the FRC’s Guidance on Board Effectiveness provides some useful insights, including that the term is not limited to the UK workforce or employees with employment contracts. 7 s.414A CA 2006 requires all companies that are not small to prepare a strategic report. 8 s.384 CA 2006 / s.467 CA 2006 – Companies will be part of an ineligible group if any of its members is: a public company; a body corporate whose shares are admitted to trading on a regulated market; a person who has permission under Part 4 of the Financial Services and Markets Act 2000 to carry on a regulated activity; a small company that is an authorised insurance company, a banking company, an e-money issuer; a MiFID investment firm, a UCITS management company; or carries on insurance market activity. 9 BEIS FAQ on MRR, November 2018.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note that the MRR requirements in respect of the directors’ report can be provided in the strategic report as clarified by BEIS. 9
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Hallmarks of leading practice and disclosure

**Stakeholder engagement**

- Who and why? Defining the company’s key stakeholders and the importance of engaging with each group by making connections to the company’s business model, strategy and principal risks.
- How? Explaining the engagement mechanisms and the board’s involvement.
- What? Setting out key topics of engagement, feedback and points of view obtained from stakeholders.
- Actions and Outcomes Articulating the impact of engagement, if any, on the board’s discussions, decisions and actions.

**S172(1) statement**

- Setting out the company’s principal decisions (such as capital allocation) and for relevant principal decisions, explaining how directors considered (among other matters) stakeholder interests and views in arriving at the decision.

---

**Examples: disclosures explaining why it is important to engage stakeholders, with linkages to the business model and/or strategy**

**The Unite Group plc, 2018 ARA (pages 8–23)**

Sets out why it is important to engage each stakeholder group, their link to strategy and how each priority is measured. For example, in relation to customers, the key priorities are keeping promises, delivering outstanding service and retaining customers. The links to strategy include increased purchasing and cross selling, and positive customer recommendations. The company also discloses the metrics used to measure progress, such as customer retention.

**Rentokil Initial plc, 2018 ARA (Figure 6)**

Sets out the company’s priorities for each stakeholder group, their link to strategy and how each priority is measured. For example, in relation to customers, the key priorities are keeping promises, delivering outstanding service and retaining customers.

---

**Who are the key stakeholders and why is it important to engage?**

Stakeholders are those groups which are likely to be affected by the actions of a company, or whose actions can affect the operation or business model of the company. Many companies in our sample identify their key stakeholders, typically in the business model or a distinct stakeholder engagement section. They include customers, the workforce or employees, regulators, the government, suppliers, the community and the environment.

After defining who the key stakeholders are, the next step, in our view, should be to explain why it is important to engage each group by reference to the business model, strategy and principal risks. We found this to be lacking in most ARAs, especially where stakeholder engagement reporting is contained in a standalone section (e.g., corporate social responsibility) with little connection to other sections.

---

**How are the key stakeholders engaged?**

While strictly speaking neither the 2018 Code nor the MRR specify that board members must be involved directly in engaging with the company’s stakeholders, other than the workforce, we believe it would be in their spirit to do so especially on material issues or with material stakeholders.

---

**Without positive relationships with its key stakeholders a business is unlikely to be sustainably successful and generate long-term returns for its shareholders. I hope that companies will grasp the opportunity of the new reporting requirements to demonstrate how they consider the interests of all those who play a part in their success and the impact of key decisions on them. This should in turn help companies improve these important relationships and secure longer-term, more supportive capital from investors.**

Richard Buxton, Head of UK Equities, Merian Global Investors

---

**Who are the key stakeholders and why is it important to engage?**

Stakeholders are those groups which are likely to be affected by the actions of a company, or whose actions can affect the operation or business model of the company. Most companies in our sample identify their key stakeholders, typically in the business model or a distinct stakeholder engagement section. They include customers, the workforce or employees, regulators, the government, suppliers, the community and the environment.

After defining who the key stakeholders are, the next step, in our view, should be to explain why it is important to engage each group by reference to the business model, strategy and principal risks. We found this to be lacking in most ARAs, especially where stakeholder engagement reporting is contained in a standalone section (e.g., corporate social responsibility) with little connection to other sections.

---

**How are the key stakeholders engaged?**

While strictly speaking neither the 2018 Code nor the MRR specify that board members must be involved directly in engaging with the company’s stakeholders, other than the workforce, we believe it would be in their spirit to do so especially on material issues or with material stakeholders.

---

**It is important to remember that reporting is not a panacea for all issues. Boards should consider how they can use stakeholder engagement to inform their strategy and risk management.**

Freddie Woolfe, Head of Responsible Investment and Stewardship, Merian Global Investors

---

**How are the key stakeholders engaged?**

While strictly speaking neither the 2018 Code nor the MRR specify that board members must be involved directly in engaging with the company’s stakeholders, other than the workforce, we believe it would be in their spirit to do so especially on material issues or with material stakeholders.

---

**It is important to remember that reporting is not a panacea for all issues. Boards should consider how they can use stakeholder engagement to inform their strategy and risk management.**

Freddie Woolfe, Head of Responsible Investment and Stewardship, Merian Global Investors

---

**How are the key stakeholders engaged?**

While strictly speaking neither the 2018 Code nor the MRR specify that board members must be involved directly in engaging with the company's stakeholders, other than the workforce, we believe it would be in their spirit to do so especially on material issues or with material stakeholders.

---

**Who are the key stakeholders and why is it important to engage?**

Stakeholders are those groups which are likely to be affected by the actions of a company, or whose actions can affect the operation or business model of the company. Many companies in our sample identify their key stakeholders, typically in the business model or a distinct stakeholder engagement section. They include customers, the workforce or employees, regulators, the government, suppliers, the community and the environment.

After defining who the key stakeholders are, the next step, in our view, should be to explain why it is important to engage each group by reference to the business model, strategy and principal risks. We found this to be lacking in most ARAs, especially where stakeholder engagement reporting is contained in a standalone section (e.g., corporate social responsibility) with little connection to other sections.

---

**How are the key stakeholders engaged?**

While strictly speaking neither the 2018 Code nor the MRR specify that board members must be involved directly in engaging with the company’s stakeholders, other than the workforce, we believe it would be in their spirit to do so especially on material issues or with material stakeholders.

---

**Who are the key stakeholders and why is it important to engage?**

Stakeholders are those groups which are likely to be affected by the actions of a company, or whose actions can affect the operation or business model of the company. Many companies in our sample identify their key stakeholders, typically in the business model or a distinct stakeholder engagement section. They include customers, the workforce or employees, regulators, the government, suppliers, the community and the environment.

After defining who the key stakeholders are, the next step, in our view, should be to explain why it is important to engage each group by reference to the business model, strategy and principal risks. We found this to be lacking in most ARAs, especially where stakeholder engagement reporting is contained in a standalone section (e.g., corporate social responsibility) with little connection to other sections.

---

**How are the key stakeholders engaged?**

While strictly speaking neither the 2018 Code nor the MRR specify that board members must be involved directly in engaging with the company’s stakeholders, other than the workforce, we believe it would be in their spirit to do so especially on material issues or with material stakeholders.

---

**Who are the key stakeholders and why is it important to engage?**

Stakeholders are those groups which are likely to be affected by the actions of a company, or whose actions can affect the operation or business model of the company. Many companies in our sample identify their key stakeholders, typically in the business model or a distinct stakeholder engagement section. They include customers, the workforce or employees, regulators, the government, suppliers, the community and the environment.

After defining who the key stakeholders are, the next step, in our view, should be to explain why it is important to engage each group by reference to the business model, strategy and principal risks. We found this to be lacking in most ARAs, especially where stakeholder engagement reporting is contained in a standalone section (e.g., corporate social responsibility) with little connection to other sections.

---

**How are the key stakeholders engaged?**

While strictly speaking neither the 2018 Code nor the MRR specify that board members must be involved directly in engaging with the company’s stakeholders, other than the workforce, we believe it would be in their spirit to do so especially on material issues or with material stakeholders.
Examples: workforce engagement approaches

Combining a designated NED with some form of employee forum or group: ITV plc has an Ambassador network of employees and a designated NED acting as a conduit between the network and the Board (2018 ARA, pages 7, 77 and 109). The Weir Group plc has appointed a designated NED and is going to set up new Employee Voice Forums to share feedback with the Board and Group Executive (2018 ARA, pages 18 and 19).

More than one designated NED: Rolls-Royce Holdings plc appointed a NED in 2017 as its ‘employee champion’ and, in recognition of the success of this role, recently appointed a second NED as the board’s employee champion for its North American employees (2018 ARA, pages 5, 65, 67 and 101). Paddy Power Betfair plc has appointed two NEDs for workforce engagement (2018 ARA, page 72). Some boards such as Unilever plc share the responsibility amongst all NEDs (2018 ARA, page 51).

Use of board committees: Workforce engagement, amongst other matters, is under the remit of Aggreko plc’s Ethics & Corporate Responsibility board committee (2018 ARA, page 60). BAE Systems plc’s Corporate Responsibility board committee which comprises only NEDs (2018 ARA, page 73, 87 and 88), and Derwent London plc’s newly established Responsible Business board committee which is to be chaired by the designated NED for workforce engagement (2018 ARA, pages 11 and 84).

Workforce engagement
The 2018 Code requires companies to adopt one or a combination of three mechanisms (i.e., designated NED, workforce advisory panel or employee director) or explain the alternative arrangements in place. Our review and discussions with companies have identified that some are adopting a hybrid of the 2018 Code’s mechanisms (e.g., designated NED combined with some form of employee forum or group).

Examples: companies providing more detail on their workforce engagement mechanisms
Derwent London plc, 2018 ARA (page 84) discloses that two employees will join the Responsible Business Committee (a board committee). The criterion for nomination is that employees must have worked at Derwent for at least two years as at 1 January 2019.

Taylor Wimpey plc, 2018 ARA (page 79) discloses the Board’s attendance at its National Employee Forum – the chair and the chair of the remuneration committee attended one meeting – and the topics of discussion (e.g., benefits).

Rolls-Royce Holdings plc, 2018 ARA (page 101) discloses how its designated NED engaged with the workforce during the year, including the topics addressed. For example, it reports that bullying and harassment had been picked up as an emerging theme. This issue was then considered by the Safety & Ethics Committee and resulted in the launch of a global anti-bullying campaign.

Examples: disclosure of material stakeholder issues
Inmarsat plc, 2018 ARA (page 42) presents a materiality matrix that shows the sustainability issues that stakeholders are most concerned about. These were identified via stakeholder interviews and then prioritised for the information, Communications and Technology industry by conducting an analysis of key sustainability topics reported in the Dow Jones Sustainability Indices World Index.

Royal Bank of Scotland plc, 2018 ARA (pages 11 and 12) includes a materiality matrix that shows external influences, both in terms of their relevance to stakeholders and their potential commercial impact on the bank. These were identified using stakeholder interviews and a cross-bank workshop. The linkage between each key influence and the bank’s strategic priorities is also indicated.

Fresnillo plc, 2018 ARA (pages 22 and 23) has a table explaining the material issues for each key stakeholder group. For example, the issues that matter to contractors and suppliers include working conditions, labour rights and health and safety.

What were the topics of engagement?
In our view, boards should clearly establish the strategic issues on which they wish to obtain stakeholder input and feedback. Companies should then disclose the material stakeholder issues and topics covered. Some companies already do this using matrices, tables and case studies, with a few including wider linkages to strategy and principal risks.

We would also recommend disclosing the output: the feedback and views obtained from stakeholders and the outcomes i.e., the link to the board’s decisions and discussions (if any).
What was the impact of engagement on board decisions and actions?

Engagement alone is of limited use unless its output is considered by the board in a timely fashion and can influence strategy and long-term value creation. For this reason, regulators and investors are most interested in the ‘so what?’ aspect of engagement: what impact does it have on the board’s actions and decisions? We acknowledge that such transparency will be challenging to achieve at least in the early years. However, lack of disclosure would technically represent a failure to comply fully with the new reporting requirements. It could also raise doubts about whether boards are taking engagement seriously and potentially lead to more interventionist regulation.

Examples: disclosure of topics of engagement

National Grid plc, 2018 ARA (pages 47 and 53) provides case studies on its employee engagement sessions, including high level detail on the topics discussed and feedback given by employees. For example, it explains that the recruitment schemes discussion emphasised the significance of culture and the need for the company to review where and how it advertises in order to get the best talent and broadest diversity.

Examples: disclosing the impact of engagement on board decisions

Derrwent London plc, 2018 ARA (pages 86 and 94) describes an updated process to require a stakeholder impact analysis for all material decisions to assist its directors in performing their s172 duties. A case study on a major board decision includes stakeholder impact analysis and the board’s response.

Freddie Woolfe, Head of Responsible Investment and Stewardship, Merian Global Investors

We often find that boards get highly edited views on stakeholder engagement and culture from management. We would like to understand how companies engage directly with stakeholders and, if not, how they ensure they are receiving their unfiltered views.

There is an opportunity for companies to tell their own story as an increasing number of investors turn to third party sources such as Glassdoor for more information.

Figure 7. Derwent London plc, 2018 ARA (page 94)

Examples: disclosing the impact of engagement on board decisions

National Grid plc, 2018 ARA (Figure 8) explains that in 2019 a robust framework will be established to ensure that stakeholder considerations are suitably captured. It identifies the stakeholder groups considered for each key board focus area and explains how each group has influenced the board’s decision making.
Deconstructing the Section 172(1) Statement

Section 172 imposes a duty on all company directors to act in the way they consider, in good faith, would be most likely to promote the success of the company for the benefit of its shareholders as a whole. It also requires directors to have regard to a non-exhaustive list of factors (see Figure 9) to ensure that, in promoting the success of the company, broader implications of decisions are considered.

Although s172 is not new, the disclosure requirement is causing (or should cause) some directors to re-evaluate how they demonstrably discharge this duty. For premium listed entities, it is aligned with Principle D and Provision 5 of the 2018 Code. Beyond the questions of who, why, how, what and so what discussed above, the s172(1) statement includes other considerations, such as the long-term consequences of a board’s decisions and their impact on the company’s reputation.

S172(1) statements

In our view, for a s172(1) statement to be meaningful, it must be specific. The statement should include the principal decisions made in the year and explain how the board considered the long-term consequences of these decisions, the interest of employees, suppliers and customers, and the impact on the environment and community.

Generic, boilerplate disclosures will not add any value to reporting.

We have developed practical guidance and illustrative examples to help companies meet the s172(1) reporting requirement (Figures 10 and 11).

---

Deconstructing the Section 172(1) Statement, EY, September 2019.
The following disclosures describes how the directors have had regard to the matters set out in Section 172(1)(a) to (f):

## Deconstructing the Section 172(1) Statement

### Group

**WHO?**

Stakeholder Group

**WHY?**

Why it is important to engage

**HOW?**

How management and/or directors engaged

**WHAT?**

What were the key topics of engagement and what feedback and input did the board/management obtain?

**ACTIONS AND OUTCOMES**

What was the impact of the engagement including any actions taken?

### Investors

- The major interests in our shares are set out on page X within our Governance Report.
- Key metrics:
  - Earnings per share
  - Total dividends paid
  - TSR

- Continued access to capital is of vital importance to the long-term success of our business. Through our engagement activities, we strive to obtain investor buy-in into our strategic objectives and how we go about executing on them.
- We create value for our shareholders by generating strong and sustainable results that translate into dividends. We are seeking to promote an investor base that is interested in a long-term holding in the company.

### Pension Trustees

- [not completed]
- [not completed]
- [not completed]
- Plans for the utilisation of the high accumulated cash position: refer to principal decision 1 for further details.

### Principal decisions

- We define principal decisions as both those that are material to the group/company, but also those that are significant to any of our key stakeholder groups. For detail as to how we established and defined our key stakeholder groups see page X.

- In making the following principal decisions the board considered the outcomes from its stakeholder engagement as well as the need to maintain a reputation for high standards of business conduct and the need to act fairly between the members of the company:

##### Principal decision 1: Special dividend

- The Board has decided to pay a total dividend of EXXX in respect of the year.
- Details of the dividend policy are included on page XXX, where we explain our long-term approach to dividends in the context of profitability.
- During our engagement with investors, we were questioned on and debated the high level of cash maintained by the company. After due consideration, the directors decided to exercise their discretion and return some of the cash to the shareholders by declaring a special dividend of XXX.

- The directors took into account whether it would impact the on-going strategic investment in the new green energy plant, which is considered critical to the long-term success of the company and achievement of our strategic objectives and concluded it would not, in light of the strong cash position net of the special dividend payment. The directors also considered the net liability position of the Group’s pension scheme and are in the process of agreeing a plan with the Pension Trustees to increase the scheme funding over the next two years (see note X to the financial statements).
- Details of our capital allocation policy are included on page X; where we explain our priorities and the framework we use to decide between them.
- The models supporting the going concern assessment and viability statement factored in the higher than normal cash distribution in the current year. However, future payments have been modelled in line with the basic dividend policy.

---

**Figure 10. Extract from Deconstructing the Section 172(1) Statement**

The following disclosures describes how the directors have had regard to the matters set out in Section 172(1)(a) to (f):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stakeholder Group</th>
<th>WHY?</th>
<th>HOW?</th>
<th>WHAT?</th>
<th>ACTIONS AND OUTCOMES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Investors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pension Trustees</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[not completed]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 11. Extract from Deconstructing the Section 172(1) Statement**

**Principal decisions**

We define principal decisions as both those that are material to the group/company, but also those that are significant to any of our key stakeholder groups. For detail as to how we established and defined our key stakeholder groups see page X.

- In making the following principal decisions the board considered the outcomes from its stakeholder engagement as well as the need to maintain a reputation for high standards of business conduct and the need to act fairly between the members of the company:

**Principal decision 1: Special dividend**

- The Board has decided to pay a total dividend of EXXX in respect of the year.
- Details of the dividend policy are included on page XXX, where we explain our long-term approach to dividends in the context of profitability.
- During our engagement with investors, we were questioned on and debated the high level of cash maintained by the company. After due consideration, the directors decided to exercise their discretion and return some of the cash to the shareholders by declaring a special dividend of XXX.

- The directors took into account whether it would impact the on-going strategic investment in the new green energy plant, which is considered critical to the long-term success of the company and achievement of our strategic objectives and concluded it would not, in light of the strong cash position net of the special dividend payment. The directors also considered the net liability position of the Group’s pension scheme and are in the process of agreeing a plan with the Pension Trustees to increase the scheme funding over the next two years (see note X to the financial statements).
- Details of our capital allocation policy are included on page X; where we explain our priorities and the framework we use to decide between them.
- The models supporting the going concern assessment and viability statement factored in the higher than normal cash distribution in the current year. However, future payments have been modelled in line with the basic dividend policy.
Overview of findings

When conducted appropriately, board evaluations should provide an objective view of the board’s effectiveness and progressively help the board to improve how it operates. Our review found good disclosures on the board evaluation process. However, under the 2018 Code, companies will need to start reporting evaluation outcomes and the actions taken or committed to be taken to address these.

New requirements

2018 Code

- Include a statement on whether the external evaluator had any connection not only with the company, but also with individual directors (Provision 21).
- Explain how the board evaluation was conducted, including the nature and extent of the external evaluator’s contact with the board and individual directors (Provision 23).
- Report the outcomes and actions taken as a result of the board evaluation (Provision 23).
- Provide information on how the board evaluation has or will influence board composition (Provision 23).

Hallmarks of leading practice and disclosure

- An objective process to select and appoint an independent external evaluator.
- Open and honest interaction between the external evaluator and the board.
- A rigorous approach to internal board evaluations undertaken in intervening years between external evaluations.
- Concerted focus by the board on progressing actions to address recommended areas of improvement.
- Addressing identified skills gaps through targeted board recruitment and succession planning.
- Disclosures that are balanced and transparent, reflecting the positives but also the key challenges: we recommend draft disclosures are reviewed by the external evaluator to ensure they fairly reflect evaluation outcomes.

We felt that developing a code of practice for board evaluators was too narrow a focus and decided to take our consultation a step further as we believe that some of the issues in this market need action from companies as well. For example, how a company selects and appoints an evaluator and how it discloses the outcomes from an evaluation have just as much importance in ensuring the quality and independence of a board evaluation. We hope that the overall package that we have proposed will give all stakeholders more confidence in the findings reported.

Peter Swabey, Policy and Research Director, ICSA

ICSA Consultation: review of the effectiveness of independent board evaluation in the UK listed sector

ICSA sought views on the need for a code of practice for providers of board evaluation services. ICSA also considered voluntary principles for listed companies to apply when engaging evaluators, and guidance on disclosure of the conduct and outcomes of their board evaluation.
The process and independence of the external evaluation

The 2018 Code requirements, coupled with the ICSA review of the effectiveness of independent board evaluations (once finalised), should help create more rigour in the board evaluation process and improve trust in external evaluations.

Based on our review, many companies are already reporting clear detail around the process of the external board evaluation. We consider it leading practice to set out the different steps of the evaluation, the timing of those steps, how the board and individual directors interacted with the evaluator at different stages, and the findings of the external evaluator.

In light of the 2018 Code, we expect further disclosure around the external evaluator’s connection not only to the company, but also to individual directors.

Examples: board evaluation disclosures

Man Group plc, 2018 ARA (Figure 12) sets out the different phases of the board evaluation, including the multiple interactions the external evaluator had with the board at different stages in the process.

Mondi plc, 2018 ARA (page 101) discloses more detail than most companies around the internal board evaluation. This demonstrates a rigorous approach is taken to evaluations in intervening years between external evaluations.

Figure 12. Man Group plc, 2018 ARA (page 56)

Evaluation cycle

Following two internal evaluations in 2015 and 2017, a full external evaluation was carried out in 2018. Claire Chambers (CC), who has no other connection with the Company, was selected to carry out this work and her findings and recommendations were reported to and discussed by the Board and its Committees in December. The key stages of the evaluation process undertaken are set out below:

- **Phase 1 – Engagement**: Chairman and Company Secretary briefed CC on the scope of the review and suggested areas of focus.
- **Phase 2 – Briefing**: CC received a full set of Man Group’s Board papers to provide insight into the quality of materials provided.
- **Phase 3 – Interviews**: CC conducted 11 interviews with Board members and senior management. Executive Committees also attended, covering both standard topics and others aligned to individual roles and responsibilities.
- **Phase 4 – Board meeting observation**: CC attended the October Board meeting to observe Board dynamics and individual director contributions.
- **Phase 5 – Feedback meeting with Chairman**: Chair conducted a feedback meeting with the Chairman and provided confidential feedback on individual Board members.
- **Phase 6 – Board review of findings**: Board reviewed the evaluation findings and agreed to priority areas for focus in 2020.

Examples: action focused reporting

Rentokil Initial plc, 2018 ARA (page 67) discloses a progress tracker for actions in the past and upcoming year for the board. This should steer companies away from boilerplate, process-driven narrative. Stakeholders are interested in what was done in the year to improve board performance and effectiveness, as well as what actions will be implemented in the future.

Lloyds Banking Group plc, 2018 ARA (page 63) reports on director recruitment resulting from a skills gap identified in the prior-year board evaluation.

National Grid plc, 2018 ARA (page 56) goes further than most, assigning specific responsibility to individuals for planned actions. This increases accountability and confidence that the board is taking the outcomes of evaluations seriously.

Man Group plc, 2018 ARA (page 65) provides more detail than usual on not just the board evaluation, but also committee evaluations. For example, as a result of the prior year nomination committee’s evaluation, a director has been recruited specifically to fill an identified skills gap.
Overview of findings

Given the strategic importance of talent planning and the broadened role of nomination committees under the 2018 Code, we expect nomination committee reports in future years to contain more detail on what they did — particularly around senior management succession. Chair tenure has been high on board agendas due to the bright line test in the 2018 Code. We recommend that companies acknowledge the issue where they have long-serving chairs and provide some colour on what actions are being taken.

New requirements

2018 Code

- The board should have oversight of succession planning of a diverse pipeline for both the board and senior management positions (Principle J, Provision 17).
- Consideration should be given to the length of service of the board as a whole to ensure membership is regularly refreshed (Principle K).
- Board appointments should be made objectively, while promoting diversity of gender, social and ethnic backgrounds, cognitive and personal strengths (Principle J).
- The annual report should describe the work of the nomination committee, including its diversity and inclusion policy, how it has been implemented and the progress in achieving set diversity and inclusion objectives (Provision 23).
- The chair should not remain in post beyond nine years from the date of their first appointment to the board (Provision 19).

Expanded responsibilities of the nomination committee

The nomination committee's role and responsibilities under the 2018 Code are broader than before. A key change is that nomination committees have oversight of succession planning for senior management — not just the board — and of the development of a diverse talent pipeline. Our review found that a number of nomination committees have refreshed their terms of reference accordingly and hope that reporting in future years will provide colour on the activities and outcomes in this area.

We found that where nomination committees are currently reporting oversight of senior management, this is usually for top or critical senior leadership positions. In these instances, companies are demonstrating awareness of the potential benefits in nurturing and retaining key talent.

Hallmarks of leading practice and disclosure

- A long-term view by the nomination committee of succession plans for board and senior management.
- Clarity on how independence and objectivity are safeguarded in instances where chairs or NEDs have long tenures.
- Transparent disclosure on the tenure of all board members, from their first appointment, as well as any plans for board refreshment.
- A progress report on diversity initiatives showing the outcomes and benefits, using case studies to help bring the topic to life.

It would be interesting to see what boards are doing to build executives’ CVs, including how they are increasing the executives’ exposure to the business to develop future leaders.

Ashley Hamilton Claxton, Head of Responsible Investment, Royal London
Promoting a diverse pipeline of talent

Echoing the findings from various reviews, including the Hampton-Alexander and Parker reviews, the 2018 Code has a heightened focus on diversity in its widest sense. It explicitly refers to the need for appointments and succession plans to promote diversity of gender, social and ethnic backgrounds, cognitive and personal strengths.

Based on our review it is evident that boards are acutely aware of the issue. Disclosures have most impact when they highlight specific actions taken and initiatives in place to improve diversity and their results e.g., progress made in the year. Kingfisher plc’s 2018 ARA (page 70) provides a good example. We encourage companies to build on their reporting by clearly stating their objectives, referencing statistics based on broad diversity characteristics, reporting on progress made through past initiatives and describing further actions that need to be taken to achieve their diversity objectives.

Examples: talent development and succession planning

Taylor Wimpey plc, 2018 ARA (pages 87 and 88)
The nomination committee report discusses internal talent development programmes, such as talent management boards that help senior management and executives to broaden their skills.

Rolls-Royce Holdings plc, 2018 ARA (page 73)
demonstrates the company’s commitment to developing and progressing the careers of internal talent. For example, a board apprentice programme provides individuals with leadership development experience by joining board committees and receiving mentorship by existing board members.

Examples:

talent development and succession planning

PageGroup plc, 2018 ARA (pages 51 and 52)
discloses that the nomination committee has been focused on ensuring succession plans are in place for key roles and emergency successors are identified for all critical roles in the organisation.

Assessing chair and NED tenure

The 2018 Code states that the chair should not remain in post beyond nine years, from the date of their first appointment to the board (with limited extension under some circumstances). Our review found that chair succession is high on the board agenda, with many companies discussing accelerating their succession plans. This may reflect the fact that almost 40% of the top 350 UK companies have a chair who has served on the board for eight years or more.12

12 Board tenure in the UK, Minerva Analytics, February 2019.

Reporting is so often a box ticking exercise. Rather we would want companies to focus their reporting on what has been of strategic importance in the year e.g., spending more time reporting on chair succession planning, given how key the role is to the company.

Nathan Leclercq, Head of Corporate Governance, Aviva Investors

Figure 13. Prudential plc, 2018 ARA (page 111)
In advance of the recommended nine-year maximum tenure taking effect, some companies disclose in their 2018 ARA that they have chosen to retain their current chairs. Overall, the explanations in these cases are limited. The better disclosures give specific reasons why the board viewed the decision as appropriate, e.g., Prudential plc (Figure 13) cites major ongoing business change. We consider it good practice for the SID to provide insights into the reasons for the extension of the term of, or change of, the chair.

The 2018 Code also points to the need to assess board tenure as a whole. Based on our review of FTSE 350 ARAs, nomination committees note the potential benefits that board refreshment could bring, including the ability to encourage diversity. However, overall discussion on tenure for NEDs is limited. Only a few companies comment on long tenures and succession planning — typically in instances where directors were retiring from their position on the board. We encourage boards to provide more information on what they are doing to consider board tenure as a whole and the succession plans in place, while also clearly disclosing current director tenures, e.g., as done by BAE Systems plc (Figure 14).

Examples: chair tenure

Mondi plc, 2018 ARA (page 87) explains why the Joint Chair should continue in post, despite having served over nine years: his experience and understanding of the history and operations of the group are seen as important, given the proposed simplification of the group structure.

Rentokil Initial plc, 2018 ARA (pages 77 and 78) includes information from the SID around accelerated succession plans and the recruitment of a new chairman.
Overview of findings

In recent years, investors have voiced concerns around the ‘over-boarding’ of some NEDs i.e., whether those who hold multiple appointments have the time and capacity to commit to their directorships. Such concerns have resulted in investors voting against the re-election of certain directors — as confirmed by the Investment Association’s Public Register of voting results.

Our review and discussions with investors confirm that companies should enhance disclosures about the time directors have available to commit to their roles, particularly when a director takes on a new external position.

New requirements

2018 Code

- The board should take account of other demands on directors’ time when making new director appointments, and prior to appointment candidates should disclose their significant commitments with an indication of the time involved (Provision 15).
- Directors should seek prior approval from the board before taking on additional external appointments (Provision 15).
- The ARA should explain the reasons for permitting significant appointments and in general it is expected that full-time executive directors should not take on more than one non-executive directorship in a FTSE 100 company or equivalent (Provision 15).

Hallmarks of leading practice and disclosure

- Collective board understanding of the necessary commitment, capacity and skill required to fulfill director roles effectively – both in business as usual and ‘crisis’ circumstances.
- Transparency on directors’ current external commitments, with an indication of any proposed changes that may affect their role on and availability to the board.
- Balanced assessment of a proposed new director’s skills and availability, recognising the potential benefits or drawbacks the individual’s other external commitments could bring.

The 2018 Code if applied in spirit should go some way to address these concerns by requiring companies to consider director time commitments more rigorously, with related disclosure. However, defining the right minimum time commitment is challenging. There is wide variation in the roles directors hold, their responsibilities and the types of organisations they work for or the boards they serve, e.g., FTSE or AIM company, trust or charity.

The obligations and expectations on directors have increased over the years and this has not been sufficiently reflected in their time commitments and the number of boards they are able to serve on. We have updated our policy with stricter limitations with a view to initiating a discussion and debate with full knowledge there will be exceptions due to size and complexity of the business.

Rebecca Vine, Senior Corporate Governance Analyst, Aviva Investors

The age of the figurehead director is over; we need board members to have sufficient time to dedicate to the company and add real value. This is of particular importance for the audit committee, whose role in challenging management and securing investor confidence in the accounts cannot be over-emphasised. I am therefore very interested to see disclosures helping me understand the expectations of the role and the time directors have available to commit.

Richard Buxton, Head of UK Equities, Merian Global Investors
Examples: addressing concerns around over-boarding

Meggitt plc, 2018 ARA (page 82) demonstrates a transparent approach by responding clearly to investor concerns about the chair’s over-boarding due to his positions on three other listed company boards.

BAE Systems plc, 2018 ARA (page 82) includes disclosures on the external commitments of non-executive directors and conclusions reached on their ability to discharge their responsibilities effectively.

Capita plc, 2018 ARA (page 82) shows openness in the statement by the remuneration committee chair about his decision to step down as chair, but remain in post as a non-executive director, based on his changing external time commitments.

Our review found examples of companies disclosing minimum time expectations covering a broad range: from a minimum of 12 to 15 days for each NED, rising to up to 60 days, especially in the financial services sector e.g., Barclays plc (Figure 15).

Many companies state that in most instances directors will be expected to go above and beyond these minimum time commitments, especially during periods of business disruption.

In terms of changing commitments, the 2018 Code indicates that directors should seek board approval before taking on additional appointments. Similarly the EPIC report (see page 7) calls on companies to be transparent about changes in directors’ external responsibilities to help engender stakeholder trust.
Emerging risks

Overview of findings

The 2018 Code focuses on emerging risks, in addition to the previously required principal risks. This change is primarily driven by two factors: (1) many risk disclosures appear to be ‘stale’ (i.e., there is little or no change in principal risks year on year); and (2) there is inadequate consideration of risks which some boards see as distant e.g., climate change.

New requirements

2018 Code

- The board should complete a robust assessment of the company’s emerging and principal risks (Provision 28).
- Companies should describe what procedures are in place to identify emerging risks, and explain how these are being managed or mitigated (Provision 28).

Hallmarks of leading practice and disclosure

- Defining what an emerging risk is in the context of the organisation.
- Detailing the key emerging risks and explaining how the board monitors their development using specific examples.

What is an emerging risk?

Boards should first define what an emerging risk is and ensure this is understood throughout the organisation. There is no common definition of emerging risk, nor is the term defined in the 2018 Code. Given this lack of definition we would encourage companies to clarify in their own terms what it means for them.

Although companies are not required to disclose the emerging risks themselves, some have shared this information. Emerging risks identified in our review include climate change (page 52), Brexit, cyber-security, disruptive technology and geopolitical issues.

Definition of emerging risks

EY view

Emerging risks are generally considered to be those that are likely to either materialise or impact over a longer timeframe. This timeframe can vary, although we recommend it should at least exceed a two year period. Emerging risks also generally do not have much by way of a ‘track record’ or previous known experience against which they can be considered. Therefore it is likely that different ‘scales’ such as vulnerability, velocity and preparedness may need to be used to help assess, track and monitor emerging risks, as it is unlikely their likelihood and impact will be known.

Cambridge Centre for Risk Studies

‘Emerging risk can be defined as a new risk, a changing risk or a novel combination of risks for which the broad impacts, likelihoods and costs are not yet well understood.’

Enhanced Disclosure Task Force

An emerging risk may be defined as ‘one which has large uncertain outcomes which may become certain in the longer term (perhaps beyond one year) and which could have a material effect on the business strategy if it were to occur’.

Hallmarks of leading practice and disclosure

- Defining what an emerging risk is in the context of the organisation.
- Detailing the key emerging risks and explaining how the board monitors their development using specific examples.
How to identify and manage emerging risks

Most organisations still focus on short-term issues or known problems. Few companies have a formal process for differentiating emerging risks from principal risks and even fewer disclose this in the annual report or explain their process in practice.\(^\text{15}\)

Those that provide more detail on their emerging risks process refer to the use of internal stress tests, external analysis (see GlaxoSmithKline plc, Figure 16), discussions by the Board (see Wood Group (John) plc, Figure 17), technology, risk scanning services, and a group risk appetite dashboard.

In identifying emerging risks, we recommend that boards consider horizon scanning, the use of external insights, deploying effective monitoring mechanisms, and assessing the role of culture.\(^\text{15}\)

The 2018 Code does not require disclosure of what the emerging risks are, but rather the process of identifying as well as managing or mitigating them. Our view is that this may lead to boilerplate, process-oriented disclosures that are not risk specific. Investors have also indicated that they will be looking for companies to provide more detail on what their emerging risks are, including any climate-related risks.

For these new disclosures to be helpful, they need to give users a sense of how the board monitors emerging risks and assesses the speed with which they may develop. Company reporting will be most meaningful if it includes specific examples to illustrate the board’s approach. Included here are examples of companies which provide more detail on emerging risks.

We recommend that companies explain how the board monitors emerging risks and assesses the speed with which the risks will develop, using specific examples, even though not required by the 2018 Code. One area in which we are beginning to see more disclosures in this respect is climate change.

Examples: emerging risk disclosures

Vodafone Group plc, 2019 ARA (pages 46, 47 and 50)

Vodafone Group plc discloses emerging risks in two ways. First, the emerging threats in respect of each principal risk, e.g., extreme weather events caused by climate change causing technology failure in relation to technology resilience principal risk, and evolving threats in areas including the use of machine learning for cyber threat principle risk. Second, a watchlist of the emerging risks which may potentially impact them in the longer term and the relevant mitigating activities (e.g., climate change in relation to which they undertook an independent gap analysis of their reporting against the TCFD recommendations to achieve full alignment).

Severn Trent plc, 2019 ARA (Figure 18)

Severn Trent plc explains that they monitor emerging risks and with time they may become fully fledged enterprise risk management (ERM) risks or be incorporated into existing ERM risks (as potential causes) as they learn more. A list of current emerging risks is disclosed including their time horizon (i.e., short, medium or long).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Detail</th>
<th>Area / Factor</th>
<th>Time Horizon</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Macroeconomics</td>
<td>Increased macroeconomic uncertainty post Brexit</td>
<td>Economic</td>
<td>Short</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compliance</td>
<td>The challenge of compliance in a more complex, disaggregated regulatory framework for AMPs and beyond</td>
<td>Legal &amp; Regulatory</td>
<td>Short</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Automation, robotics &amp; AI</td>
<td>Opportunity for increased efficiency through use of automation, robotics and artificial intelligence</td>
<td>Technology &amp; Social</td>
<td>Short</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water industry structure</td>
<td>Increasing social and political pressure on the structure of the water industry</td>
<td>Political &amp; Social</td>
<td>Short</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The TCFD was created by the Financial Stability Board (FSB) and establishes recommendations for consistent ‘disclosures that will help financial market participants understand their climate risks’. In our view, companies should consider the recommendations (set out in the Figure 19), which are structured around the core elements of how companies operate.

The TCFD’s 2019 Status Report reviews how the TCFD recommendations have been implemented by companies and contains examples of good disclosures from companies such as Unilever plc and International Consolidated Airlines Group plc.

I want to know what the key emerging risks are and what is the company doing about them. Disclosures on the process alone to identify and manage would not be as useful. It would also be helpful to know over what timeframe are risks looked at by the board. At what point will an emerging risk turn into a principal risk? What are the mechanisms in place to monitor that?

Ashley Hamilton Claxton, Head of Responsible Investment, Royal London

We expect the scrutiny on climate change and companies’ associated reporting to only increase. Under the government’s Green Finance Strategy, the Task Force on Climate-related Financial Disclosures (TCFD) recommendations may become mandatory for listed companies and large asset owners from 2022 onwards. Concurrently, the FRC has stated it will monitor companies’ climate change reporting and consider the adequacy of auditors’ work on principal risk disclosures, including climate risk.
Overview of findings

With increasing scrutiny from the media and stakeholder pressure around remuneration at both executive levels and across the wider organisation, executive reward remains a highly emotive subject. The scrutiny has recently widened to pay for senior manager/key management personnel and the gulf between the pay at the top and bottom.

5 Broadened responsibilities of the remuneration committee

a. Responsibilities of the remuneration committee

New requirements

2018 Code

• The remuneration committee should review wider workforce remuneration and related policies, taking these into account when setting executive reward. This includes the pension arrangements available to the wider workforce (Provision 33, Provision 38).
• The annual report should evidence what engagement with the workforce has taken place to explain how executive remuneration aligns with wider company pay policy (Provision 41).
• The remuneration committee should consider how executive reward aligns to culture. Incentive schemes should drive behaviours consistent with the company’s purpose, values and strategy (Provision 40).

Complex legislative requirements

The rules and regulations governing the reporting of executive remuneration and the role of the remuneration committee are complex and are covered in numerous regulatory sources including:

• The Large and Medium-sized Companies and Groups (Accounts and Reports) Regulations 2008/2013
• The 2018 Code
• MRR
• With effect from 10 June 2019, The Companies (Directors’ Remuneration Policy and Directors’ Remuneration Report) Regulations 2019 (SI 2019/970) which implement parts of the Shareholder Rights Directive II (SRD II) into UK law.

Our review focused on the changes arising from the 2018 Code but it is interesting to note that many of these are covered in some way in existing requirements. For example:

a. Responsibilities of the remuneration committee

• On discretion — While the MRR introduce a new requirement for the statement from the chair of the remuneration committee to summarise any discretion exercised and the annual report on remuneration to specify in relation to performance-related pay, whether the discretion applied has been exercised due to share price changes, Schedule 8 of the Large and Medium-sized Companies and Groups (Accounts and Reports) Regulations 2008 (Schedule 8) has required for some time disclosure on discretion in respect of performance-related pay, including particulars of how it was exercised and how the resulting level of award was determined.
• On consideration of pay across the organisation — While the 2018 Code introduces the new requirements for the remuneration committee (discussed above), Schedule 8 has required for some time that remuneration committees state:
  • How pay and employment conditions of employees were considered when setting the remuneration policy for directors; and
  • Whether and if so how, the company consulted with employees when drawing up the directors’ remuneration policy.

Hallmarks of leading practice and disclosure

• Clarity from the remuneration committee on how the policy and approach for executive and senior management remuneration fits within the overall remuneration approach across the organisation, including their engagement with workforce to explain this.
• Clarity on reward available at different organisation levels including pensions.
• A clear and balanced set of metrics that determine performance-related pay which align with the company’s culture, purpose, values and strategy.
Therefore, the additions to the 2018 Code in respect of remuneration amplify the importance of the existing requirements as well as the need to consider them holistically especially where they overlap.

We also recommend that the government considers conducting a review of the impact and effectiveness of Schedule 8, just as there have been reviews on recently introduced legislation such as the Modern Slavery Act 2015 and payment practice reporting. This should help streamline and consolidate the requirements and help alleviate some of the regulatory complexity in this area.

Explaining executive pay approach and its alignment with wider pay policy

As explained above there are some pre-existing requirements in Schedule 8 for remuneration committees to explain how pay and employment conditions were considered. Unsurprisingly therefore, we noted that most companies reference consideration of the pay and conditions of the wider workforce but few provide much detail on how this was done. British American Tobacco plc’s 2018 ARA (page 88) details the mechanisms in place for the remuneration committee to engage with the workforce. However, given the elevated focus both in the 2018 Code and MRR of engaging with stakeholders including the workforce, we expect disclosure of this to develop in particular to explain how the remuneration committee engaged with the workforce to explain how executive remuneration aligns with wider company pay policy.

Aligning executive reward with the workforce

Based on a review of a sample of FTSE 350 ARAs, EY found that approximately a third of FTSE 350 companies have reduced executive director pension contributions. The Investment Association has stated that companies should disclose the pension contribution opportunities for the wider workforce and they expect companies to exercise judgement in determining a contribution level that is appropriate for this group.17 Although companies across the FTSE 350 are lowering pension contributions for both new and existing directors, only a small number have disclosed the pension contribution levels available to the wider workforce (typically between 5-15%). Given the views expressed by investors, we expect additional disclosure around this point in the next year.

Aligning reward to culture

The 2018 Code states the remuneration committee should consider how executive reward aligns to company culture and its purpose, values and strategy. As explained in the culture section of this report (pages 12 to 21), including appropriate non-financial metrics in remuneration schemes is important to help make this link and help embed the right behaviours and values. From our review we have seen that companies are referring to a broader set of metrics, beyond financial measures. Lloyds Banking Group plc (Figure 20) have a balanced scorecard referencing metrics including around culture.


Ashley Hamilton Claxton, Head of Responsible Investment, Royal London

We want to see communicated in annual reports what other than money motivates your CEO — what makes him or her tick? It is often not until we speak to the individuals in person that we see what their drivers are and how they care for the culture of their organisation.

Ashley Hamilton Claxton, Head of Responsible Investment, Royal London
Overview of findings

We noted in our report last year that companies had voluntarily started disclosing a CEO pay ratio in anticipation of regulations being finalised. More companies continued to do so in their 2018/19 ARAs ahead of the MRR requirement becoming mandatory. We expect to see greater focus on the narrative explaining the ratios and ensuring messaging is consistent with the wider “pay story”.

New requirements

MRR

Companies within scope must report in tabular form within their annual directors’ remuneration report the ratio of their Chief Executive Officer’s latest Single Total Figure of Remuneration (STFR) to:

- The median (i.e., 50th percentile) full time equivalent (FTE) remuneration of the company’s UK employees;
- The 25th percentile FTE remuneration of the company’s UK employees; and
- The 75th percentile FTE remuneration of the company’s UK employees.

Companies must provide some accompanying narrative information including:

- The methodology chosen for calculating the ratio;
- The reason(s) for any changes to the ratios compared to the previous year; and
- In the case of the median ratio, whether and if so why, the company believes this ratio is consistent with the company’s wider policies on employee pay, reward and progression.

Communicating your “pay story”

Approximately 35% of the FTSE 350 have published their CEO pay ratio. Most companies that state their methodology used Option A, the government’s and investors’ preferred methodology i.e., based on data of total pay and benefits of every UK employee. However, fully conforming with Option A has presented some data challenges to companies. Whilst disclosure of the methodology is important, investors have stated that they will pay most attention to the narrative that contextualises the ratio. To date we have primarily seen practical disclosures explaining the methodology adopted together with a small number of disclosures on what this means within the broader approach to reward. These disclosures include:

- How salary progression is structured for those at the lowest pay bands;
- Statements regarding the real living wage; and
- Referencing fair pay principles that form the backbone of a remuneration framework that is intended to be fair and free from discrimination.

Best practice in narrative will evolve and this will need to include explaining the inevitable variability in the ratio on a year on year basis. Unilever plc’s 2018 ARA (pages 63 and 64) provides insightful explanation combining narrative and charts.

Hallmarks of leading practice and disclosure

- A remuneration committee who understands pay and workforce practices throughout the organisation.
- Insightful narrative that explains the movements in the ratio.
- Clarity on the methodology adopted and how this is applied to the specific company.

Unilever plc’s 2018 ARA provides an example where the CEO pay ratio is just one of the data points that should be used by remuneration committees to explain why executive pay is appropriate. Reward quantum remains a contentious issue, and as such, remuneration committees are encouraged to ensure they provide a consistent and transparent view across the whole of the remuneration report, touching on all data points and utilising them to support the overall messaging on reward. This will require a “pay story” to be developed rather than approaching this from a pure compliance perspective and simply listing out different statistics and charts.
Appendices

Appendix 1 Looking ahead: Upcoming reporting developments

Increased transparency via disclosure and reporting looks to remain a key tenet of many of the public policy initiatives that businesses will have to contend with over the coming years. Below we provide an overview of the narrative reporting developments – many which may impact ARAs – that companies will need to start preparing for either as they are already effective or recommended or that they should have on their radar as the related policy initiatives develop further. It is interesting to note that the effectiveness and impact of disclosure requirements that were introduced a few years ago e.g., transparency in supply chains etc. have recently been reviewed and this may also create new or enhanced disclosures in some areas.

Notes:
- Only a summary/outline of the developments (as of August 2019) has been provided and companies must refer to the regulatory sources for completeness both of reporting requirements and of the broader regulatory and governance implications.
- For impending developments, details on scope, timing and source have only been provided where known.

### A: Reporting developments which are effective

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reporting development, scope, regulatory source and timing</th>
<th>Detail</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Streamlined energy and carbon reporting (SECR)** | The new SECR requirements supersede the mandatory Greenhouse Gas Reporting which has been in force since 2013. Under the new SECR requirements:
- Quoted companies must report on their global energy use in addition to greenhouse gas emissions in their Directors’ Report.
- Large unquoted companies and limited liability partnerships must disclose their annual energy use and greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions and related information. The Government’s previously issued environmental reporting guidelines were updated in March 2019 to reflect SECR. While it is not mandatory to tag SECR data, the Government is keen to enable companies to digitally report their SECR data. Therefore, a SECR taxonomy is currently being consulted on to enable this. |

### Shareholder Rights

Scope of reporting climate-related information

- **Scope:** Voluntary for companies that fall under the scope of the EU Non-Financial Reporting Directive (NFRD) which was implemented in the UK via amendments to the Disclosure Guidance and Transparency Rules (DTR) and Companies Act 2006.
- **Source:** EU
- **Timing:** Immediate

- Companies should consider providing the recommended disclosures outlined in the guidelines and summarised below if they decide that climate is a material issue as part of their reporting on environmental matters under the NFRD.
- **Business model**
  - The impact of climate-related risks and opportunities on the company’s business model, strategy and financial planning.
  - The ways in which the company’s business model can impact the climate, both positively and negatively.
  - The resilience of the company’s business model and strategy, to different climate related scenarios over different time horizons.
- **Policies and due diligence processes**
  - Any policies related to climate, including any climate change mitigation or adaptation policy.
  - Any climate-related targets the company has set as part of its policies, especially any GHG emissions targets, and how company targets relate to national and international targets and to the Paris Agreement in particular.
  - The board’s oversight of climate-related risks and opportunities.
  - Management’s role in assessing and managing climate-related risks, opportunities and the rationale for the approach.
- **Outcomes**
  - The outcomes of the company’s policy on climate change, including performance against the indicators used and targets (including GHG emissions targets) set to manage climate related risks and opportunities.
- **Principal risks and their management**
  - The principal climate-related risks the company has identified over the short, medium, and long term throughout the value chain, any assumptions that have been made when identifying these risks and the processes for identifying, assessing and managing these risks.
- **KPIs**
  - Any indicators and targets used to assess climate related risks and opportunities in line with the company’s strategy and risk management processes. |
B. Impending developments which companies should keep a watching brief on

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reporting development, scope, regulatory source and timing</th>
<th>Detail</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>European Single Electronic Format (ESEF)</strong>&lt;br&gt;Scope: Issuers with securities listed on a regulated EU market&lt;br&gt;Source: European Securities and Markets Authority (ESMA)&lt;br&gt;Timing: Annual financial reports from 1 January 2020, although UK impact is uncertain due to Brexit</td>
<td>As part of amendments made to the EU Transparency Directive in 2013, to facilitate accessibility, analysis and comparability of annual reports, issuers will be required to prepare their annual reports in a single electronic reporting format. ESMA was assigned the responsibility to develop regulatory technical standards (RTS) to specify this electronic reporting format. The key changes are as follows:&lt;br&gt;• Companies will have to file the entirety of their ARA in XHTML format – a combination of XML and HTML – that can be read by standard internet browsers.&lt;br&gt;• Companies will initially have to tag/mark up their IFRS primary financial statements using XBRL, a form of XBRL which can be embedded within XHTML web pages.&lt;br&gt;The RTS was approved by the European Commission and published in the Official Journal in May 2019. It contains the core taxonomy (based on IFRS taxonomy) that companies can use to tag their financial statements.&lt;br&gt;In the event the UK remains subject to EU law on 1 January 2020, the FCA is currently consulting on a new provision in the DTR to implement UK requirements for ESEF. Refer to FCA CP 19/27 issued in September 2019.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Climate change reporting</strong>&lt;br&gt;Scope: All listed companies and large asset owners&lt;br&gt;Source: UK Government</td>
<td>As part of the UK Government’s Green Finance Strategy, Transforming finance for a greener future, published in July 2019, there are several proposals which may lead to new disclosure changes, including:&lt;br&gt;• All listed companies and large asset owners to disclose in line with the TCFD recommendations by 2022.&lt;br&gt;• The government and the Pensions Regulator have jointly established an industry group to develop TCFD guidance for pension schemes which will be put into statutory footing in due course.&lt;br&gt;The FRC concurrently issued a statement to say it will continue to review whether companies are complying with the current statutory disclosure requirements of the strategic report (which includes reporting on principal risks and uncertainties) as well as any financial statement implications of climate change.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Independent Review of the Modern Slavery Act 2015 (MSA 2015)</strong>&lt;br&gt;Scope: TBC. Current scope of the MSA 2015 is organisations with a turnover, or group turnover of £36m or more which are either incorporated in the UK or carry on a business in the UK.&lt;br&gt;Source: UK Government</td>
<td>In May 2019, an independent review report of the Modern Slavery Act 2015 was published. The Government issued concurrently in July 2019, its response as well as a consultation, to inform future legislation in this area. Among the proposals being consulted on, those likely to affect reporting are:&lt;br&gt;• Companies should not be able to state they have taken no steps to address modern slavery in their supply chains, as the legislation currently permits, and that the six areas of reporting currently recommended in guidance should be made mandatory.&lt;br&gt;• The statutory guidance on transparency in supply chains will be strengthened to include a template of the information organisations are expected to provide on each of the six areas.&lt;br&gt;• MSA statements will be filed a centralised online government registry and there will be a single reporting deadline.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Payment practices

**Scope:** Currently, large private companies, large limited liability partnerships and large listed companies.<br>**Source:** UK Government, FRC<br>Following a call for evidence, the Government published a response in June 2019 proposing to introduce a package of measures to tackle late payments. It states that it will use its enforcement powers to prosecute and fine large companies which have not yet reported or have reported payment practice data incorrectly.<br>The proposed changes which are likely to impact reporting include:<br>• As announced in the Chancellor’s 2019 Spring Statement, audit committees of large companies will be required to review their payment practices and report on them in their ARA. The FRC is expected to publish guidance for audit committees on this in due course.<br>• The Government has also asked the FRC to review how well payment practices are reflected in the first year of the new MRR requirement on stakeholder reporting.<br>**Board evaluation in the UK listed sector**<br>**Scope:** Listed companies<br>**Source:** ICSA; The Governance Institute, UK Government<br>The Government’s response to its consultation on Insolvency and Corporate Governance, recommended an examination on the quality of board evaluations. ICSA consulted on this matter and in due course will publish and submit a report of its recommendations to the Government for its consideration. Depending on the outcome, listed companies may be required in the future to provide additional disclosures on the conduct of and outcomes from evaluations.<br>**Ethnicity pay reporting**<br>**Scope:** TBC, consultation proposal was companies with 250 employees or more UK Government<br>**Source:** UK Government<br>The UK government consulted between October 2018 and January 2019 to inform future government policy on ethnicity pay reporting. The Government has not yet finalised its analysis of the responses, but companies may be required in the future to conduct an equal pay review and publish information on their ethnicity pay gap.
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