

CEP

MAGAZINE

A PUBLICATION OF THE SOCIETY OF
CORPORATE COMPLIANCE AND ETHICS



**CFIUS: Compliance with a
National Security Agreement**
(P20)

Making audit your best friend
(P24)

**Cyberattacks in a global supply
chain: How compliance officers
can mitigate risk** (P28)

**So different and so alike:
Internal audit and
compliance** (P32)

JACKI CHESLOW, CCEP, CCEP-I

DIRECTOR, BUSINESS ETHICS & COMPLIANCE, RECORD &
INFORMATION MANAGEMENT, AVIS BUDGET GROUP

**DRIVE THE CHANGE
IN YOUR ORGANIZATION** (P14)



SCCE[™]



“ It is up to us to drive change in the conversations with our organization. ”

See page 14

COMPLIANCE & ETHICS PROFESSIONAL

CEP

MAGAZINE

A PUBLICATION OF THE SOCIETY OF CORPORATE COMPLIANCE AND ETHICS

February 2019

Columns

- 1 **Letter from the CEO**
by Gerry Zack
- 19 **Empirically speaking**
by Brian K. Lee and Dian Zhang
- 23 **Conversations on culture**
by Steve Priest
- 27 **Kaplan's court**
by Jeffery M. Kaplan
- 31 **The view from Nickel City**
by Jennifer Kennedy
- 37 **How to be a wildly effective compliance officer**
by Kristy Grant-Hart
- 58 **The last word**
by Joe Murphy

Features

- 14 **Meet Jacki Cheslow**
an interview by Adam Turteltaub
- 20 **CFIUS: Compliance with a National Security Agreement**
by Michael Rose and Steve Siemborski
The second of a three-part series examining foreign investment regulations.
- 24 **Making audit your best friend**
by Sam Abadir
Collaboration with auditors can pay off for your organization and department.
- 28 **[CEU] Cyberattacks in a global supply chain: How compliance officers can mitigate risk**
by Matan Or-El
Mitigate cyberattack risk through a detailed vendor risk management plan.
- 32 **[CEU] So different and so alike: Internal audit and compliance**
by Mónica Ramírez Chimal
Compliance prevents, internal audit detects, and both can achieve more together.

Compliance & Ethics Professional® (CEP) (ISSN 1523-8466) is published by the Society of Corporate Compliance and Ethics (SCCE), 6500 Barrie Road, Suite 250, Minneapolis, MN 55435. Subscriptions are free to members. Periodicals postage-paid at Minneapolis, MN 55435. Postmaster: Send address changes to Compliance & Ethics Professional magazine, 6500 Barrie Road, Suite 250, Minneapolis, MN 55435. Copyright © 2019 Society of Corporate Compliance and Ethics. All rights reserved. Printed in the USA. Except where specifically encouraged, no part of this publication may be reproduced, in any form or by any means, without prior written consent from SCCE. For subscription information and advertising rates, call +1952.933.4977 or 888.277.4977. Send press releases to SCCE CEP Press Releases, 6500 Barrie Road, Suite 250, Minneapolis, MN 55435. Opinions expressed are those of the writers and not of this publication or SCCE. Mention of products and services does not constitute endorsement. Neither SCCE nor CEP is engaged in rendering legal or other professional services. If such assistance is needed, readers should consult professional counsel or other professional advisors for specific legal or ethical questions.

Conflict-of-interest policies and procedures

by Jeffrey M. Kaplan

Conflicts of interest (COIs) have long been among the most common sources of compliance and ethics (C&E) risk. They have also long been of interest to me — particularly since, as much as any C&E risk area, they can be seen as existing “where law and ethics meet.”

But effectively mitigating risks in this area can be quite a challenge. What should a company seeking to develop or enhance a COI C&E program focus on?

First, consider conducting a risk assessment for COIs. This need not be an elaborate undertaking, and for many companies, the main COI risks are largely the same: economic relationships (ownership or employment) with customers, competitors and suppliers (including gifts, etc.), and family employment issues. But a risk assessment will help determine the extent to which other risks — such as those arising from charitable activities — should be focused on as well.

Second, a COI policy should address not only actual and apparent COIs but also potential ones, which are not widely understood. A potential COI risk typically entails a situation that does not yet exist but is reasonably likely to come into being, such as where an employee is being considered for a transfer from a non-procurement role to a procurement-related one.

Third, one should consider implementing COI certifications. These can be either standalone or part of a larger (i.e., multi-risk) mitigation process. In many companies, certifications are required on an annual basis, but a less frequent cycle may be acceptable — so long as employees understand the need to disclose on a timely basis any meaningful changes to the underlying facts in the prior certification. Moreover, not all employees need be required to certify. It is generally sufficient to limit such requirements to those in higher-risk positions.

Fourth, companies should have training and other communications around COIs. In some (indeed, many) organizations, training for senior executives and the board should be tailored to risks most significant to them. The same is true of risky functions. And, companies may wish to consider developing communications designed to help managers understand how to handle COIs disclosed to them by their subordinates.

Finally, there should be a robust “checking” dimension to the program. This includes auditing to see if policies are understood and are being followed. It also includes monitoring of COIs that are — under company rules — allowed to exist subject to specified conditions. ^{CEP}



Jeffrey M. Kaplan

(jkaplan@kaplanwalker.com) is a Partner with Kaplan & Walker LLP in Princeton, New Jersey, USA.