



corporatecompliance.org

Compliance & Ethics PROFESSIONAL®

A PUBLICATION OF THE SOCIETY OF CORPORATE COMPLIANCE AND ETHICS

DECEMBER 2018

Roy Snell

former SCCE & HCCA
Chief Executive Officer
Edina, MN





FEATURES

- 16 **Meet Roy Snell**
an interview by **Odell Guyton**
- 23 **Compliance and ethics: A profession with a tough mission**
by **Joe Murphy**
The stakes are high for compliance professionals, but the tools, knowledge, and resources exist for compliance and ethics to succeed even under tough circumstances.
- 28 **[CEU] Writing a code of conduct: A simple method**
by **Alexandre C. Serpa**
Codes of conduct are a key component of compliance programs. Breaking down the steps necessary to create a code can make the process more manageable and focused.
- 34 **Doing more with less: Building cross-functional partnerships on a budget**
by **Lauren Connell**
Budget constraints and a wide scope of responsibilities are common in compliance and ethics. Building cross-functional partnerships can help compliance professionals better leverage their time and build stakeholder support.
- 42 **[CEU] Bedouin compliance and the ethical supply chain**
by **Lori Baker**
Compliance is a growth area in the Middle East, but a balance between regional culture and the developing business customs must be maintained.

DEPARTMENTS

- 6 **News**
- 9 **SCCE news**
- 14 **People on the move**
- 70 **SCCE congratulates newly certified designees**
- 73 **Takeaways**
- 74 **SCCE upcoming events**

COLUMNS

- 3 **Letter from the CEO**
by **Gerry Zack**
- 21 **Empirically speaking**
by **Billy Hughes and Dian Zhang**
- 27 **Ethics vs. or AND compliance**
by **Steven Priest**
- 33 **Compliance, life, and everything else**
by **Thomas R. Fox**
- 41 **View from the front lines**
by **Meric Craig Bloch**
- 49 **Kaplan's Court**
by **Jeffrey M. Kaplan**
- 53 **The view from Nickel City**
by **Jennifer L. Kennedy**
- 57 **How to be a wildly effective compliance officer**
by **Kristy Grant-Hart**
- 72 **The last word**
by **Joe Murphy**



Compliance & Ethics Professional is printed with 100% soy-based, water-soluble inks on recycled paper, which includes 10% post-consumer waste. The remaining fiber comes from responsibly managed forests. The energy used to produce the paper is generated with Green-e® certified renewable energy. Certifications for the paper include Forest Stewardship Council (FSC), Sustainable Forestry Initiative (SFI), and Programme for the Endorsement of Forest Certification (PEFC).

by Jeffrey M. Kaplan

Directors and compliance oversight liability

Jeffrey M. Kaplan (jkaplan@kaplanwalker.com) is a Partner with Kaplan & Walker LLP in Princeton, NJ.

How useful to promoting compliance is the threat of personal liability to directors for failing to oversee their respective companies' compliance programs? Earlier this year, in a post in the Harvard Law School Corporate Governance Forum,¹ Donald C. Langevoort of the Georgetown University



Kaplan

Law Center reviewed the case law under the famous *Caremark* decision.² He found the law itself was not particularly strong, but expressed confidence that board members were nonetheless sufficiently motivated to do the right thing, due mainly to:

...pressures from regulators and enforcers at the federal level, who have come to believe in the value of a stronger board-level presence in compliance. The Organizational Sentencing Guidelines, COSO [Committee of Sponsoring Organizations of the Treadway Commission] principles and numerous regulatory pronouncements seek not only board approval of written policies and procedures and key compliance personnel decisions, but a much more interactive involvement that includes reporting lines running from the chief compliance officer (and perhaps chief legal officer) directly to the board, unfiltered by senior executives.

But not everyone agrees that *Caremark* is fit for purpose. More recently, writing in the same blog, John Armour (University of Oxford),

Jeffrey N. Gordon (Columbia Law School), and Geeyoung Min (Columbia Law School) argue that:

the *Caremark* standard is no longer sufficient to carry the freight assigned to it. In particular, it insufficiently addresses the distorted incentives created for compliance investment and oversight by the rise of stock-based pay. The present regime is likely to engender "box-ticking" compliance programs. Liability standards must work to offset the incentives to avoid compliance with applicable legal rules. The compliance oversight standard of *Caremark* has become a poor match for the greatly-intensified incentives of both managers and directors.³

The professors "propose more assertive directors' liability for compliance failures..." However, it would be "limited in quantum to a clawback of stock-based pay. This would realign directors' interests with shareholders'—directors would stand to lose in parallel with shareholders when a compliance failure materializes—but limiting liability in this way would avoid pushing boards to overinvest in compliance."

This seems like a sound proposal to me. Although I generally agree with Langevoort about the importance of regulatory expectations, nothing so focuses the mind as the real prospect of personal liability. *

1. Donald C. Langevoort, "Caremark and Compliance: A Twenty Year Lookback," *Harvard Law School Forum*, March 29, 2018, <http://bit.ly/2RAnTOL>.
2. *In re Caremark International Inc. Derivative Litigation*, 698 A.2d 959 (Del. Ch. 1996).
3. John Armour, Jeffrey N. Gordon, and Geeyoung Min, "Short-Changing Compliance," *Harvard Law School Forum*, September 27, 2018, <https://bit.ly/2R4xnBF>.