



On the 2022 board agenda

KPMG Board Leadership Centre



27 January 2022

Considering the accelerated trends of companies reposition for the future especially under the “new normal,” it is increasingly clear that resilience—of strategy, the organisation, and operating muscle—is proving to be the great differentiator of the pandemic era. From pivoting to “remote everything” and focusing on workforce well-being to deepening digital engagement with customers and recalibrating supply chains, the ability to quickly adapt to dramatic disruptions and dislocations has defined the survivors and thrivers.

The unprecedented events of the past two years have clearly put corporate governance processes, including board oversight, to the test. Demands for action on ESG performance, including climate risk, increased cybersecurity risks (including ransomware attacks), economic and supply chain challenges, a fast-changing regulatory landscape, and other factors impacting the global risk environment will continue to challenge even those boards at the top of their game.

In short, boards are at a pivotal moment. As one director recently observed, the need for today’s boards to help their company “reimagine, rethink, and reset is probably a once-in-a-generation opportunity.”

Drawing on our research, insights, and interactions with directors and business leaders, we highlight eight issues here for boards to keep in mind as they consider and carry out their 2022 agendas:

- **Deepen the board’s engagement in strategy and envisioning the future.**
- **Embed ESG, including climate risk and Diversity, Equity and Inclusion (DEI), into risk and strategy discussions.**
- **Engage proactively with shareholders, activists, and other stakeholders.**
- **Make talent, human capital management, and CEO succession a priority.**
- **Approach cybersecurity and data privacy holistically as data governance.**

- **Reassess the company’s crisis prevention and readiness efforts.**
- **Help set the tone and closely monitor the culture of the organisation.**
- **Think strategically about talent and diversity in the boardroom.**



Deepen the board’s engagement in strategy and envisioning the future.

Given the volatile and fluid business environment ahead—managing remote workforces, employee activism, digital transformations and other accelerating megatrends, building more resilient supply chains and strengthening connections with customers whose behaviors, preferences, and expectations are changing—take time to reassess the board’s engagement in strategy. Review the alignment of culture, values, and strategy. And identify specific practices to drive quality boardroom discussions about strategy and the future.

A fundamental question for every board is whether boardroom conversations are, in fact, conversations. Does the board allocate sufficient agenda time to meaningful, two-way discussions between management and the board about forward-looking issues—challenging assumptions and considering scenarios (likely and unlikely)—versus reviewing historical, compliance-related information which, while essential, can crowd out valuable agenda time.

The board's fiduciary role remains oversight, but effective engagement in strategy discussions (which investors expect) increasingly calls for a collaborative mindset: How can the board help management think through the implications of pressing and potentially existential strategic questions and decisions? And is management helping to set the context, providing meaningful materials to the board to prepare directors for those critical conversations and maximise the board's contribution?

In our discussions with directors over the past year, a number of elements and practices were highlighted that may be helpful:

- *Encourage management to revisit its strategic planning processes.* Is the process adequate in light of the speed and impact of megatrends—and does it capture the risks and potential disruptions on the horizon? Does the process challenge the validity of key assumptions that the company's strategy and business model are based on? Is it an iterative process—with milestones and opportunities to recalibrate—and does it bring in perspectives from throughout the organization, beyond the inner team?
- *Develop a vivid picture of the future.* This is never an easy undertaking, and it's particularly challenging today, given the level of uncertainty and transformational changes underway. Where are the company's industry and competition (both industry competitors and those in adjacent industries) headed? What might the business look and feel like in 2, 5, or 10 years? Make time for the board to have meaningful "what-if" discussions in a focused and urgent way—including devoting time to less-likely scenarios (without getting overly theoretical). Risks and scenarios related to climate, ESG, human capital, and supply chain should be front and center.
- *Make resilience part of the strategy discussion.* Full resilience is not only the ability to bounce back when something goes wrong; it's also the ability to stand back up with viable strategic options for staying competitive and on the offense.
- *Understand the value of the board's lens.* Management is immersed in running the business, looking around the corner, and staying competitive—as they should be. Board members are likely picking up broader perspectives and signals from their activities—and may be "seeing and hearing things differently than management." Leverage directors fully, as valuable sources of insight and competitive advantage.



Embed ESG, including climate risk and DEI, into risk and strategy discussions.

How companies address climate change, DEI issues, and other ESG risks is now viewed—by investors, research and ratings firms, activists, employees, customers, and regulators—as fundamental to the business and critical to long-term sustainability and value creation. Expect the intense regulatory focus on these issues to continue in 2022.

The clamor for attention to climate change as a financial risk has become more urgent, driven by a confluence of factors, the most visible of which is the accelerating physical impact of climate change—including the frequency and severity of floods, wildfires, rising sea levels, and droughts—as well as concern by many experts that the window for preventing more dire long-term consequences is rapidly closing. Related to climate risk are the "transition risks" that companies face as they work—in conjunction with countries, regulators, and other stakeholders—to reduce reliance on carbon and the impact on the climate. The Task Force on Climate-related Financial Disclosures (TCFD) defines these transition risks as "risks associated with the transition to a lower-carbon economy, the most common of which relate to policy, tax, and legal actions, technology changes, market responses, and reputational considerations." A challenge for boards is to help ensure that these transition risks are addressed by management in its enterprise risk management processes—together with other climate change risks.

Monitoring the rapidly changing legal and regulatory developments regarding climate change is critical as regulators and policy makers globally are placing greater demands on companies to take action—as evidenced by the launch of strategic plan by the Green and Sustainable Finance Cross-Agency Steering Group chaired by the Hong Kong Monetary Authority and Securities and Futures Commission requiring Hong Kong financial institutions and listed companies to disclose in line with TCFD recommendations no later than 2025. The Guidance on Climate Disclosures was published by the HKEx in November 2021 to provide practical guidance to facilitate listed companies in complying with the TCFD recommendations.

With respect to DEI, heavier emphasis is placed on workforce and Board diversity as noted from the amended HKEx Corporate Governance Code and Listing Rules which comes into effect on 1 January 2022. The HKEx also published a new set of guidance ([Corporate Governance Guide for Boards and Directors](#)) to assist issuers' compliance with the new requirements in December 2021.

Going forward, listed companies are required to set numerical targets and timelines for achieving gender diversity at board level, and annual review of board diversity policy. Disclosure should also be made on gender ratios in the workforce with plans or measurable objectives established for achieving gender diversity.

Furthermore a single gender board will not be considered to be a diverse board where listed companies with commitment in listing document should appoint a director of a different gender within the three-year transition period (i.e. appointment no later than 31 December 2024). Such requirements are also applicable to IPO applicants filing A1 submission on or after 1 July 2022.

To that end, several fundamental questions should be front and center in boardroom conversations about the company's ESG journey. After determining which ESG issues are material to the company, assess which of these issues are of strategic significance. How is the company embedding them into core business activities (strategy, operations, risk management, incentives, and corporate culture) to drive long-term performance? Is there a clear commitment and strong leadership from the top, and enterprise-wide buy-in?

Oversight of these risks and opportunities is a significant challenge, involving the full board and multiple board committees. For example, elements of climate, ESG, and DEI oversight likely reside with the nominating and governance, compensation, and audit committees—and other committees may have responsibilities as well. Overlap is to be expected, but this puts a premium on information sharing and communication and coordination among committees. It also requires that committees have the expertise to oversee the issues delegated to them.



Engage proactively with shareholders, activists, and other stakeholders.

Given the intense investor and stakeholder focus on climate risk, ESG, and DEI, particularly in the context of long-term value creation, engagement with shareholders and stakeholders should be a priority. Institutional investors and stakeholders are increasingly holding boards accountable for company performance and are continuing to demand greater transparency, including direct engagement with independent directors on big-picture issues like strategy and ESG. Indeed, transparency, authenticity, and trust are not only important to investors, but increasingly to

employees, customers, suppliers, and communities—all of whom are holding companies and boards to account.

The board should request periodic updates from management about the company's engagement activities:

- Does the company know, engage with, and understand the priorities of its largest shareholders and key stakeholders?
- Are the right people engaging with these shareholders and stakeholders—and how is the investor relations (IR) role changing (if at all)?
- What is the board's position on meeting with investors and stakeholders? Which independent directors should be involved?

In short: Is the company providing investors and stakeholders with a clear, current picture of its performance, challenges, and long-term vision—free of "greenwashing"? (Investors, other stakeholders, and regulators are increasingly calling out companies and boards on ESG-related claims and commitments that fall short—and all indications are that they will continue to do so.)

As reflected in regulatory changes and trends, strategy, executive compensation, management performance, climate risk, other ESG initiatives, DEI and human capital management, and board composition and performance will remain squarely on investors' radar. We can also expect investors and stakeholders to focus on how companies are adapting their strategies to address the economic and geopolitical uncertainties and dynamics shaping the business and risk environment in 2022. The HKEx published the Guidance on Climate Disclosures in November 2021 and the HKMA has issued the Supervisory Policy Manual (SPM) module GS-1 "Climate Risk Management" in December 2021 to require all Authorised Institutions to implement within a 12-month period.

Having an "activist mindset" is as important as ever—particularly given the increasing demand by investors on corporate leaders for improving sustainability practices that both benefit the companies' bottom line and create greater impact on the wider community. Such demands align with studies results suggesting that ESG and corporate performance are intrinsically intertwined and ESG practices are clearly linked to long term value creation. Considering the escalating investments dedicated to ESG and sustainability, companies should hasten their responses to institutional investors' demands for transparent and detailed ESG disclosures.

As stated in the Total Value Framework report published by Engine 1, an investment firm purpose-built to create long term value:

“We developed our Total Value Framework to address the current deficiencies in ESG data and to help investors generate lasting impact on corporate behavior and robust long-term financial returns—not just the warm glow of a ‘pure’ portfolio.

Through the Total Value Framework, we attempt to measure the value companies create or destroy for both shareholders and stakeholders—their employees, customers, communities, and environment—as well as on the connection between the two groups. Instead of ESG scores and ranks, which in effect constitute little more than emojis and are as difficult to incorporate into spreadsheets or algorithms, we try where possible to quantify the impact in dollars. We use independent sources and estimates to assess the firm-level costs of emissions, resource use, waste, social practices, and a host of other ESG factors.

Armed with this new data, we can proceed to focus on how the value a company delivers to its stakeholders affects the value it is then able to impart to its shareholders. This forces us to examine drivers like potential regulation, changes in customer or employee preferences, technological disruption, and other relevant contributors to a company’s risk or growth.”



Make talent, human capital management, and CEO succession a priority.

The events of 2020–2021 further highlighted the strategic importance of human capital management (HCM) issues—including employee and supply chain health and safety issues so critical to the company’s performance and reputation. Institutional investors have been increasingly vocal about the importance of human capital and talent development programs and their link to strategy—including calling for more engaged board oversight and enhanced disclosure of HCM-related metrics.

In 2022, we can expect continued scrutiny of how companies are adjusting their talent development strategies. The challenge of finding, developing, and retaining talent, amid a labour-constrained market has created a war for talent. Does the board have a good understanding of the company’s talent strategy and its

alignment with the company’s broader strategy and forecast needs for the short and long term? Which roles throughout the organisation are mission critical, and what are the challenges keeping those roles filled with engaged employees? Which talent categories are in short supply and how will the company successfully compete for this talent? Does the talent strategy reflect a commitment to DEI at all levels? More broadly, as millennials and younger employees—who increasingly choose employers based on alignment with their own values—join the workforce in large numbers and talent pools become globally diverse, is the company positioned to attract, develop, and retain top talent at all levels?

Pivotal to all of this is having the right CEO in place to drive culture and strategy, navigate risk, and create long-term value for the enterprise. The board should ensure that the company is prepared for a CEO change—whether planned or unplanned, on an emergency interim basis or permanent. CEO succession planning is a dynamic and ongoing process, and the board should always be focused on developing a pipeline of potential CEO candidates as well as all other C-suite positions. (Succession planning should start the day a new CEO is named.)

How robust are the board’s succession planning processes and activities? Which board committee has responsibility to review the plans (at least once per year, but likely more often in these uncertain times)? Are succession plans in place for other key executives? How does the board get to know the high-potential leaders two or three levels below the C-suite—especially in a work-from-home environment when office visits and board-executive in-person meetings may not be feasible?



Approach cybersecurity and data privacy holistically as data governance.

The rapid shifts that companies have made during the pandemic to keep their businesses up and running—remote work arrangements, supply chain adjustments, and increased reliance on online platforms—have been a boon to organised crime, hacktivists, and nation-states. Cyberattacks of all types proliferated during the pandemic, highlighting the far-reaching implications for supply chains and operations, as well as the ongoing cybersecurity challenge facing companies.

Boards have made strides in monitoring management’s cybersecurity effectiveness—for example, with greater

IT expertise on the board and relevant committees, company-specific dashboard reporting to show critical risks, and more robust conversations with management. Despite these efforts, the acceleration of digital strategies, remote and hybrid work models, increased regulatory scrutiny of data privacy, and the growing sophistication of cyberattackers, all point to the continued cybersecurity challenge ahead.

As we've noted, data governance overlaps with cybersecurity, but it's broader. Data governance includes compliance with industry-specific privacy laws and regulations, as well as privacy laws and regulations that govern how personal data—from customers, employees, or vendors—is processed, stored, collected, and used. Data governance also includes the company's policies and protocols regarding data ethics—in particular, managing the tension between how the company may use customer data in a legally permissible way and customer expectations as to how their data will be used. Managing this tension poses significant reputation and trust risks for companies and represents a critical challenge for leadership.

To oversee cybersecurity and data governance more holistically:

- Insist on a robust data governance framework that makes clear how and what data is being collected, stored, managed, and used, and who makes decisions regarding these issues
- Clarify which business leaders are responsible for data governance across the enterprise—including the roles of the chief information officer, chief information security officer, and chief compliance officer
- Reassess how the board—through its committee structure—assigns and coordinates oversight responsibility for both the company's cybersecurity and data governance frameworks, including privacy, ethics, and hygiene.



Reassess the company's crisis prevention and readiness efforts.

The litany and severity of crises that companies have found themselves facing in recent years looms large, with crisis prevention and readiness now featuring more prominently than ever in boardroom conversations. Crisis prevention goes hand-in-hand with good risk management—identifying and anticipating risks, and putting in place a system of reporting and controls to help prevent or mitigate the impact of such risk events.

We're clearly seeing an increased focus by boards on cultural risks as well as key operational risks across the extended global organisation—e.g., supply chain

and outsourcing risks, information technology and data security risks, etc. Does the company understand its critical operational risks, including mission-critical company and industry risks? What's changed in the operating environment? Has the company experienced any control failures, and if so, what were the root causes? Is management sensitive to early warning signs regarding safety, product quality, and compliance?

Periodically reassess the clarity and appropriateness of risk oversight responsibilities among the board's committees—being mindful to not overload the audit committee's agenda, and recognising the importance of good communication and coordination among committees, as certain risks likely touch multiple committees.

Help ensure that management is weighing a broad spectrum of what-if scenarios—from supply chains and the financial health of vendors to geopolitical risks, natural disasters, terrorist acts, and cyber threats. Is the company's crisis response plan robust and ready to go? Is the plan actively tested or war-gamed—and updated as needed? Does it take into account the loss of critical infrastructure—e.g., telecommunications networks, financial systems, transportation, and water and energy supplies? Are there communications protocols to keep the board apprised of events and the company's response? Even the best-prepared companies will experience a crisis, but companies that respond quickly and effectively—including with robust communications—tend to weather crises better.

A final, important reminder from the COVID-19 pandemic experience: While management should keep the board apprised throughout a crisis, the board should avoid information requests that unduly add to management's workload and potentially distract the CEO and management team from mission-critical activities.



Help set the tone and closely monitor the culture of the organisation.

The events of 2020–2021 have increased the risk of ethics and compliance failures, particularly given the increased fraud risk due to employee financial hardship and the pressure on management to meet financial targets. Closely monitor the tone at the top and culture throughout the organisation with a sharp focus on behaviors (not just results) and yellow flags. Is senior management sensitive to human resource issues, particularly the pressures on employees (both in the office and at home), employee health, safety and well-being, productivity, engagement and morale, and normalising work-from-home arrangements? Does the company make it safe for people to do the right thing?

Headlines of sexual harassment, price gouging, aggressive sales practices, and other wrongdoing continue to put corporate culture, leadership, and incentives front and center. With the near-instantaneous speed of social media, corporate crises (particularly when self-inflicted) are hitting corporate reputations fast and hard, with investors, regulators, and others increasingly asking, “Where was the board?”

Given the critical role that corporate culture plays in driving a company’s performance and reputation, we see boards taking a more proactive approach to understanding, shaping, and assessing corporate culture. The amended HKEx Corporate Governance Code has a new Code Provision to highlight board’s role in shaping and monitoring the culture. Have a laser focus on the tone set by senior management and zero tolerance for conduct that is inconsistent with the company’s values and ethical standards, including any “code of silence” around such conduct. Be sensitive to early warning signs, and verify that the company has robust whistle-blower and other reporting mechanisms in place, and that employees are not afraid to use them. Closely monitor the reporting systems to understand how claims are addressed/ resolved and identify trends. If the company has a sizable workforce and few or no claims, the board should dig deeper.

Understand the company’s actual culture (the unwritten rules versus those posted on the breakroom wall); use all the tools available—surveys, internal audit, hotlines, social media, virtual town halls as well as walking the halls, and visiting facilities—to monitor the culture and see it in action. Recognise that the tone at the top is easier to gauge than the mood in the middle and the buzz at the bottom. How does the board gain visibility into the middle and bottom levels of the organisation? Make sure that incentive structures align with culture and strategy and encourage the right behaviors. Take a hard look at the board’s own culture for signs of groupthink or discussions that lack independence or contrarian voices. Focus not only on results, but the behaviors driving results.



Think strategically about talent and diversity in the boardroom.

Boards, investors, regulators, and other stakeholders are increasingly focused on the alignment of board composition with the company’s strategy—with diversity front and center.

Indeed, the increased level of investor engagement on this issue highlights investor frustration over the slow pace of change in boardrooms, and points to the central challenge with board composition: a changing business and risk landscape. Addressing competitive threats and business model disruption, technology innovations and digital changes, climate and ESG risks, cyber risk, and global volatility requires a proactive approach to board-building and board diversity—of skills, experience, thinking, gender, and race/ethnicity.

While the world is making well progress on diversity, the progress of Hong Kong and Mainland China is lacking behind. According to the Women on Board Progress Report issued by MSCI in November 2020, Hong Kong is among the few markets that had its number of all-male boards rise, from 32% in 2019 to 37% in 2020.

Expect continued legislative and regulatory action on board composition and diversity. For example, the amended Corporate Governance Code and Listing Rules published in December 2021 proposed several enhancement on the diversity issues and disclosure, as well as Board independence and refreshment, including requirements to end single-gender boards among listed companies.

Board composition, diversity, and renewal should remain a key area of board focus in 2022, as a topic for communications with the company’s institutional investors and other stakeholders, enhanced disclosure in the company’s proxy, and most fundamentally positioning the board strategically for the future.

The KPMG Board Leadership Centre

The KPMG Board Leadership Centre offers support and guidance to non-executive directors, whether managing a portfolio non-executive career or embarking on a first appointment. Membership offers you a place within a community of board-level peers with access to topical and relevant seminars, invaluable resources and thought leadership, as well as lively and engaging networking opportunities. We equip you with the tools you need to be highly effective in your role, enabling you to focus on the issues that really matter to you and your business.

Learn more at kpmg/cn/boardleadership

Contact us

Shanghai:

Frank Mei
Partner

Tel: +86 (10) 8508 7188
frank.mei@kpmg.com

Kevin Huang
Partner

Tel: +86 (21) 2212 2159
kevin.huang@kpmg.com

Joyce Ge
Partner

Tel: +86 (21) 2212 3295
joyce.ge@kpmg.com

Sabrina Fang
Partner

Tel: +86 (21) 2212 4197
sabrina.hl.fang@kpmg.com

Li Fern Woo
Partner

Tel: +86 (21) 2212 2603
lifern.woo@kpmg.com

Stephanie Chew
Partner

Tel: +86 (21) 2212 3080
stephanie.chew@kpmg.com

Ivy Ye
Director

Tel: +86 (21) 2212 3327
ivy.ye@kpmg.com

Effeir Li
Director

+86 (21) 2212 2347
effeir.li@kpmg.com

Beijing:

Jessica Xu
Partner

Tel: +86 (10) 8508 5952
jessica.xu@kpmg.com

Charles Wan
Partner

Tel: +86 (10) 8508 5303
charles.wan@kpmg.com

Johnson Li
Partner

Tel: +86 (10) 8508 5975
johnson.li@kpmg.com

Vera Li
Partner

Tel: +86 (10) 8508 5870
vd.li@kpmg.com

Haoyu Liu
Director

Tel: +86 (10) 8553 3343
haoyu.liu@kpmg.com

Medivh Luo
Director

Tel: +86 (10) 8508 5016
medivh.luo@kpmg.com

Aaron Ren
Director

Tel: +86 (10) 8508 5454
aaron.ren@kpmg.com

May Gao
Director

Tel: +86 (10) 8508 5390
may.gao@kpmg.com

Hong Kong:

Alva Lee
Partner

Tel: +852 2143 8764
alva.lee@kpmg.com

Ivy Cheung
Partner

Tel: +852 2978 8136
ivy.cheung@kpmg.com

Jia Ning Song
Partner

Tel: +852 2978 8101
jianing.n.song@kpmg.com

Jeffrey Hau
Partner

Tel: +852 2685 7780
jeffrey.hau@kpmg.com

Edna Wong
Partner

Tel: +852 2143 8693
jedna.wong@kpmg.com

David Lonergan
Partner

Tel: +852 2826 7195
david.lonergan@kpmg.com

Paul Cheng
Director

Tel: +852 28 47 5075
paul.cheng@kpmg.com

Claudia Yu
Director

Tel: +852 2685 7898
claudia.yu@kpmg.com

Gianfran Liu
Director

Tel: +852 2847 5164
gianfran.liu@kpmg.com

Guangzhou/Shenzhen:

Ming Chung
Partner

Tel: +86 (20) 3813 8828
jming.chung@kpmg.com

Kelvin Leung
Partner

Tel: +86 (755) 2547 3338
kelvin.oc.leung@kpmg.com

Eric Chang
Partner

Tel: +86 (20) 3813 7088
eric.chang@kpmg.com

Joyce Xie
Partner

Tel: +86 (755) 2547 1261
joyce.xie@kpmg.com

Mona He
Director

Tel: +86 (20) 3813 8239
mona.he@kpmg.com

Sandy Wang
Director

Tel: +86 (755) 2547 1159
sandy.k.wang@kpmg.com

Season Wu
Director

Tel: +86 (20) 3813 7505
season.wu@kpmg.com

kpmg.com/cn

The information contained herein is of a general nature and is not intended to address the circumstances of any particular individual or entity. Although we endeavour to provide accurate and timely information, there can be no guarantee that such information is accurate as of the date it is received or that it will continue to be accurate in the future. No one should act on such information without appropriate professional advice after a thorough examination of the particular situation.

© 2022 KPMG Advisory (Hong Kong) Limited, a Hong Kong (SAR) limited liability company and a member firm of the KPMG global organisation of independent member firms affiliated with KPMG International Limited, a private English company limited by guarantee. All rights reserved. The KPMG name and logo are trademarks used under license by the independent member firms of the KPMG global organisation.