

Corporate governance



**ASSIGN
BUSTER**

Overall Similarity Index 22% sources 7% match (Internet from 11/24/05) (11-24-05) http://erisk.com/LearningCenter/CaseStudies/ref_case_bcci.asp 2 5% match (Internet from 11/16/05)

(11-16-05) <http://corpgov.nl/page/downloads/corpgov05.pdf>

3

3% match (publications)

Robert Goddard. "(quote)Modernising Company Law(quote): The Government's White Paper", *Modern Law Review*, 5/2003

4

1% match (Internet from 08/15/08)

(8-15-08) <http://www.icaew.com/index.cfm?route=116204>

5

1% match (Internet from 03/02/08)

(3-2-08) <http://www.som.hw.ac.uk/somac/btdem2.pdf>

6

1% match (Internet from 09/16/07)

(9-16-07) <http://www.secp.gov.pk/Reports/HarmonizingCode.pdf>

7

1% match (Internet from 01/06/08)

(1-6-08) [http://www.econsense.](http://www.econsense.de/_CSR_INFO_POOL/_CORP_GOVERNANCE/images/hampel_report.pdf)

[de/_CSR_INFO_POOL/_CORP_GOVERNANCE/images/hampel_report.pdf](http://www.econsense.de/_CSR_INFO_POOL/_CORP_GOVERNANCE/images/hampel_report.pdf)

8

1% match (publications)

Maclean, Mairi. "Corporate governance in France and the UK: long-term perspectives on contemporary institutional arrangements", *Business History*, Jan 1999 Issue

<https://assignbuster.com/corporate-governance/>

9

< 1% match (Internet from 01/15/07)

(1-15-07) http://www.football-research.org/Training%20Pack/pdf/ch_6.pdf

10

< 1% match (Internet from 01/03/07)

(1-3-07) [http://www.developmentwork.](http://www.developmentwork.org/Dissertation/PHD_THESIS_BY_GREGORY_MAASSEN_APRIL_1999_3.pdf)

[org/Dissertation/PHD_THESIS_BY_GREGORY_MAASSEN_APRIL_1999_3.pdf](http://www.developmentwork.org/Dissertation/PHD_THESIS_BY_GREGORY_MAASSEN_APRIL_1999_3.pdf)

11

< 1% match (publications)

Acumen PI- Title: Corporate Governance, Name: lu shang, Date: 2004-10-13

12

< 1% match (Internet from 09/20/08)

(9-20-08) [http://www.yellgroup.co.](http://www.yellgroup.co.uk/files/6RLD3P/2005+yell+finance+bv+annual+report+sec+filing.pdf)

[uk/files/6RLD3P/2005+yell+finance+bv+annual+report+sec+filing.pdf](http://www.yellgroup.co.uk/files/6RLD3P/2005+yell+finance+bv+annual+report+sec+filing.pdf)

13

< 1% match (Internet from 09/19/08)

(9-19-08) <http://supporters-direct.org/downloads/pdfs/handbook.pdf>

14

< 1% match (publications)

Chris Mallin. " The Financial Sector and Corporate Governance: the UK case",
Corporate Governance An International Review, 7/2005

paper text:

Intrductin Th scndls f crprtiv gvrnmnt f high prfil nd th incrsd ctivism f shrhldr
ld bttr prctic s rgrds gvrnmnt. Whil th gvrnmnts nd th rgultrs tk upsuch
confronts by approving novel regulations or simply by modifying the existing
codes of corporate government as it is observed that cnsnsus f mrgnc f th

<https://assignbuster.com/corporate-governance/>

llwd prctics nd this tndncy is has to prolong. Whil th cds cnvrg nd th stndrds
 imprv f th invstrs lk bynd frnk cnfrmity 2t sk th fctrs which cntribut t th crtin f
 in th lng (Stephanie Maier, How global is good Corporate Governance)run
 vlut. (Slmn 2007: 25-58) Th ruls nd prctics by which public cmpnis r gvrnd rvl
 much but cuntry's systm f cpitlism. Whs intrsts thy srv th ffct thy hv n wlth
 crtin nd risktking nd th frms f ccuntbility thy mbdy r vitl t th functining f th
 cnmic nd pliticl systm. Crprt gvrnnc mchnisms r criticl fctr in issus rnging frm
 th lvl f businss invstmnt t mpnymnt nd cmmunity stbilty nd th distributin f th
 fruits f cnmic grwth. Dspit this prvsiv rl in structuring bth cnmic prfrmnc nd
 civil scity qustins f crprt gvrnnc rmin pliticl sidshw flickring n t th public stg
 nly in rspns t vry prticular (thugh imprtant) vnts such s ppulr cncern vr lvls f
 xcutiv rmunrtin r th bcklsh ginst th cnsquncs f unchckd mngmnt filur r finncil
 imprprity. Indd it is ths fctrs tht hv spurrd th rcnt rrivl f crprt gvrnnc n th UK's
 pliticl mp. (Wring 2005: 65-78) Discussin Th Cdbury Cmmitt ws crtd in 1991
 in rspns t th Maxwell scndl nd th cllps f Pily Pck nd thr prminnt businss. Th
 Grnbury Cmmitt mrgd in 1995 s rctin t th pliticl furr surrounding xcutiv
 rmunrtin prticularlly in th rcntly privtisd utilitis. Th Hmpl Cmmitt in its rpt
 publishd in 1998 st ut t rviw nd updt th cds prducd by ths rliar bdis. 4 cnslidtin
 f th wrk f ll thr cmmitts nw pprs s th Cmbind Cd. 3ll f th rpts f ths cmmitts hv
 shrd similr st f ssumptins but bth th ntur f crprt gvrnnc nd th mns through
 which it shuld b rfrmd. Gvrnnc is undrstd t b primrily but th rltinship btwn
 shrhldrs (wh r viwd unprblmticly s th slwnrs f cmpny) nd mngrs. Th bjctiv f
 th vrius cmmitts hs thrfr bn t cm up with prpsls which in sm sns imprv th
 quality f this rltinship withut rcurs t hvy-hndd gvrnmnt intrvntin. (Robert
 Goddard, "Modernising Company Law": The Government's White Paper)This
 hs bn viwd s lrgly tchnicl xrcis in which th businss cmmunity is xhrtd t imprv

standards of corporate hygiene in its own terms. From this perspective there is scant politics and not much more criticism involved in the rather recent questions to which corporate governance gives rise. (Slmn 2007: 25-58) This review starts by outlining some of the key provisions of the Combined Code departing from prior codes. The self-regulatory nature of the current system is then explored and its strengths and weaknesses highlighted. The review finishes by raising questions about the position of the shareholders within the current framework of corporate governance and considering the potential direction of new policy initiatives. The Cadbury requirement was first listed through the non-executives. For some companies with large boards the new provision will therefore mean an increase in the non-executive limit. Majority of non-executives should be independent of management and far from any business relationship which could materially interfere with the exercise of their independent judgment. As with Cadbury the Combined Code does not insist that the roles of chairman of the board and chief executive be split but it is now necessary that a company publicly justify combining the posts. In any event there should be a known independent non-executive director identified in the annual report to whom shareholders concerns can be conveyed. (Slmn 2007: 25-58) Companies must appoint a nomination committee (unless the board is small) to make recommendations to the board on all new board appointments. Majority of the committee should be non-executive directors. The Financial Sector and Corporate Governance: the UK case

Chris Mallin ¹, Andy Mullineux ² and Clas Wihlborg ³

but not necessarily independent ones. Cadbury regarded nomination committees as good practice but did not make them a requirement. There is some strengthening of Cadbury and Greenbury in relation to the presence of independent non-executives on the audit and remuneration committees. In the case of the former committee majority of its members must now be independent non-executives and in the latter they must all be independent. (Wring 2005: 65-78) The Combined Code endorses the approach of the Greenbury Report to director remuneration. Hence expressed the view that it was vital to judge how the Greenbury code is working in practice and to consider the case for possible changes. COMMITTEE ON CORPORATE

GOVERNANCE Final Report

Hmpl did nt tk th stp fr which sm institutinl invstrs hv prssd tht dirctrs' py b
 md subjct t shrhldr pprvl. Grnbury's min rspns t bus in th stting f dirctrs' trms
 nd cnditins ws t incrs disclsr thugh it ls lid dwn sm mr substntiv rquirmnts fr
 xmpl tht dirctrs' srvc cntrcts shuld nrmlly b trminbl by th cmpny with n mr
 thn n yr's ntic. This hs th ffct f limiting th munt f dmgs pybl if th cmpny
 prmtrly trmints dirctr's cntrct. s t whthr th disclsr philspy is wrking th
 cntinuing prpnsity f dirctrs' py t ris t rt cnsidrbly fstr thn tht f th cmpny's
 wrkfrc s whl suggsts thrwis. (Brickly 2007: 95) thr rquirmnts f th Cmbind Cd
 includ tht ll dirctrs stnd fr r-lctin t mximum f thr-yrly intrvls nd tht cmpnis
 6ntr int dilgu with institutinl shrhldr bsd n th mutul undrstnding f bjctivs. Th
 ltr 10is n xmpl f cd principl tht is sttmnt f gnrl guidnc s distinct frm prvisin r
 spcific rquirmnt. This divisin is n ttmt t vrcm bx ticking mntlity which Hmpl
 rgud my n th n hnd ld shrhldr t dmnd vryly rigid 12cmplinc with th dtils f th
 cd nd n th Sponsored by Merrill Lynch International Morgan Stanley & Co.
 International Limited Schroder Salomon Smith Barney

thr nbl sm cmpnis t gt wy with cnfrming t th ltr f th cd but nt its spirit.

(Wring 2005: 65-78) Th Cmbind Cd is slf-rgultry in tw snss. First lik its
 prdcssrs it is nn-gvrnmntl inititiv nd hs n sttutry bcking. It ws frmultd by
 rprsnttivs f th crprt sctr th invstmnt cmmunity nd rlted intrst grups. In th cs f
 Hmpl th mmbrship f th cmmitt prdminntly cmprisd snir cmpny xcutivs with
 nly limitd shrhldr rprsnttin (Cdbury's mmbrship ws mr divrs). (Cdbury 2006:
 115-120) Scnd cmpnis hv n frml bligtin t by th cd but nly t discls infrmtin but
 thir cmplinc rcrd. This duty is impsd by th Stck xchg Listing Ruls which prvid
 tht cmpnis must 6in thir nnul rprt giv nrrtiv ccunt f hw thy hv pplid th cd's
 principls (THE COMBINED CODE, PRINCIPLES OF GOOD GOVERNANCE AND

CODE OF BEST PRACTICE

Derived by the Committee on Corporate Governance from the Committee's Final Report and

from the Cadbury and Greenbury Reports).

and statements that whether or not they have complied with its more specific provisions. That is it is open to companies to depart from the code's requirements but if this is the case they must say so and give reasons. The Independent Director's Code states that disclosures of matters which are capable of being objectively verified must be reviewed by the auditors. It follows that the mechanism relied on for securing conformity with the code is shareholder pressure. The assumption is that shareholders informed but non-complacent will where it is appropriate do so lobby management for change in policy. Intentionally shareholders dissatisfied with the company's governance record might sell their shares creating market pressure to that end. (Cadbury 2006: 115-120) Given that the way large companies are run is of fundamental importance to the portion of the economy and the supporter's trust handbooks major impact on the lives both of employees and of the wider community a basic question is whether the task of ensuring that corporate governance structures are effectively established is left to private regulation. In the not too distant past indictments of serious failures in the framework of management accountability would have led to strengthening of the law. Why has corporate governance recently been matter for self-regulation codes rather than company law (Cadbury 2005: 65-78) In fact reliance on codes seems to imply that the partial rejection of the theory of efficient regulation and the acceptance that the market has failed to secure widespread compliance with acceptable governance standards. The criticisms are strong enough to suggest that dispersed shareholders lack incentives and face significant collective action problems in identifying governance weaknesses in the individual companies in which they invest and then in advising and pressuring them to make non-proper responses. Acknowledging the difficulties market theorists face in explaining instead of the threat of takeover as source of management discipline both directly and as mechanism for inducing improvements in governance structures. However the level of slack in the market for corporate control and the absence of clear correlation between under-performance and the likelihood of takeover suggest that their confidence

will often be misplac'd. (Brickly 2007: 95) Case Study: Maxwell The misperception of Maxwell was mainly composed of two publicly quoted companies - Maxwell Communication Corporation and Newsprint Group of America. The heavy loss in the financial expansion of its misperceptions of the 2nd and 3rd led to the insupportable levels of the debt. Further the supposed suicide of Robert Maxwell the financial problems of the group were exposed. The debts of the GBP 4 billion and GBP 441 million classified the high in its pension funds were revealed thereafter. The following analysis contained certain number of insufficiencies of corporate governance. 2 Robert Maxwell held the positions of the President and the senior officer. (Bacht 2004: 20) The lack of separation of the roles led to the concentration of the power which facilitated the fraudulent activities. The effectiveness of the directors and the non-executive administrators of pension was also called into question although the officer of fraud negates did not bring any expansion against them. The scandal of Maxwell was described like greater fraud of the 20th century forcing the question of the corporate governance firmly in the public the business and the political arena. 1 Case Study: Bank of Credit and Commerce International In July 5 1991 an incident which was described like the greatest fraud of bank in the history came to head when the regulators in several countries plundered and took the rest of the Bank of Credit and Commerce International (BCCI). The ministry losses of the scandal were enormous with valuations extending from \$10 billion to \$17 billion although many billions since were recovered from creditors by the liquidators Dillett & Tuch. The scandal had developed during almost two decades and surrounded an international web complex institutions financial and companies screen which had escaped with the full payment. Activities of BCCIs and this for part of its leaders doubtful included record keeping fraudulent trades swindler to make fun of the payments of property of bank and many washing in addition to the legitimate activities of bank transactions. The banks structure and the manufacture of business laws is complex that further the establishment was liquidated its activities always completely or not decided not included/understood. (Clasns 2000: 35-59) The new way to be thought of the saga of the BCCI is like an attempt to create the plural position of company with practices of management integrated of risk. In this case unquestionable personal leader of bank and having right simply did not give in risks but of the gaps pointed in the structure of risk management of

banks and between its subsidiary companies to achieve various goals. This puts in a unfavourable position for the banks such as million approximately 15 small depositors around the world and certain institutional depositors attracted by the relatively high rates of BCCIs which provide most of the placement of banks. While writing the banks of bank had the small arrangement of the structure of banks and the total financial position and were encouraged not to call into question of the practices regarding bank for the reason for the flow of the funds between the entities of bank. (Gwillim 2008: 77-79) Conclusion The Combined Code is unlikely to be the last word in corporate governance in the UK. The DTI has recently announced fundamental review of company law which among other things will examine the boundary between self-regulation and law and the merits of wider understanding of directors' responsibilities. It presents the system of corporate governance as reflected in the Combined Code undoubtedly addresses the two central and potentially contradictory challenges which should be exercising policymakers. The first of these is to identify workable proposals to encourage key stakeholders to make the necessary investments in the wealth-creating potential of firms. This issue should not be viewed so narrowly as interest only to management theorists and company lawyers: it has direct bearing on current debates about productivity, business investment and investment in human capital. The second challenge is to find ways of harnessing the growing power of institutional investors in order to increase corporate accountability. For instance current levels of transparency surrounding shareholder voting are manifestly inadequate and are unlikely to be rectified by reliance on voluntarism. In contrast to previous inquiries into corporate governance which have come up with unconvincing answers to rather limited sets of questions the current DTI review is the last striding in the right place. As the DTI's consultation paper states there is now clear need to re-examine the UK's system of company law and governance to see how it might best support the current growth and competitiveness of British companies while at the same time protecting the interests of all those involved in the Maclean, Mairi. ntrpris. References Becht Marco Patrick Bolton and Rull 2004. Corporate Governance and Control. Brickley James . William S. Klug and Jerold L. Zimmermann 2007. Managerial Economics & Organizational Architecture ISBN Cdbury Sir drian 2005. The Code of <https://assignbuster.com/corporate-governance/>

Best Practice Report of the Committee on the Financial Aspects of Corporate Governance Gee and Co Ltd. Cadbury Sir 2006. Corporate Governance: Brussels Instituut voor Bestuurders Brussels. Clessens Stijn Djankov Simeon & Ljungqvist H. P. 2000. The Separation of Ownership and Control in East Asian Corporations Journal of Financial Economics 58: 81-112 Gwillim D 2008. Nivette or Muddled Methodology: the accounting and audit Implications of Independent Insurance Professional Negligence 24(4) 215-230 Solomon J 2007. Corporate Governance and Accountability. John Wiley & Sons; 2nd edition. Waring R. 2005. Cases in Corporate Governance. Sage